

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01001	<p>In particular, I am concerned for the land to the west of the Wirral Way in Heswall:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This area is an extremely important area for wildlife. The farmland is an integral part of the habitat alongside the marshland and the Dee Estuary, which is tidal. Many migratory and non-migratory species rely on it. • The Wirral Way is a highly acclaimed amenity, providing safe recreation for walkers of all ages, cyclists and horse riders. Davenport Road is the link road between 2 of the parts of the Wirral Way. Frequently large groups of schoolchildren are to be seen walking along this quiet road in the same frame of mind as they were in when on the Wirral Way (i.e. without much road sense). It is also a useful area for families to introduce new members to the joys of cycling. Any increase in housing in the area would inevitably lead to a major increase in traffic which would seriously impair the use of the Wirral Way and put the lives of its users in jeopardy. <p>There are vast tracts of brownfield sites on the Wirral that would lend themselves to solving the housing problem. I appreciate that this might be a more expensive option in terms of money in the short term, but in the long-term future generations would thank us for it in terms of environmental legacy.</p> <p>Wirral is fortunate to have Peel Holdings that is willing to commit to a major contribution to satisfy the need for additional housing, particularly in the areas that need it most.</p>
DOR01002	<p>I would like to raise an objection to the proposed plan to build on the Civic Centre car park at Bromborough. There is simply nowhere else to park, the Co-op car park is always full and shoppers would have to park in the streets which would be a congestion hazard. If shoppers decide it is too inconvenient it will put the whole shopping centre at risk of becoming uneconomic. Also as a wheelchair user I need to use the disabled place in the car park. I also need to use the Bromborough Co-op now the Co-op in Lower Bebington is closed. May I suggest a rethink? Surely there are other sites which can be built on. I understand there may be a lot more land available for building in the near future. Also if the businesses in Bromborough close there are less business rates for WBC. It does not seem to make economic sense? Surely Bromborough village can be spared?</p>
DOR01003	<p>We wish to raise an objection to the consideration of development of green belt land behind our home. The site in question is an area of natural beauty and has been protected for many years. It provides an area of tranquillity for both residents and visitors to be enjoyed by current and future generations. Our choice to move to this area and buy our home was based on the location, peace, tranquillity and views of the estuary, all of which would be affected by development and increase pressure on all local services. We respectfully suggest that consideration should be given to the many brown field sites available throughout Wirral and/or encourage owners of larger plots to build additional homes on those sites. To conclude, we wish to lodge our objection in the strongest possible terms and wait to hear from you in due course.</p>
DOR01004	<p>There are no exceptional circumstances to justify the release of any land in designated Green Belt. Alternative suitable previously developed land exists to deliver needed jobs and homes. The figures need to be reviewed in light of the recently published ONS 2016-based household projection. The countryside of Wirral should be fully protected in the future for the benefit of all. There is intrinsic value and economic, social and environmental value too. Once countryside is gone, it is gone forever. We urge the Council to do all it can to keep our farm fields, wildlife habitat and greenspace for the benefit of everyone for generations to come. The development options are currently much too developer led and we seek a more just and balanced approach. This report shows that in accordance to the National Planning Policy Framework 2018, the employment and housing requirement, can be easily met from the allocation and development of brownfield sites in the former industrial areas, promoting regeneration in the more deprived communities, and delivering needed jobs and homes for the people of Wirral in the future. Wirral Council has no exceptional circumstance necessitating the loss of a single square inch of Green Belt land for future development needs, and should now publicly re-affirm the existing, tested Green Belt boundaries. The 19 local societies are unanimously opposed to any Green Belt loss without justification and support Wirral Waters as the prime location for regeneration. The Council has been informed by Peel Group Holdings, 10th September 2018 (see appendix 2.0), that it is proposing some 6,450 new homes at Wirral Waters in the 15 years of the plan period with the ultimate goal of building 13,000 new homes over the plan period, contrary to a letter to residents from [the Council Leader] in August 2018 (appendix 1.0). The deliverability and viability assurance from Peel Group Holding should enable Wirral Council to meet the Government's new Housing Delivery Test and adopted a local plan without delay. Given that the household projection figures that underpin the housing requirement have been reduced by almost half during the consultation period and further revisions to the way housing need is calculated by Government are expected in December 2018, it is recommended that Wirral Council revisits the requirement figures and site allocations in entirety. The local societies are concerned that Wirral Council progresses the Local Plan in the spirit of the updated National Planning Policy Framework, 2018, recent court ruling by Judge Lindblom, letter from Peel, and updated Office of National Statistics 2016-based household projection.</p> <p>[Councillor's letter to residents attached] [Landowner's letter to Councillor]</p>
DOR01005	<p>We are writing in response to the Council's consultation regarding the Development Options Review. As local residents we are deeply concerned about the future of the Borough, its economic prosperity and the quality of its open spaces and landscape.</p> <p>We would like to comment as follows:</p> <p>i. Housing numbers: We have no issue with the projected 15 year housing requirements that are driving the review. We believe that Wirral should adopt targets based on demographic projections uplifted to reflect the economic ambitions of the borough, and in particular a strategy which seeks to close the growth gap between the Liverpool City Region and more prosperous areas of the south.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Whilst we recognise that the formulaic approach recently adopted by Government to establishing minimum housing requirements is deeply flawed, in reality the numbers generated are similar to those projected by more rigorous local studies commissioned by the Combined Authority (such as the SHELMA). The Council needs to be brave in defending these numbers, rather than claiming they have been imposed by Government.</p> <p>ii. Exclusive focus on Green Belt: We are deeply concerned that in translating these household growth numbers into housing land requirements in the absence of an adopted local plan, the Council has put itself in a position where the only apparent option is a radical redrawing of green belt boundaries. The size of the gap between land availability and the land required to accommodate household growth is driving a green belt review of such a scale that it is almost impossible to undertake in a rational, credible and fair way which avoids a divisive process for the communities of the Wirral. The fact that the review exercise has led to such a large area of green belt being identified as potential housing sites (or 'sites for further consideration') suggests that the Council should have first considered other 'radical' options, including a complete review other open space policies, including those relating to playing fields. Given its regeneration ambitions, the council should have also reconsidered brownfield site availability and development densities, in a 'no stone unturned' approach. In particular it seems barely credible that the Wirral Waters development is contributing a little over 1000 new homes over the next 15 years, when it has set an ultimate housing target of over 12 times this number over the life of the project. As it stands, the Wirral green belt is being treated as a development 'pressure valve'.</p> <p>iii. Prioritisation method: The council has adopted what, on the face of it, seems like a sophisticated method of prioritising green belt sites which could be considered for future housing development. However in reality this initial sifting process has been very limited in the factors it has considered (which the Council acknowledges), reducing it to a narrow technical exercise solely based on the evaluation criteria of 'enclosure' and 'separation', which the Council claims are capable of objective measurement. Even then it is totally unclear how sites have been scored or ranked against these criteria to inform the 'shortlisting' process. The key evidence document – Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment (Sept 2018) – is 194 pages long, and does little to help a reader understand how some sites have been selected for further consideration, and others rejected. The whole exercise gives a sense of accuracy which is somewhat spurious, whereas the ultimate selection of sites for further examination (and more importantly the exclusion of others) appears to have been a highly subjective process. One powerful example of this is the inclusion of sites in the Storeton/Little Storeton area (SP030 – 037, and SP041), which despite being very open in character and clearly contributing to the separation of urban east Wirral and the settlements of Thingwall, Barnston and Heswall, have somehow been prioritised for further consideration above other sites in west and north Wirral, apparently because of their proximity to the distinctive boundary of the M53 which could form a new 'front line' for urban east Wirral.</p> <p>There has been no attempt at this stage to consider other important criteria for assessing the suitability of green belt sites for development (based on the full range of NPPR green belt policy objectives), such as protecting the countryside from encroachment and promoting urban regeneration. The documentation suggests that these criteria will be considered at a later stage which, of course, will be too late, in that a large number of sites will have already been discounted.</p> <p>iv. Lack of Strategy: Ultimately we believe that the analysis has been undertaken the wrong way round: based on a bottom up, technical assessment of small sites, rather than a top-down, strategic assessment of broader areas. At no point does the exercise seem to have tried to discern the relative value of wider areas of green belt, and their contribution to the landscape of the Wirral and their value and use by local residents. This would have been a far better and more meaningful focus for public consultation, which could have included surveys and focus groups of residents exploring the function and value of larger groups of sites and the landscapes they form. This could have been used to establish key principles for prioritisation, with the finer grained, technical method which has actually been deployed, used as part of a more focused secondary exercise. In our view, this flawed process has led to an outcome which is extremely difficult for the Council to defend. The majority of sites identified for further investigation are in east Wirral, a continuous swathe of land which would effectively extend the built up areas of Eastham, Bromborough, Bebington and Prenton right up to the M53.</p> <p>The motorway has been treated as a boundary of overriding significance, which practically invites development up to its hard shoulder. At no point has the question been seriously asked as to what the impact of such a loss of open land from east Wirral will be on the overall character of the peninsula's landscape. Nor the extent to which green belt sites which are more accessible to larger numbers of citizens, are more valuable than those which are less. In conclusion we urge the Council to rethink this whole process, rather than rush into irreversible policies which could be hugely damaging to Wirral. The exercise as presented does not feel credible: the borough's first proper Green belt review resulting in its decimation, with decisions having to be made in a matter of a few months.</p> <p>We respectfully suggest that the Council does the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. takes a radical look at other policies relevant to identifying land for housing supply within current settlement areas, including playing field policies; ii. redoubles its efforts to identify brownfield sites, applying significant pressure on Peel to release more land for housing within the 15 year timescale; iii. in considering any green belt loss, first undertakes a strategic assessment of (iii) the value of larger zones of green belt, making this the focus for proper public consultation; iv. Following all of this, makes a more detailed assessment of prioritised zones, using criteria related to all of the green belt objectives set out in the NPPF

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01006	<p>Please see the list of reasons for objecting to the proposed plan for reclassifying Wirral Green belt land specifically around the Eastham area:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • increase in pollution and traffic. • local amenities under pressure. • losing green space which is so vital on this side of the motorway. • Increase in pollution if industrial units on proposed sites go ahead. The area is already dominated by the noise of oil tankers and the smoke from its funnels, further industry will put residents at risk of respiratory difficulties, disturbed sleep due to noise. • Eastham Village and surrounding areas are steeped in history, proposed building plans put these areas at risk of losing important sites of importance for local history. Eastham Wood has a wealth of history which should be protected and celebrated. • although it is stated that Eastham woods will be protected, don't take away its green belt status. We need to protect this area from further development as surrounding industrial sites encroach on the park. When these sites are built it is diminishing natural habitats for a wealth of plants and animals that live within it. • If all the green belt land is reclassified this side of the motorway, there will be 0% left. The office of national statistics outlines the difference in life expectancy and healthy life expectancy which is heavily skewed towards the Wirral on the west side nearest the Dee. Green spaces are needed for the health and wellbeing of residents and workers alike. Take away the green space and you take away people's recreation space and encourage the possibility of unrestricted building leading to urban sprawl. East Wirral has its fair share of industry and built up areas, don't punish areas of poverty and restrict access to protected green belt land. • don't take away the identity of Eastham and preserve the rich history and green space for future generations.
DOR01007	<p>Housing Plan for Wirral Borough - To alleviate the housing shortage, the Government requires Wirral Borough Council to plan for about 800 new homes a year over fifteen years. Public meetings have been filled to overflowing with people alarmed at proposals to re-designate parts of the Green Belt as building land. We have been told that the housing required has been calculated using a formula agreed in Parliament about two years ago. The formula might provide the correct answer at a national level, but it does not make sense when applied to over the six years since the last census the population of Wirral has risen by 2,959, or 493 a year. As the average number of people per household in the UK is 2.36, the increase in the population of Wirral requires 209 houses a year. This must be compared with the government's imposed target of 800. It is a huge discrepancy.</p>
DOR01008	<p>Strongly object to the Councils plans to re-classify the Green Belt land surrounding Eastham Conservation Area for the following reasons:-</p> <p>Eastham Village was designated as a conservation area in 1974. It consists of nucleated village with an agricultural background and origins in medieval times and lies in a clearly defined Green Belt boundary so that it is separated from urban spread. The village should continue to be protected. We already suffer from excess traffic and heavy goods vehicles either seeking a short cut through the village or going to the industrial area down Bankfield Road. This presently causes unnecessary noise, traffic blockages in the village and damage to pavements. This situation would only deteriorate further should the existing green belt be re-classified to permit further development.</p> <p>Eastham Village currently attracts many visitors wishing to see a beautiful village, enjoy the lovely walk down Ferry Road past the golf club to the ancient woods with its bear pit and remains of the fountains. Bird watchers also love to visit the woods to see the many varieties of birds. Many visit the burial ground to sit and gaze over the River Mersey to see the planes taking off and landing at John Lennon airport. Many just like to take their children to sit and eat ice-cream down by the old ferry or have afternoon tea at the Mimosa café. The 16 century 'TheTap' public house and the Ferry Hotel are additional popular public attractions. These wonderful attributes should never be interfered with or changed to Eastham and its conservation area. We do not want any changes that would take away the precious, peaceful, wellbeing feel of this ancient, beautiful village.</p> <p>We strongly rebut any intentions Wirral Borough Council to re-classify Green Belt proposals.</p>
DOR01009	<p>Generally my comments on the consultation are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF Paragraph 136) - My understanding are that the boundaries are to be 'only altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. The new ONS figures contradict the projections for housing need on which the proposals are based. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If there is dispute about the number of houses needed over the period how can the circumstances for boundary alterations be said to be 'fully evidenced'? • If there is doubt about the number of houses needed over the period how can the alterations be said to be 'justified'? • Moreover in the event of doubt or dispute about the figures what is the basis for establishing 'exceptional circumstances'? 2. Existing planning permissions - There are currently 2,634 existing permissions (as at April 2018) not yet translated into development of housing. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mechanism to force developers to build on land with planning permission. In that case where the evidence that any new permissions granted on released land is will deliver the (projected) housing need over the period? • And, if the local authority is powerless to translate permissions - with every chance future permissions similarly fail to deliver builds - doesn't that undermine any case for release based on 'exceptional circumstances'? Put another way, why is making the local authority better able to accumulate undelivered permissions an 'exceptional circumstance'? • Recent analysis of housing ministry figures (MCHLG) shows that in North West England only 50% of new homes were built where planning permission was granted between 2012 and 2017. (Guardian online 25 October 2018) The local authority should resist releasing green belt when the prospect of translating permission to builds is so remote.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Specifically: - Green Belt Parcel SP019B- Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment - This area is a poor fit with the criteria for release from the Green Belt because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the area is poorly enclosed with potential for high impact on urban sprawl; • development on this area would project discordantly into the open countryside; • development on this area would leave a 'weak' boundary for any new Green Belt to the north of the site; • no amount of design and boundary treatment is going to prevent the adverse visual and landscape impact of the addition of 524 dwellings; • the volume of proposed dwellings – or any proportion of that number - is bound to encroach upon existing countryside use and be a negative intrusion on open countryside; • Providing access to Arrowe Park would not replace the loss of public open space provided by this area which is used daily and by many people of all ages for recreation. • The 'conserve' character of the area would be adversely impacted. The steps taken to give the impression that the area is completely wooded from high ground would not make up for the adverse impact of the utility of the open space for residents or the 'conserve' character at ground level. • the good quality and condition of the land would not be retained by protecting the landscape features alone. • 524 dwellings would put pressure on the local infrastructure – schools, GPs, parking and traffic flow. <p>Green Belt Parcel SP060 - Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment - This area is a poor fit with the criteria for release from the Green Belt because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • it is best and most versatile agricultural land (95.6%); • any Option is inconsistent with the capacity to accommodate change or the landscape features –to conserve wooded naturalistic character of Harrock Wood - set out in the landscape guidelines in the Wirral Landscape Character Assessment; • both Option 60.4 and Option 60.5 will adversely impact the visual landscape; • any of the proposed Options would adversely impact on the landscape strategy for the area character as 'enhance'; • becoming contained within a development will adversely impact on Harrock Wood as a prominent landscape feature; • Will designation of Harrock Wood as an Urban Greenspace really protect its woodland and wetland Priority Habitat status? • Option 60.5 in particular will be bound to have adverse impact on traffic bearing in mind the number of cars that will accompany 846 dwellings; • 846 dwellings would put pressure on the local infrastructure – schools, GPs, parking.
DOR01010	<p>Following the presentation I attended at Hulme hall it is clear that some radical action is required to identify proposed sites.</p> <p>Can I suggest, due to the size of the issue, that the council consider the creation of a "new town"</p> <p>This can then be developed with new drainage, new power and access etc. rather than a disruptive upgrade across the whole region.</p> <p>It could also allow for new services such as healthcare and schools etc.</p> <p>In overall terms it would allow a focus on a specific area and reduce the overall disruption to the Wirral as a whole.</p> <p>It would also allow an economy of scale, potentially reducing the volume of current greenbelt being lost " forever "</p>
DOR01011	<p>SHLAA2024, SHLAA2025: The centre contains not only shops & local cafes & restaurants to create a community hub but also necessary services of banks, doctors, dentists & civic centre library. These places are crucial for a community. With no parking, thereby, no access people will simply stop coming. This will have a disastrous effect on the local shops & cafes/ restaurants. These are not big chain businesses. They are owned & run by locals. The effect on the local economy will be catastrophic. If the centre is affected in this way the knock on impact is then on people who cannot travel further afield to shop. There are no other local facilities within close proximity. Despite the impact on the current local community, there is the fact that there will be none of these facilities then available in the future for the people who are to move into these houses. The loss of the civic centre & library is no more than unbelievable & disastrous for the local area. The centre is used by local groups & is a meeting place. These proposals will rip out the community & the area.</p> <p>They are Short sighted. New houses need these facilities too. People do not want to live isolated. City centres are crucial to life for everyone. There are plenty of better suited areas to build houses, where those people would come into a centre to support & sustain it. Please listen to us local people.</p> <p>I am very angry & incredulous these could even be proposed.</p>
DOR01012	<p>I am completely disgusted, furious, angry and upset that this is even being considered. The Green belt land should be protected at all costs. We are a peninsula which has limited space and as we are unable to expand outwards yet the council want to fill in the precious and limited green space and countryside we have left. This seems absurd and completely against the will of the people that live here! How is this even being allowed? The council should be here to protect the people they represent and their local area not use it as a money making project. Which most probably will benefit the very few business men at the consequence and ruining the Wirral and making thousands of others angry? I am 29 years old and just married. In the future I would love to bring up a family on the Wirral. However, if all the proposed green belt land is to have permission to be built on, I certainly will not be staying.</p> <p>The worries of what 12,000 extra homes would bring are endless. Increased Traffic, increased pollution, a huge negative Impact on the environment, busier schools, and a longer waiting list to gain doctors and dentist appointments, more strain on our local NHS and hospital the list goes on!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The roads are not built for this extra traffic. The new homes will have a negative effect on the value of current homes. What about the habitats and wildlife? We should be keeping this land for and encouraging farmers to farm this land as it has been for hundreds of years. I don't care what the government says Wirral council should find a way round this or fight it! Let's regenerate areas such as Birkenhead, Wirral waters, new ferry, let's bring life, business and a hub back to the Wirral in these areas that always used to be the heart of the Wirral. Let's use brown land, waste land, industrial land and empty homes if we need to build. Please do not touch our beautiful green space!</p> <p>The uniqueness of the Wirral is that we have country side on our doorstep but with Liverpool so close by. Why would anyone want to lose this? Why do we want to live on top of each other, lose our fresh air, practically become a concrete jungle, merging each town into one another? I am at a complete loss to why anyone that lives or works on the Wirral would want this apart from the few people that it will directly benefit their pocket! I am saddened that the Wirral will be changed beyond recognition. Once building has taken place it cannot be reversed and will never be the same again. We will lose the beauty and uniqueness that the Wirral has to offer. I feel powerless and that the hands have already been shaken without really asking the local people. THIS IS NOT RIGHT and I strongly believe living in a democratic society local people's views should be heard loud and clear and should be the priority. The council are simply not doing enough to challenge this! Work with the people, not against them.</p>
DOR01013	Not a response - [6 sites in Heswall submitted under the call for sites process]
DOR01014	<p>Please accept this letter as an official objection to the proposed development on the green belt land on the Wirral - most specifically west of Barnston village.</p> <p>[OBJECTIONS RAISED ARE THE SAME AS DOR00868]</p>
DOR01015	Proposed dwellings planned to be built on Saughall Massie Green Belt. Building this amount of houses in our local area would reduce our local wildlife, increase air pollution and cause additional traffic. We believe this is completely unreasonable, unfair and we fully oppose the plans to destroy our green belt fields. Our local council need to find other ways of making money that don't involve eradicating our local environment.
DOR01016	<p>While we understand that additional housing is required within the Borough of Wirral we cannot accept that destruction of the Wirral's Green Belt is acceptable in order to appease developers. During this consultation period we have attended numerous meetings and listened to the points of view from the representatives of the Authority and the people of Wirral. What we find most disappointing is the Authority's acceptance that destroying the Green Belt is inevitable without giving due considering to the full facts. The Authority is now stating that figures for the growth of population are to be challenged and that a statistician is to be engaged on a consultancy basis in order to examine the figures. Why was this not completed earlier in order to provide a clearer picture for the consultation process? The Authority failed to challenge the Government figures prior to the consultation stating Green Belt development was necessary. Does the Authority always act in the affirmative with regard to Government instructions? We think not!</p> <p>There is also the issue with Peel Holdings' development of Wirral Waters. Peel has stated that they can provide many homes at Wirral Waters with the consequence that the Green Belt would remain intact. It is our considered opinion what Peel need, in order to progress, is the support of the Authority and the impression we have formed throughout this consultation period is that support is not forthcoming from the Authority. Another factor that we feel the Authority has overlooked is that if the Green Belt is to be handed over to developers then Wirral Waters will never be developed. The rationale behind this statement is that developers will always choose Green Belt sites as they are less costly to build upon than brown field sites making the developer more profit; the point being, the developer demands profit and the easier it is to attain the better. This point is similar for many areas throughout the Borough including that of Rock Ferry, an area still waiting for regeneration following the explosion. The Borough will be blighted for at least two generations if building is allowed on the Green Belt. In addition a paralysis will set in throughout housing market as people living in areas local to Green Belt development sites will find it difficult to sell their homes while first time buyers will delay their purchase waiting on spin from the developers to be delivered. This will have a detrimental effect for tens of years. With regard the consideration of parcel of land SP060 as detailed within Appendix 2 – Green Belt Land Parcels. The reasons for our concern are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Appendix 2 – Green Belt Land Parcels SP060 have been identified, we understand, by a number of Landowners and Developers as a potential development site. A number of developers have identified sites within this parcel of Green Belt land with the view of building hundreds of buildings. In addition, we understand that the developer proposing site 892 as detailed within Appendix 3 – Map of Sites Submitted by Landowners and Developers is also the owner of the Green Belt land immediately adjacent to the South of site 892. The consequence, together with the other development sites as part of SP060, would be that of major sprawl of large development resulting in the merger of three distinct settlement villages of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall into one unrecognisable Town while at the same time allowing the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. • We have been advised from Authority officials that said areas are classed as one settlement area. It is not one settlement area to the people of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall and we suggest the Authority reviews its methodology in coming up with this undemocratic decision; • Within Appendix 4 – Map of Flood Zone 3 the West side of site 892 as proposed by developers is boarded in total by an area as define as highest level of flood risk. National planning policy dictates that inappropriate development in areas at risk of flooding should be avoided by directing development away from areas of highest risk (NPPF, Para 100). The risk of flooding is enhanced even further by the fact that proposed development site 1932, to the West of development site 892, development sites 1546, 1979 and 1980 upstream of site 892 will, if built on, result in flooding concerns to existing homes with, at best, increased insurance premiums, and worst disruptive lives due to flooding rendering existing homes worthless; • Within Appendix 5 – Map of Core Biodiversity Areas site 892 as proposed by developers is surrounded on two of its boundaries as Core Biodiversity Areas. Core Biodiversity Areas which, as detailed within "The Liverpool City Region Ecological Network", not only represents a critical biodiversity resource for the people of Wirral but also for the nation. Again, the consequence of

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>building in such a location as site 892 as proposed by developers would be to destroy a well-balanced area of biodiversity and nature conversation;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Within Appendix 7 – Map of High Quality Agricultural Land site 892 as proposed by developers is designated by the national Agricultural Land Classification as the best and most versatile quality farmland. It must be remembered that if the Authority allows building on quality agricultural land then this resource, capable of producing food for today's and future generations, will be lost forever. This proposed loss should be considered also in context of Brexit and the fundamental question of where the nation will find its food provision in the future; • And in addition, physical access to site 892 as proposed by developers is both limited and restricted. Elm Road for example is narrow and falls below the width for a road servicing the amount buildings as proposed. Elm Road is substantially congested on a continuous basis as vehicles from homes located in Menlo Avenue park in Elm Road. This is due in part to Menlo Avenue being a narrow single lane road and the fact that homes within the locality have been allowed, by the Authority, to be over developed with the resulting consequence that private drives can no longer accommodate the parking of vehicles. <p>There is also the added issue of cars turning into and out of Elm Road from Thingwall Road. Over the years there have been a number of fatal road traffic collisions within the vicinity of this junction resulting in the most significant of consequences. Any development on Green Belt site 892 will only increase the risk of road traffic collisions.</p> <p>There is also a legal issue with regard access to site 892. The issue is that the owners of site 892 do not have full possession of the land to the South of Elm Road (from the Land Registry). Therefore the site should be removed from consideration for development and remain within Green Belt as the development as proposed cannot be delivered.</p> <p>We mentioned at the start of this response of our understanding that a few new homes are required within the Borough however it is our considered view the wrong options are being considered and completing the following would deliver the outcome as required without destroying the Green Belt:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • ensure areas that have received planning consent are developed; • ensure that brown field sites throughout the Borough are developed; prior to Green Belt sites being considered; • improve governance and management of the hundreds of existing empty homes located throughout the Borough to ensure they are occupied; and • work with, not against, Peel Holdings in order to deliver Wirral Waters! <p>In conclusion, the development of site 892 will be devastating for this area of Green Belt and the people of Irby living within its vicinity.</p> <p>Along with reducing the quantity of Green Belt within the Borough a core biodiversity area will be ruined, an increase in the risk of flooding to existing homes within the locality would be realised, the destruction of high quality agricultural land for both current and future generations will be complete, the merger of three distinct settlement villages (and they are different settlements) of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall into one unrecognisable town while at the same time allowing the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas and the increase in road traffic collisions due to the lack of access to site 892 as proposed.</p>
DOR01017	<p>I write to object to the proposal that green belt land surrounding Lever Causeway in Bebington, Wirral, is released to allow building on it.</p> <p>I object on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are sufficient brown land sites in urban areas of the Wirral to build upon, for example a large area of land around the dock area of Wallasey is yet to be built on. • The proposals will fundamentally change the character of the area. • The area around Lever Causeway is an area of relaxation for Wirral residents for walking, cycling, running and horse riding, it therefore provides health benefits in terms of physical and mental well-being for local residents. I suspect that this plan does not fit with other local plans in relation to improving the health of the local population. • Once this green belt space is lost it will be gone forever. • The development is unnecessary. I understand that the population projections used to evidence the need for the building work are not correct. <p>I feel very strongly that these proposals would be to the total detriment of the area. And I am aware that there is a great strength of community feeling in the area against this proposal. I am hoping that kind consideration will be given to this objection</p>
DOR01018	<p>These representations have demonstrated that our client's site, the land off Lowfields Avenue / Kingsley Avenue, Hooton, is an appropriate candidate site for release from the Green Belt. The Site is self-contained and benefits from strong physical boundaries. The development of this site would have a very limited impact on the surrounding area. The site very clearly meets the key tests in terms of suitability, availability and achievability and therefore is considered to be deliverable. In terms of the deliverability, there are no constraints that would prevent this site from coming forward. Importantly, the land is within a single ownership and entirely deliverable for residential purposes. It would make a very valuable contribution to housing land supply, which at the current time is significantly less than the required 5-year supply that is set out within NPPF. It is clear that the only restriction preventing this is its Green Belt designation. Given the Site's context and that its Green Belt function is low and the Site is suitable, available and achievable, the release of this site for development should be considered throughout this Local Plan process. The accompanying vision document provides additional detail to assist the Council in allocating the site for development.</p>
DOR01019	<p>My main belief is that Green Belt should remain green belt and not be sold for building purposes. I believe that the population of the planet is too high but is bound to rise. One hears of so many areas of the world where people are starving to death, deserts are increasing in size and fertile land is at a premium. With that in mind how can anyone consider building on land that, on a council map, is referred to as 'High Quality Agricultural Land'? Map 7 of the WBC Development Options Review shows the area from the back of Barnsdale Avenue to Gills Lane as High-Quality Agricultural Land. A large percentage of the land from Gills Lane to Milner Road is shown as High-Quality Agricultural Land. The country can only supply 60% of the food our population needs. The rest is</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>imported. We can only speculate on what will happen to food prices once we leave Europe. Remember- Global warming is not just something that happens in the Amazon.</p> <p>Traffic - Every morning that I drive past Barnston Dip, towards Heswall, I pass a traffic jam of cars waiting to either turn right along Storeton Road or continue on to Thingwall corner. Building houses along this stretch of road is only going to add to the traffic jam and to the resultant air pollution from cars in the traffic jam.</p> <p>Another traffic jam is common in Gills Lane. Cars waiting to turn right through Barnston Dip and holding up cars waiting to turn left onto Barnston Road. Those turning left onto Barnston Road will join the traffic jam at Thingwall corner. From there they will join the traffic jam at Arrowe park traffic lights. More traffic jams equals more air pollution. On top of that; exiting from Gills Lane and trying to turn right is a dangerous manoeuvre that I try to avoid carrying out. Barnston Dip is dangerous.</p> <p>As you well know the Wirral is a peninsula and, as such, there are about 5 roads of the Wirral into Cheshire and, of course, two tunnels. That makes the Wirral one of the longest cull-de-sacs in the country. Extract from -www.environmentlaw.org.uk/therapsid=38</p> <p>Due to the increase in the use of private cars, road traffic pollution is considered a major threat to clean air in the UK and other industrialised countries. Traffic fumes contain harmful chemicals that pollute the atmosphere. Road traffic emissions produce greenhouse gases that contribute to global warming. This area will go from being an area that was a source of fresh air to a source of pollution</p> <p>Sewers - There is a sewage plant in the Prenton Brook within a mile (estimate) of the Fox and Hounds. The sign on it calls it Barnston Storm Tanks, Combined Sewer Overflow, reference WIR 0095. The stream goes from Barnston Dip and on through to Prenton. I have complained to United Utilities about this plant. On a number of occasions I have seen toilet paper and other such products along the banks of the Brook. United Utilities say that this is acceptable under certain circumstances. More houses will add to this disgusting mess.</p> <p>Flooding - The map in Appendix 4 of the Documents indicates that there could be a flooding risk from the Prenton Brook or a tributary of it running through this area and crossing Barnston Road in Barnston Dip. If more houses are built in this area then the results will be Less ground to absorb the rain. The rain will be channelled into Barnston Brook to cause more problems with the erosion of the banks and, possibly, more effluent from Barnston Storm Tanks, see above.</p> <p>Services - The only services on Barnston Road from Thingwall corner to the Heswall roundabout are two pubs and one shop. The bus service is limited to one an hour.</p> <p>Wildlife - Of course; with the loss of the fields will go the loss of wildlife. I cannot list all of the species that live in the area but I would think that it would be a fair cross section of the wildlife you would expect in such an area.</p>
DOR01019	<p>The following is an extract from the WBC -Sites of Biological Importance Woodland: Since semi-natural woodland is in short supply in Wirral, SBI woodlands should include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> i. All woodland which by presence of indicator species appears to be ancient and/or semi-natural; ii. All other woodlands of high species diversity (plant/animal), especially where rare species are present. There is also the dreadful possibility that the houses, if they are built, could remain unsold. <p>My son lives in London and put his flat up for sale. After 4 months he took it off the market as he had no offers. If house prices in London are falling then what hope for the Wirral?</p> <p>Perfectly true but it is not the top of the "What people need list"</p> <p>Air – 3 minutes and you are dead Water – 3 days and you are dead Food –3 weeks and you are dead Housing-???</p> <p>So, by providing for housing you will be degrading the three more important items on the list.</p> <p>Another answer to the question about where people can live is answered by the changes that are happening in the high street. We frequently hear that the high street is at risk.</p> <p>What is wrong with turning unwanted shops into houses? I do realise that the council will lose some rates in the deal but it is better to use old shops than see them fall into disrepair. As a basis for my argument; consider the Albert Docks in Liverpool. Once a warehouse, now expensive flats. Now we have the report that many Debenhams shops will be sold. On a lot of the WBC logos I see the expression "The Wirral a pleasant place to live" will you be amending that?</p> <p>The other Wirral publication is headed – "Wirral a place for wildlife and people." Will you be changing that?</p> <p>If building has to go ahead it should be on the basis that only 801 houses are built per year. This means that the minimal amount of damage is done to the environment in the hope the Peel Holdings will start releasing the land that they are holding.</p> <p>Apart from the traffic I will not really be affected by the building along Barnston Road and so I cannot be called a NIMBY.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01020	<p>I strongly object to the current proposed plans to the possibility of building on Green Belt Land. The Green Belt needs to be protected at all cost for the benefit of all and more generations to enjoy. There is no necessity to build the number of new homes claimed. Both yours and the Governments "Crystal Ball" figures are completely unfounded. The population in Wirral has remained stable for well over 20 years. The figures prove this. The housing projections that you are relying on have proved to be wrong in the past and there are numerous reports showing the calculation formula used by Government and others is also wrong as it provides incorrect figures, not all areas are the same. There is no valid argument for the need to build more houses in Wirral. The identification of possible building land adjacent to Pipers Lane Heswall beggars belief. this is lovely countryside with some of it backing onto the Wirral Country Park. There is no practical access to any of it unless you want to totally destroy the ambiance, natural environment and amenity of the surrounding area, what vandal would do that, which could possibly see that as a good planning proposal. Some areas including SP058C & D & E would be totally unacceptable due to their sensitive location the lack of access down a very narrow lane. Also, we are fortunate to have the Wirral County Park / Wirral Way, any building adjacent to this would again destroy the surrounding environment which must be protected at all cost. If there is a housing shortage, then please Tellme why it is that there are so many Estate Agents with new ones opening on a regular basis, they would not exist if there were no houses to sell. There are TEN Estate Agents in Heswall alone with a new one recently opened. Why should we be expected to live in a concrete jungle. Already 43% of Wirral is built on compared to neighbouring Cheshire West @ 10% and the UK as a whole @ only 6%. Source, University of Sheffield, A Land Cover Atlas of the UK.</p> <p>The public outcry at these proposals must surly tell you that this will not be tolerated, therefore anyone going against People Power do so at their peril. You experienced it when you planned to sell of the Green Triangle piece of land in Heswall at the junction of Telegraph Road and Boundary Lane. Such strong objections are evident all over the Country, so why it that Council Leaders from other Council's around the country is cannot get together, putting Politics aside, to bring about a change of Government attitude to this. In Wirral we do not have the infrastructure for a higher population, the roads are continually clogged up and there is no money or space to build more roads. Our Hospitals are full and overflowing, you can't get a Doctor's appointment because there are not enough Doctors to serve the current population, the Ambulance service is over stretched, and Police numbers are at an all-time low with crime rising due to lack of money. The list is endless, the Wirral is a tiny space, we are already bursting at the seams, and we are almost an Island. Let's preserve what little space we have left.</p> <p>The Council have tried to blame Peel Holdings for their lack of commitment to build on Brown Land, but attached is a copy of a letter dated 10th September 2018 which I have obtained from Wirral Waters addressed to [the Council Leader] which lays out them disputing your allegations.</p> <p>Green Belt Land should only ever come under consideration when every bit of Brown field land has been built on and Estate Agents have queues and waiting lists.</p> <p>[Attached Letter from Landowner]</p>
DOR01021	<p>[SAME AS DOR00455] [SAME AS DOR00362] At a Council Meeting on 15 October, Motion 3 was voted on and carried unanimously. (First Para of Motion 3 quoted)</p>
DOR01022	<p>I would like to raise an objection to the proposed plan to build on the civic centre car park in Bromborough. There is simply nowhere else to park, the Coop car park is always full and shoppers would have to park in the streets which would be a congestion hazard. If some shoppers decide it is too inconvenient it will put the whole shopping centre at risk of being uneconomic. I respectfully suggest that there should be a rethink. Surely there are other sites which can be built on. I understand there may be a lot more land becoming available for building anyway. Surely Bromborough village can be spared?</p>
DOR01022	<p>I'm protesting against building on/over Lever Causeway. I feel this is harming the environment and wildlife that is situated around Lever Causeway, it has always been a rural area. This will be a shame for future generations to experience such a splendid country walk when we have so many other urban areas to build on.</p>
DOR01023	<p>I strongly object to any development of Wirral's green belt land. I do not feel the council have proven the need to build on green belt when there are many brownfield sites, many not recognised by the council. Where is this population explosion we have been told about Where are the jobs for all these people Where is the infra structure to service these houses What are affordable houses The traffic in my area Storeton is already at dangerous levels. How have the planners justified the parcels of land, a child could have drawn the same This looks like urban sprawl to me. Once the land is gone there is no going back. Wirral is the place it is because of the greenbelt Levers causeway and Storeton area, lanes and roads are used for recreation by many people every day. Walkers, cyclists, trekkers, horse riding, dog walking. People recovering from illnesses that need the exercise. People with mental health issues who need the space to help them clear their heads. The wildlife has made a comeback over recent years.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Badgers owls bats buzzards rabbits sparrowhawks and many small birds rodents are often seen around Storeton</p> <p>The only people who benefit are the developers, and the people who help them.</p> <p>In my opinion this plan is being led by people who have no interest in other people's lives or the local area.</p> <p>I will not be supporting anybody who is trying to push these plans through.</p>
DOR01024	<p>I feel compelled to express strongly my views that the Green Belt in Wirral should NOT be built upon.</p> <p>As an Irby resident I was horrified to discover the number of Green Belt areas very close to my home that had been identified as suitable areas for redevelopment. I was further disgusted to find out that in the ward of Greasby/Franky/Irby, 4 out of the 5 identified areas of Green Belt land were in Irby alone. In an area surrounded by green fields providing my family and I with immediate access to the outdoors. This will be destroyed if the area that we use for family exercise, relaxation and fresh air is removed forever. My garden is a haven for local hedgehogs, bats and owls and I fear these animals would be lost forever in the local Irby environment if ANY Green Belt land is redeveloped. As a nation we are suffering from an obesity crisis, so removing any local areas of Green Belt that are currently used for exercise and health benefits will only lead to an increased pressure on the already stretched local NHS services. BUILDING ON IRBY GREEN BELT LAND MUST NOT HAPPEN. Currently the villages of Irby, Thingwall, Pensby and Heswall are separate, with each having its own very different and unique feel. I resent that I may be made to feel part of a much larger area if the local Green Belt is built on and all these areas become joined. Building on these Irby Green Belt areas goes completely against point 2 of why we have areas of Green Belt land – to keep the separate identities of towns and to stop individual towns from merging. The Green Belt areas identified for redevelopment in Irby could theoretically have over 2,000 homes built on them. Irby does NOT have the amenities to support an increase of possibly 5,000 – 10,000 people as it is a small community. It has only 2 primary schools – 1 of which is C of E aided, full to capacity, with a religious based entrance criteria. Neither school have the capacity to take many more children. There is only 1 secondary school that is already popular and in demand by families both within and outside the local area. Irby village has NO doctors or dentist's surgeries. Parking in Irby Village is extremely limited and the village becomes extremely congested at the weekend. Parking is often dangerous and creates limited clear access through the village. The main road through Irby village is busy and dangerous, and at peak times it is very difficult and challenging to drive through. I worry greatly about the safety of primary and secondary school children, and their families walking through Irby village during peak times. Building any new houses on the Green Belt land in Irby will NOT create the affordable housing that Wirral council insists that it needs. The wider local area, that includes – Gayton, Heswall, Barnston, Brimstage, Pensby, Thingwall, Irby, Greasby and Frankby have no access to Council leisure facilities - that include swimming pools, fitness suites and indoor sports halls. It is unacceptable to increase the population in these areas without having the ability to provide adequate facilities for the local residents.</p> <p>Wirral is a unique area with a geography that is completely different to that of any other part of the UK, with many areas being of significant archaeological interest. As such, its needs should not be determined by a government based in London, who have no realistic understanding of the actual needs of our local area, but by the local community of Wirral. It has now become apparent that the initial government estimates of the need for Wirral to build over 800 new homes per year (12,000 homes over the 15 year plan span) were wildly over inflated, even exaggerated, and that in reality the realistic figures are more like 500 homes per year (7,500 homes over the 15 year plan span).</p> <p>The initial figures were over exaggerated by both the ONS and Wirral Council. As a council Wirral should stand firm AGAINST the need to build any houses on Green Belt land. It is completely unnecessary to release ANY Green Belt land to be built on. There are plenty of disused, run down houses and other council owned properties that can be upgraded and released back into the housing stock. Wirral council need to be upgrading far more than the 200 per year that has been quoted as the number they are managing to add to the local housing stock each year. Wirral council seems to recently have adopted the policy, in whatever it introduces (recent parking charges at beauty spots around Wirral), to: – initially overstate the case, then draw back from initial figures/charges, and finally claim credit for changes being better than were originally planned, but have still been implemented to some degree. Wirral council MUST accept that the need for detailed planning consent for 6,500 homes on Wirral Waters is actually NOT needed for these housing figures to be included by the council. The 2017 Appeal Courts Ruling states that developments need only be 'reasonably possible', not even 'probable', and certainly not 'certain' of proven deliverability. If these figures are included by the council then NO Green Belt land should be allowed to be redeveloped. The council MUST apply this ruling. We are at a turning point for this council's success. The council needs to listen to the views of its residents, think VERY carefully about the legacy they are creating for our communities and ensure that the Green Belt land the council was originally determined to protect, remains free and undeveloped for generations to come.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01025	<p>I am very disappointed to read there are a number of ecologically important sites that are up for consideration for development in Wirral, for a number of reasons.</p> <p>There are over 70 Sites of Biological Importance in Wirral but it appears that the most affected sites for proposed development include Storeton Woods, Harrock Wood and Eastham Country Park. These small areas of woodlands are home to legally protected species such as bats, and species of conservation concern such as barn owls, toads, and a variety of other bird species and flora, such as English Bluebells now endangered. Other wider environmental concerns for building on our green belt and SSSI sites include loss of high-quality farmland in a time of climate change which is already having adverse effects on our wildlife such as bees, our food supplies, increased air pollution, and risks of increased flooding. I understand the projected housing development numbers put forward by WBC, do not match the population levels of Wirral, in fact the population can be considered stable or even, it's slowly decreasing. Isn't this why schools such as The Dell Primary School and Rock Ferry High School, an asset to the community, was closed down and demolished (unless there was another reason not openly put forward to the community)? Basic research shows that Wirral already has over 50% of its land developed, should further development take place, that figure is set to rise over 60%. In areas where tourism has a hold, insensitive development would harm what precious little tourism Wirral has. Furthermore, there are no major industries in Wirral therefore there is no rationale for the 800 per year building quota that WBC puts forward. In the light of the housing 'crisis', it is appropriate and expected that brownfield land should be developed first and there is enough in Wirral to fulfil the quota of houses thus far required. Wirral, sadly, is already a region low on species diversity, therefore development on wildlife corridors must be taken into account. Biodiversity has declined globally over the last forty years. In the 1960's Rachel Carson pointed out the decline of species was due to poor agricultural practice and that decline has reached the Rubicon; it is now almost irreversible. Much work, against the odds it would seem focuses on trying to mitigate further decline of species, but this can only happen with more trees and open spaces to off-set rising carbon and help species recover. New gardens will not be a significant help as fences, concrete posts and driveways block corridors for wildlife to hunt, feed, breed and survive; an example is the hedgehog, which, according to the British Trust for Ornithology calculates Britain has lost around 30% of this beloved mammal, equating to fewer than a million hedgehogs left in the UK today. Tragically, we are losing hedgehogs at the same rate as tigers are globally – at around 5% a year, both in rural and urban habitats.</p> <p>In Wirral, an obvious East/West socio-economic divide exists, and this has a direct impact on health and in particular chronic disease. The incidence of people with Diabetes to Chronic respiratory conditions is far greater on this side of the motorway than the other and yet it is here that the majority of sites are to be selected for yet again further development. Does this side not matter? Are we less important? One side is far more built up than the other and yet that seems to be of little concern. My children researched the area they live in as part of a homework assignment for secondary school a few years ago and we were horrified at the levels of pollution in the Eastham area, well above the recommended levels, for aviation being under the flight path for Liverpool and Manchester airports, and from automobiles on the M53 and the very busy A road - A41. Many occasions we are affected by an odour that is carried from the Eastham and Ellesmere port refineries and I have complained about that myself. The saving grace is Eastham woods, the Leverhulme fields and surrounding green areas and yet you want to interfere with this. A more consistent study was carried out by Mersey Forest and they calculated that every £1.00 spent on open space was worth £7.00 in savings to the NHS, an important consideration that cannot be ignored in these NHS cash-strapped times. If our Green Belt and special places are lost or reduced, the wildlife goes with it and our sense of place and purpose. A reduction of trees will equal more carbon, creating an unmitigated disaster. All life on earth is experiencing the sixth mass extinction due to human pressure and global climate change. WBC cannot afford to be idle or complacent in the face of such an urgent crisis. Building on our green belt and tearing up our woodlands would be reprehensible in the strongest terms; the damage inflicted irreversible. Species needs green belt as it acts as a buffer from the concrete sprawl, and woodlands to thrive and survive and we all benefit as a result. We are a part of Nature; we are not anterior to it. WBC needs to recognise that our woodlands and green belt should not be sold off; these precious places are necessary for wildlife and for a healthy eco-system to thrive. I hope that WBC will do everything in its power to save these ecologically precious spaces for wildlife, but also for the health and well-being of Wirral's residents. I hope my concerns are taken into consideration.</p>
DOR01026	<p>Bromborough car park needs to remain in its current form i.e. a car park. There are more than seventy businesses in Bromborough village. In order to keep Bromborough as a thriving hub the car park needs to remain. In addition to the established enterprises there is a fair in Bromborough twice a year bringing outside businesses and many visitors. I reiterate' leave Bromborough car park as it is. Keep Bromborough as a thriving community. Help it to grow economically. Do not allow it to wither and die.</p>
DOR01027	<p>Two points about the proposed developments west of the Wirral Way, Lower Heswall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The farmland is 'green sand' and unsuitable for development. Park West, Seabank Road and Riverbank Road were originally developed on spits of rock. 2) People want to live or come to West Wirral because of Green Spaces - which are so important for their well-being. Remove these and the housing market and tourism would suffer. <p>A further very good point has been made about the proposed golf course at Hoylake. Apart from not needing another golf course, the development, instead, of something like Martin Mere would benefit tourism far more.</p>
DOR01028	<p>I would like to express my objections to any such building projects, in and around Thornton Hough. The extension of our estate would impact onto areas of agricultural land and have a devastating effect on the openness of the green belt. I was under the impression from the Initial Green Belt review that the area is part of the Thornton Hough Rural farmland Landscape Character Area. This character area is sensitive to any changes which would reduce the local distinctiveness of the village. The increase of extra roads and traffic would not be a suitable outcome for a Green Belt area. It is essential that the character of Thornton Hough is retained. It is clear now that the dwelling requirements in Wirral for the next 15 years should be downgraded due to the recent figures released by the ONS. In light of this new information can the council give an undertaking that green belt boundaries will not be re-drawn. The development at Wirral Waters, along with Brownfield site availability and the 4000 - 6000 empty units that exist that could be brought back into habitable use will more than suffice the requirement of 7320 units over the 15 year period.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01029	This plan if it works looks good and can do a lot of good for the economy of Wirral. The employment boost is excellent...problem is how long is this going to take and in which century are people going to be employed, would like to think in the next few years, especially with a decent wage. It's a pity no mention of more police officers to make people feel safer and some areas more safe.
DOR01030	You are custodians of our lovely peninsula please do not use our green belt land for housing when you have houses boarded up and need attention also brownfield sites should always be used before any consideration of green belt land. Please don't destroy farm land the environment will suffer from pollution congestion and a strain on public resources. You will overload doctors surgeries, public transport etc. Please listen to the majority of people who don't want to lose our green belt. We are worried that you will make hasty decisions.
DOR01031	After only moving to our property ten weeks ago, we are absolutely devastated by these proposals, when purchasing our property we felt that the greenbelt area surrounding us were safe from development. Apart from the fact that the roads surrounding us are already congested. We don't feel that Poulton Road could cope with any more traffic. We are surrounded by farmland and to develop this when there is plenty of other land on the Wirral far more suitable to development is outrageous.
DOR01032	The countryside & green belt of Wirral make living here special. The developments you plan will not benefit the majority of Wirral residents. You should be concentrating on providing affordable homes for people who need them e.g. New Ferry residents who you seem to have forgotten about Peel Holdings plans with you & not acted upon by the Planning Dept. would regenerate the River St area. This labour council are inadequate – a disgrace to those who voted for them.
DOR01033	This council should get priorities in order. We do not need another golf course built on farmland with houses being built for a privileged minority. Stop wasting time and money on this flawed project!! Instead look to the welfare of the people of New Ferry who are in real need, through no fault of their own.
DOR01034	There is no satisfactory evidence to support development on the scale proposed. The existing planning approvals more than adequately cater for the housing needs on the Wirral meaning that there is no need for the release of any green belt land for development.
DOR01035	Piper's Lane, Heswall we believe that due to the longevity of the existing buildings being in situ that there is potential for planning permission on this area of the land, which may then lead to the possibility of further developing the land, whilst maintaining the general ambiance of the surrounding area. We are acutely aware of local concerns over access and increased traffic on the lane, particularly given the large amount of new builds and extensions that have taken place over recent years. We also are aware of the Government target for Wirral to identify enough land for at least 12,000 new homes to be built by 2035.
DOR01036	<p>The decision to consider The Green belt as a viable option to build houses on is ill judged and a complete dereliction of duties by the council. The councils 1st purpose is surely to respect the decisions of the current electorate. (The people who put you in power) and not simply to bow to the idealisms of the national government. If we were in a position where all of the Brownfield areas had been developed to capacity then the stance of the community might be different. However this isn't the case. The 'easy' option is to simply allocate green belt to allow developers to maximise their profits instead of standing up to them and saying The Green belt is NOT for sale. It would appear that the Wirral council are happy to blame everyone else for this situation, when the truth of the matter is, the only people in a position to influence is the current labour council. Regardless of colour, blue / red / green / yellow, it's time to stop the points scoring and work together. We / you are all Wirral residents and we're all in the same boat! This is short term planning that will simply kick the problem further down the road for the next generation to try and defend what's left of our green belt. This is just NOT acceptable. It is a flawed approach that must change. During the community presentations delivered by the Assistant Director of Environment Services, it was identified and acknowledged that the magical figure of 12,000 homes (calculated by Wirral council) needed over the next 15 years was flawed and the council had employed the services of independent statistician to verify the actual number of houses required. Has this re-calculation of the requirements been completed? Has the figure of 12000 homes changed?</p> <p>The fact that the actual figure of homes required was unknown during the consultancy period proves how flawed this whole process is, and should be stopped and delayed until we have facts, not assumptions! I therefore demand that the people are heard and that the current process is altered to allow proper involvement of Wirral's Residents, free from the present headlong rush, in order to ensure community identity and our glorious Green belt are retained for the continued delight of Residents and Visitors alike, and more importantly for future generations to enjoy.</p>
DOR01037	I believe that our green belt should be protected and it should not be built on in any circumstance. The Local Plan should have the protection of green belt land as one of its paramount objectives.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01038	<p>Firstly, our client agrees that the parcel should be investigated further. On this basis, because it is not necessary to restrict development in Eastham Village as it does not have an open character that makes an important contribution to the openness of the Green Belt, it is not necessary to retain the village in the Green Belt. It is already within a conservation area and therefore the village should be excluded from the Green Belt as conservation policies provide sufficient protection. Within the context of all of these paragraphs of the NPPF, option 52.1 should not be considered – the village should be released from the Green Belt. This would happen under either of the other two options (52.2 or 52.3), which are supported by our client. Our client has owned the site since June 2002 and wishes to promote the site for residential development through the Wirral Local Plan. One option may be to convert the existing building to residential use and develop additional residential dwellings within the remaining land. Therefore we ask that our client's site is considered within the 2018 SHLAA and the Council considers allocating it within the emerging development plan.</p> <p>In summary:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The evidence base needs to be published for consultation – including (amongst other things) the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA 2018). - The Local Plan needs to ensure that it will look over a minimum period of 15 years from adoption - In terms of Local Housing Need, regard should be had to the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) and in particular the adverse impacts which would be generated by planning for a figure less than 855 dwellings per annum. No weight should be given to the figure that the latest (lower) household projections would generate using the standard methodology because the Government intends to consult on a revised methodology so that nationally 300,000 new homes per year can be achieved by the mid-2020s. - Housing delivery has been poor in the Wirral and the Council does not have a sufficient supply of land within the existing urban area to be able to demonstrate a five year supply or accommodate housing needs within the plan period. Neighbouring authorities have confirmed that they cannot accommodate Wirral's development needs and therefore there are exceptional circumstances for releasing land from the Green Belt to meet those needs. - Paragraph 138 of the NPPF confirms that where this is the case, first consideration should be given to land which is previously developed and / or is well-served by public transport. Both of these apply to Eastham Village. - Paragraph 140 of the NPPF also states that if it is necessary to restrict development in a village primarily because of the important contribution which the open character of the village makes to the openness of the Green Belt, it should be included in the Green Belt. This is not the case in Eastham as openness is reduced by the amount of built form in the village. Paragraph 140 of the NPPF continues by stating that if the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons then other means should be used such as a conservation area. - The Council has identified Eastham Village Conservation Area as a proposed Green Belt site for further investigation (ref: SP052). Our client supports this and recommends it is investigated further. - In terms of the options set out in the Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment (September 2018), option 52.1, which seeks to retain the village within the Green Belt but propose an infill boundary should not be considered further. For the reasons set out in this statement, the village performs poorly in terms of the five purposes of identifying land within the Green Belt set out in paragraph 134 of the NPPF and as above paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that it should be excluded from the Green Belt Either of the other two options (52.2 and 52.3) would release the village from the Green Belt (alongside other parcels to establish a revised Green Belt boundary and these would be supported by our client. - Within the context of the above, our client proposes that his site at Eastham Hall is allocated for residential development and would welcome the opportunity to discuss this with the Council in the preparation of its plan. <p>[Planning History Report & Map Plans attached with response to the Local Plan]</p>
DOR01039	<p>We write to express our concerns about the potential building of infill villages on Green Belt land in Heswall and the area along the Dee Estuary coastline.</p> <p>We feel strongly that planning close to our area (Davenport and Wittering lane) would not be in the interest of current residents, the local environment and for the safety of future residents. The roads are narrow with limited access to main roads. Infill villages would bring increase traffic and potential danger to local pedestrians, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders which frequent the area along the Wirral way. Increased pollution both chemical and noise would be damaging to the Dee coast, renowned for its natural beauty and wildlife. The area is already at maximum capacity for schools, doctors and local facilities. Many visitors from Wales, Cheshire and Merseyside visit the West Wirral because of its beauty and wildlife; families enjoy walking, cycling together in outdoor activities. Whilst we understand more houses need to be built on the Wirral, the proposed areas in Lower Heswall around Davenport Road and Wittering Lane simply have not got the road or access infrastructure to secure safety to the public. It would significantly impact on the public enjoying outdoor family activities and exercise opportunities and we have no doubt it will not protect the wildlife that is unique to the Dee coast. Please reconsider and protect this area.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01040	<p>My Client has landholdings at Dock Road South in Bromborough. The site is located within one of the Council's 'Priority Industrial Areas' as identified by Policy EM8 of the now aged Wirral UDP (2000), limiting activity to uses falling within classes B1 (Business), B2 (General Industrial) and B8 (Storage or Distribution) as identified by the Town and Country Planning (Use Classes) Order 1987. The site is not deemed to be appropriate for B1 uses given its location and Wirral Council's own strategy for B1 growth which focusses predominantly around Birkenhead and Wirral Waters for these uses. The site and wider industrial estate therefore be considered suitable only for small – medium scale B2 and B8 development. The site is located to the south of Dock Road South and Mersey Wharf, and to the east of Persimmon's 'Mersey View' mixed use development in Bromborough. The immediate area has historically been mixed use in nature, led initially by the construction of the Prices Patent Candle Factory and the accompanying 'Model Village' to the west at Bromborough Pool. In recent times, employment uses in the area have begun to stagnate, and the area is increasingly being redeveloped to include a significant proportion residential use, for example:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 'Chandlers Walk' by Barratt at Dock Road North; • 'Mersey View' by Persimmon at Pool Lane; and, • 'King's Hill' by Bellway at New Chester Road. <p>My Client is also aware that a large residential led mixed use scheme is proposed to the east of the site at the former Lubrizol site and land which has previously been referred to as 'Generator Park'. This scheme will further change the fabric of the area and it is of the opinion of my Client that it will make more efficient use of a vacant and contaminated area of land. Employment sites on the Dock Road South Industrial Estate are considered to be a part of Wirral International Business Park however at this location access to the main Business Park is limited, resulting in land accessed by Dock Road South having an isolated feel. Associated with Mersey Wharf, many sites in this location currently remain vacant with little interest from purchasers / businesses. My Client is increasingly aware that the area is changing, and they believe that a more mixed use vernacular is becoming evident around them. They have enlisted [agent] to sell the site and it has been on the market since June 2017 with no interest from prospective buyers. Wirral Employment Land and Premises Study Update Lichfields and LSH were commissioned by Wirral Council to prepare an Updated Employment Land and Premises Study (ELPS) in 2017. This Study forms part of the Council's evidence base for its emerging Local Plan which will assist in identifying the employment land portfolio up to 2033. The Study was approved by the Council for publication in March 2018.</p> <p>The Study report recommends an appropriate employment land portfolio for Wirral to meet the needs of local businesses and attract inward investment. Emphasis is placed on the suitability, deliverability and viability of sites and land for employment use. The report does not assess the demand for employment land as is considered in a separate report; the emerging Liverpool City Region Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment (SHELMA).</p> <p>The ELPS update identifies Dock Road South Industrial Estate as being a part of a wider employment area associated with Wirral International Business Park, citing this area as the boroughs 'flagship location' for employment uses. Bromborough is regarded as the area with the strongest demand for employment uses due primarily to its advantageous transport links (in particular its links to the M53), however even in this location the market is identified by the ELPS Update as being 'occupier-led' thus proving the boroughs lesser significance regionally as an employment location. Indeed the Wirral has been affected by competition in locations such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cheshire Science Corridor, including: • Thornton Science Park • Protos • Birchwood, Warrington; • Deeside Industrial Park; • Speke; • St Helens; • Kirkby; and, • Widnes. <p>The ELPS Update considers a number of large sites for employment development however it seems to disregard some sites within the Priority Industrial Areas. Many vacant sites throughout the Wirral have been overlooked perhaps due to their perceived active use. This would reflect a superficial evidence base for the document. It is noted that the ELPS Update makes recommendation for employment allocations across the Wirral, including a number of recommendations for the 'Safeguarding' of land for employment uses in the future. Clearly this method is conducive to the underutilisation of well-connected previously developed land which could otherwise be developed for other uses. In accordance with the NPPF1, underutilised retail and employment land should be considered for housing development in areas of high housing demand. In order to prepare a sound Local Plan for the borough, the Council should take heed of the NPPF in relation to reacting to changes in demand for land. In this case, the Council is clearly considering a major step-change in development within the borough, reflecting high housing need which outpaces demand for retail and employment development. As referenced by paragraph 120 of the NPPF "planning policy should reflect the changes in demand for land by conducting regular reviews of land allocated for development and of land availability". In doing so, the authority may be able to consider previously developed sites for more immediate housing development that is in high demand, and address any shortfall in employment land at a subsequent review of the Local Plan. The ELPS Update contradicts this important NPPF policy by safeguarding land for employment use in the future which is not viable and the market signals show that there is limited demand when alternative proposals will make better use of vacant employment sites and deliver much needed alternative development.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Draft Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment for Liverpool City Region and West Lancashire (SHELMA) - The draft SHELMA was published in March 2018 and addresses housing and employment needs through joined up thinking for the entire Liverpool City Region. Wirral is unique in that it has no land connection to the rest of the Liverpool City Region, thereby relying on access to the city by toll road, rail or ferry. The borough's only land connection is to Cheshire West and Cheshire.</p> <p>Employment Need - The study provides an overview of the employment market encompassing B1, B2 and B8 uses. The report considers needs until 2037. The region's growth in employment has been characterised by the growth of the following sectors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health; • Professional; • Scientific and Technical; • Admin and Support; and, • Education. <p>The document notes a turn in the growth of manufacturing in the region, targeted towards larger hubs in Halton, Knowsley, St Helens and West Lancashire. The locations of these broadly relate to their access to the Port of Liverpool.</p> <p>Noted from the report is the high concentration of available floorspace in the Wirral, at 288,000 sq m in 2016. Many of these units are less than 10,000 sq m. Indeed, the draft SHELMA suggests that the market identifies large industrial and large distribution uses to be the only viable options in the Wirral, with only large Industrial units being potentially viable in Bromborough. This fact has been demonstrated by the growth in developers seeking gap funding for development within Wirral International Business Park in recent years, particularly in securing ERDF funding. It is understood that ERDF and a number of similar financial streams have since ceased. It is also noted that the quantum of past development and recent employment growth may have been skewed by the availability of ERDF funding and other streams provided by the EU. With the UK due to leave the EU before the new Wirral Local Plan is adopted, it should be considered that there is uncertainty as to whether these funding options will continue in the future. Consequently, it is believed that the Council should consider a figure guided by the baseline and economic growth trends, revisiting the potential for elevated growth trends at the next plan review which will occur once the UK has left the EU. It has been indicated within the various documents for consultation within the Development Options Review that the Bromborough and Eastham area is only recommended for B2 and B8 development. The draft SHELMA does not currently include a comprehensive assessment of B8 need. Within the draft SHELMA three scenarios for class B2 are presented: Baseline Scenario - Based on Oxford Economics' baseline model, taking into account structure of local economies by sector and past performance and outlook of different economic sectors in 2016. [29.1 ha] Growth Scenario - Scenario which take into account the growth forecasts and ambitions of the Liverpool City Region, FEMA local authorities as well as Oxford Economics' forecasts in order to predict a scenario based on local trends and major proposals in the area (e.g. Wirral Waters) [30.1 ha] Completions Trend - Economic growth trend based on historic growth within the Wirral - this takes into account completions data over the period from 2000. [89.0 ha]</p> <p>The Council will be aware of the significant housing undersupply across the borough, which places it at risk of reduced planning powers in the future in line with the Housing Delivery Test. The five year supply is currently thought to be below one year when assessed against the published figure of 803 dpa from the draft SHELMA report. It can be speculated that the Council will officially address its Five Year Supply alongside its SHLAA Update 2018.</p> <p>Housing Allocations - Wirral have sought to make initial proposals as to where housing allocations might be located within the next fifteen years. Whilst it is noted that the SHLAA Update 2018 has yet to be released for public consideration, there is concern that the currently proposed allocations have not been introduced or justified sufficiently, making comment on their selection difficult. My Client is aware that they reserve the right to make further comments to the Council once the SHLAA Update 2018 is made available. The Council are currently considering Green Belt release in order to achieve its housing target. Whilst it is considered that Wirral will indeed be required to release some Green Belt land in order to achieve a varied and viable choice of housing supply to the market, attention should be drawn to the NPPF's clarifications when allocating Green Belt sites which suggests a 'Brownfield First' initiative, and ensures that all reasonable options have been considered before determining that exceptional circumstances exist which require removal of sites from the Green Belt for development². The Council have identified land within the Green Belt for 'Further Investigation', enough to provide 13,700 homes within the Green Belt (amounting to a loss of up to 22% of the boroughs total Green Belt area).</p> <p>Whilst supportive of Green Belt release where necessary, concerns exist regarding the perceived lack of available urban land in the borough which could be considered for development. This letter has already covered the availability of vacant employment land which may not currently be known to the Council. Further work could be undertaken by the Council to enhance awareness and effectiveness of the Council's Brownfield Register, which has been prepared in line with the Town and Country Planning (Brownfield Land Registers) Regulations 2017. My Client is currently considering a submission to the Brownfield Register ahead of the 2018 update which is expected at the end of the year.</p> <p>The Council has made steps to increase the pace of delivery of previously developed or urban sites throughout the borough with the continued actions of the Wirral Growth Company and actions made by the Council to put pressure on landowners with extant permissions (e.g. Wirral Waters). Urban sites, such as my Client's on Dock Road South, are frequently more sustainable than greenfield 'edge of settlement' sites, and as such should be considered first before Green Belt release.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Conclusion - My Client's site is located in a recognised area of transitional change from employment led development to an increasingly more residential led mixed use vernacular. There is concern that there has been piecemeal development in this location and a lack of joined up thinking, affecting businesses and leading to the area's decline in significance as a viable location for employment. The Council will be aware that sufficient vacant land across the borough exists to continue the growth of employment uses in the Wirral with an additional surplus of land which is currently 'safeguarded'. It is not expected that the loss of a small amount of employment land at Dock Road South would have any adverse impact in achieving this ambition. The Council should accept that land at Dock Road South Industrial Estate is evolving to provide a sustainable, mixed use community on previously developed land. Of course, this might relieve some pressure from edge of settlement Green Belt sites. My Client will be closely monitoring the progress of the Wirral Local Plan and the release of additional evidence throughout the coming months. Furthermore my Client will continue to work proactively with Wirral to prepare a 'sound' local plan and we look forward to being involved with future rounds of consultation.</p>
DOR01041	<p>Homes England owns the site reference SHLAA 2050 (ELPS 054) – Vacant Land at Clatterbridge Hospital (3.08ha) which is identified within the Development Options 'recommended for potential allocation for new mixed use development, which could also include residential development'. Homes England welcomes the sites allocation for development within the Development Options Review. However, the intention is to bring the site forward for residential development rather than mixed use. Homes England is in the process of instructing a team to prepare an outline planning application for residential development, with the further intention for a conditional contract subject to reserved matters to be agreed by winter 2019/20 with a developer and a start on site by summer 2020. Homes England is therefore committed to bringing the site forward for residential development in the short to medium term. On this basis, Homes England would therefore request that the site is identified as a residential allocation, rather than a mixed use allocation.</p>
DOR01042	<p>Wirral's Green Belt, with its splendid views, walks and recreational areas, and the very different identities of its various communities, were key reasons why we and many other residents chose to live on the Peninsula. But all this is now at risk, unnecessarily so and we need your help. Wirral Council are now compounding their lack of a 'Local Plan' with a rushed and flawed Review and Public Consultation. Their actions do not match their words about protecting our beautiful Green Belt on which the attraction and tourism of Wirral depend. On the contrary, the Council are still determined to release Green Belt for development even in the wake of much lower Growth Forecasts, from national and local sources. The high 'Housing Need' figure for Wirral, blamed by the Council on Government, was clearly based upon the Council's own inflated Growth assumptions and used to justify saying Wirral's 'Housing Need' could not be met without building on Green Belt. However, independent professional research had concluded even that former high figure was deliverable with NIL release of Green Belt. The new lower Growth Forecasts should make this easier to achieve, which is the expressed wish of Residents like ourselves. Wirral has vast untapped amounts of buildings and land outside of Green Belt to supply sufficient housing of all types throughout the Local Plan Period and beyond. To start with, Peel Holdings have confirmed up to 6,450 units can be delivered at 'Wirral Waters'. Yet, despite Officers confirming Phase One is "fully viable" due in part to a £6m Government Grant and New Homes monies, the Council have not included a single new dwelling in its First or even Second 5-Year Period and just 1,100 homes after 15 years, why? There are also thousands of Brownfield Sites and approved schemes, 16,000 existing planning consents and up to 6,000 empty houses to be brought back into use, plus opportunities for significant conversions, normal applications and 'Windfall' supply and more. Sadly, little is being made of much, whilst Officers appear happy to state that developers and the Council see greenfield development as simple, quick and lucrative. All this when your predecessor wrote to the Council saying, "This is not an area of high housing pressure."</p> <p>Not only are we protesting about the probable, completely unnecessary loss of Green Belt land but also the lack of time being afforded the public to engage properly in the process of deciding what is really needed and where in and around our community's development is best located having due regard to all factors including support infrastructure and already stretched public services and facilities. Its time Wirral Council stopped blaming everyone else and delivered a Local Plan through a process which gives its Residents real participation and reasonable time to determine what is needed and how it should fit in and around THEIR communities. Instead, there is an apparent determination to release Green Belt and reap short term rewards. This was brought home to us recently when a senior Council Officer, calmly announced that developers and the Council see greenfield development as simple, quick and lucrative. This is just NOT acceptable. It is a flawed approach that must change.</p> <p>In Irby where I and my family have made our home the deciding factor to choose this location over and above any other within Wirral is the villages distinct boundaries created by farmland and more importantly recreational spaces, paths and open views that do so much for villagers and my own family's sense of wellbeing. Should the entire number of sites surrounding Irby be developed the villages identity will be completely lost and will put an extreme strain on the infrastructure and services (Schools, Dentists, GP Surgeries, and Lack of parking) that serves the village currently. We should be looking to maintain our green belt and support the farming community to manage the land effectively and not be so quick to identify precious green belt land as the sole opportunity to develop. Further, because of location and demographic it is hard to accept that any of the developments around Irby or in other proposed locations will be affordable to low and middle income groups. It is my view that these greenbelt development should not take place in this unique peninsula We understand that independent professionals, with a different objective and approach, have demonstrated there is NO need to release ANY Green Belt land to provide in a timely fashion even the original, inflated 'Housing Need' let alone the much lower requirement in line with the latest official growth forecasts. We therefore demand that the people are heard and that the current process is altered to allow proper involvement of Wirral's Residents, free from the present headlong rush, in order to ensure community identity and our glorious Green belt are retained for the continued delight of Residents and Visitors alike, and more importantly for future generations to enjoy.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE		
DOR01043	[A schedule has been attached which sets out those sites which could have an impact on Nationally designated nature conservation sites] Annex A NE initial points for consideration on development options		
	Reference	General Location	Natural England initial comments
	ELPS 100; ELPS 415; ELPS 242; ELPS 017; ELPS 006; ELPS 324; ELPS 3043	Bromborough-Bebington	Sites in close proximity to designated sites (Mersey Estuary SSSI, SPA, Ramsar and New Ferry SSSI). Consideration to direct and indirect impacts associated with developments at this site with regard to the designated sites. Consideration of functionally linked land and disturbance for species.
	ELPS 031; ELPS 108	Birkenhead	Sites in close proximity to designated site (Liverpool Bay SPA), consideration to direct and indirect impacts associated with developments at this site with regard to the designated site.
	Wirral Waters development plots (ELPS 079; ELPS 081; ELPS 357; ELPS 417; ELPS 110; ELPS 265; ELPS 266; ELPS 267 etc)	East and West Float, Birkenhead	Sites in proximity to designated sites (Mersey Narrows and North Wirral Foreshore SPA, Ramsar, Mersey Narrows SSSI, and Liverpool Bay SPA). Consideration of direct and indirect impacts of developments at this site with regard to the designated sites. NE advising on Wirral Waters through current planning applications and note that the docks provide supporting functionally linked habitat for birds associated with the designated sites. We expect full consideration of the docks as supporting habitat through the Local Plan.
	SHLAA 1895; SHLAA 1896	Bromborough Pool	Sites in close proximity to designated sites (Mersey Estuary SSSI, SPA, Ramsar and New Ferry SSSI). Consideration to direct and indirect impacts associated with developments at this site with regard to the designated sites. Consideration of functionally linked land and disturbance for species. Further consideration to recreational pressure associated with housing developments at the coast.
	SHLAA 3040	Eastham	Consideration to recreational pressure associated with housing developments at the coast.
	SP016- Green Belt for further investigation	Hoylake	Overlap with Red Rocks SSSI and Dee Estuary (SSSI, SAC, SPA, Ramsar), potential of functionally linked land for species of the designated sites including natterjack toads and bird species.
	SP054; SP055; SP053, SP051; SP050- Green Belt sites for further investigation	Bromborough-Eastham	Consideration towards areas of open space here providing functionally linked land for bird species associated with Mersey Estuary (SSSI, SPA, Ramsar) and New Ferry SSSI
	SP042, SP043, SP044, SP045- Green belt sites for further investigation	Clatterbridge	Consideration of connectivity here with Dibbinsdale SSSI.
	<p>Designated sites. There are a number of designated sites located within and adjacent to the boundary of the Wirral Local Authority district. You should clearly identify international, national and local sites1 in the area. Natural England advises that all relevant Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs), European sites (Special Areas of Conservation and Special Protection Areas) and Ramsar sites 2 should be included on the proposals map for the area so they can be clearly identified in the context of proposed development allocations and future policies for development. Designated sites should be protected and, where possible, enhanced.</p> <p>Functionally Linked Land. When reviewing the development options we encourage you to consider the role of functionally linked land. The species for which internationally important sites (SACs and SPAs) are designated may also rely on areas outside of the site boundary. Where essential ecological functions, such as foraging, occurs beyond a site boundary, then the area within this is termed functionally linked land, or known as functional habitat. As the presence of this land is essential in meeting a species' needs, damage or deterioration of this habitat could impact upon the designated population. It is advised that the potential for offsite impacts needs to be considered in the local plan, assessing what, if any, potential impacts there may be on designated sites. We would recommend that records of the use of designated sites and surrounding habitats (is obtained from the local bird clubs (for SPA birds), record centre and wildlife trust. If there is an absence of records, it must be explained whether this is due to an absence of species, or an absence of recording of the area.</p> <p>It is the Councils decision to make amendments to the Green Belt. We would however highlight that areas within the Green Belt may provide supporting habitat for species associated with the designated sites. These areas are afforded the same protection as the SPA/SAC itself so mitigation may be required depending on the outcome of the Habitats Regulations Assessment.</p> <p>Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA). The Local Plan should be screened under Regulation 105 of the Conservation of Habitats and Species Regulations 2017 (as amended) at an early stage so that outcomes of the assessment can inform key decision making on strategic options and development sites. It may be necessary to outline avoidance and/or mitigation measures at the plan level, including a clear direction for project level HRA work to ensure no adverse effect on the integrity of internationally designated sites. It may also be necessary for plans to provide policies for strategic or cross boundary approaches, particularly in areas where designated sites cover more than one Local Planning Authority boundary.</p> <p>Natural England would welcome early discussion on the Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the plan and can offer further advice as policy options are progressed.</p> <p>People over Wind Ruling. A recent judgment from the Court of Justice of the European Union (Case C-323/17 People Over Wind v Coillte Teoranta) has provided authoritative interpretation relating to the use of mitigation measures at the screening stage of a Habitats Regulations Assessment ('HRA') when deciding whether an appropriate assessment of a plan or project is required. The court</p>		

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>concluded that measures intended to avoid or reduce the harmful effects of a plan or project on a European Site can only be considered as part of the appropriate assessment stage of HRA, and not at the preceding screening stage. This means that it is no longer appropriate to rely on these measures when deciding whether a plan or project is likely to have a significant effect on a European site(s).</p> <p>We advise that, when drafting the HRA of the Plan, you consider whether there are measures in the Plan that are intended to avoid or reduce the risk or the possibility of significant effects on European Sites that are being relied upon to rule out the need for an appropriate assessment. Where you consider this to be the case, we advise that an appropriate assessment should be undertaken to consider the impacts on the integrity of the European site(s), either alone or in-combination with other plans and projects, in view of the available advice about the site's conservation objectives. However, when determining whether the plan will have an adverse effect on the Integrity of the European site at the appropriate assessment stage, a competent authority may take account of those avoidance and mitigation measures. Natural England must be consulted on any appropriate assessment.</p> <p>Impact Risk Zones (IRZs). Natural England has recently published a set of mapped Impact Risk Zones (IRZs) for Sites of Special Scientific Interest (SSSIs). This helpful GIS tool can be used by LPAs and developers to consider whether a proposed development is likely to affect a SSSI and determine whether they will need to consult Natural England to seek advice on the nature of any potential SSSI impacts and how they might be avoided or mitigated. Further information and guidance on how to access and use the IRZs is available on the Natural England website. The IRZs are available on the Magic Map tool which we advise you utilise in order to aid your screening of the proposed allocations as there is a vast array of information that is relevant to the environment including designated sites, protected species licences, priority habitats to name a few.</p> <p>Sites of Least Environmental Value. In accordance with the NPPF, the plan's development strategy should seek to avoid areas of high environmental value. Natural England expects sufficient evidence to be provided, through the SA and HRA, to justify the site selection process and to ensure sites of least environmental value are selected. Land allocations should avoid designated sites and landscapes and should consider the direct and indirect effects of development on land within the setting of designated landscapes.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Geodiversity. The Plan should set out a strategic approach, planning positively for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of networks of biodiversity. There should be consideration of geodiversity conservation in terms of any geological sites and features in the wider environment. A strategic approach for networks of biodiversity should support a similar approach for green infrastructure. New development should incorporate opportunities to enhance biodiversity, wherever possible.</p> <p>Priority habitats, ecological networks and priority and/or legally protected species populations. The Local Plan should be underpinned by up to date environmental evidence, this should include an assessment of existing and potential components of ecological networks working with Local Nature Partnerships, as recommended by paragraphs 25 and 174 of the NPPF to inform the Sustainability Appraisal, the development constraints of particular sites, to ensure that land of least environmental value is chosen for development, and to ensure the mitigation hierarchy is followed. Priority habitats and species are those listed under Section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, 2006 and UK Biodiversity Action Plan (UK BAP). Further information is available here: Habitats and species of principal importance in England. Local Biodiversity Action Plans (LBAPs) identify the local action needed to deliver UK targets for habitats and species. They also identify targets for other habitats and species of local importance and can provide a useful blueprint for biodiversity enhancement in any particular area. Protected species are those species protected under domestic or European law. Further information can be found here Standing advice for protected species. Sites containing watercourses, old buildings, significant hedgerows and substantial trees are possible habitats for protected species. Ecological networks are coherent systems of natural habitats organised across whole landscapes so as to maintain ecological functions. A key principle is to maintain connectivity - to enable free movement and dispersal of wildlife e.g. badger routes, river corridors for the migration of fish and staging posts for migratory birds. The Plan should also reference Nature Improvement Areas (NIAs) and consider specifying appropriate types of development within them. We note that in the Liverpool City Region Ecological Network Report, 2015 by MEAS that an NIA is identified and recommendations for the local plan suggested. NIAs can provide a focal point for creating more and better-connected habitats. Where housing allocations are proposed in the environs of NIAs opportunities to contribute to habitat enhancement should be explored. Planning positively for ecological networks will contribute towards a strategic approach for the creation, protection, enhancement and management of green infrastructure, as identified in paragraphs 20 and 171 of the NPPF. Where a plan area contains irreplaceable habitats, such as ancient woodland and veteran trees, there should be appropriate policies to ensure their protection. Natural England and the Forestry Commission have produced standing advice on ancient woodland and veteran trees.</p> <p>Net Gain. Natural England recommends the inclusion of a measurable net gain policy and the use of a biodiversity metric calculation so it is aligned the 25 Year Environment Plan and the NPPF. The NPPF (para 174) states: "To protect and enhance biodiversity and geodiversity, plans should:...promote the conservation, restoration and enhancement of priority habitats, ecological networks and the protection and recovery of priority species; and identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity". Reference to this should be made, to strengthen future emerging policies. Strong wording that gives a clear demonstration of all development proposals taking account of the mitigation hierarchy should be included. We would like to see details of specific habitat types that would be most appropriate for enhancement, placing the emphasis on increase size, quality and quantity of priority habitats within cores areas, corridors or stepping stones that improves connectivity for habitats and movement of species.</p> <p>Defra metric - For the wide range of habitats within the development options within the Wirral, Natural England advocates the use of the Defra Metric to calculate any potential biodiversity losses and compensation to be measured.</p> <p>Please see the following links: https://www.gov.uk/government/collections/biodiversity-offsetting, https://www.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/69531/pb13745-bio-technical-paper.pdf</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Access and Rights of Way. Recognition should be given to the value of rights of way and access to the natural environment in relation to health and wellbeing and links to the wider green infrastructure network. The plan should seek to link existing rights of way where possible, and provides for new access opportunities. The plan should avoid building on open space of public value as outlined in paragraph 97 of the NPPF. The plan should make provision for appropriate quantity and quality of green space to meet identified local needs as outlined in paragraph 96 of the NPPF. Natural England's work on Accessible Natural Greenspace Standard (ANGSt) may be of use in assessing current level of accessible natural greenspace and planning improved provision.</p> <p>Soils. The Local Plan should give appropriate weight to the roles performed by the area's soils. These should be valued as a finite multi-functional resource which underpins our wellbeing and prosperity. Decisions about development should take full account of the impact on soils, their intrinsic character and the sustainability of the many ecosystem services they deliver. The plan should safeguard the long term capability of best and most versatile agricultural land (Grades 1, 2 and 3a in the Agricultural Land Classification) as a resource for the future in line with National Planning Policy Framework paragraph 170 to safeguard 'best and most versatile' agricultural land. The most current Defra guidance (updated 2018) is the Guide to assessing development proposals on agricultural land. This guidance explains how LPAs should assess proposals to protect BMV agricultural land from inappropriate and unsustainable development. In summary, this guidance explains what LPAs and developers should consider for development proposals and how to use ALC.</p> <p>Available ALC information can be accessed on the MAGIC website which is an interactive map service providing geographic information about the environment from across government. All "Provisional" and detailed "Post 1988 ALC" information available can be accessed by choosing the "Landscape" topic on the Interactive map, switching on the "Landscape Classifications" layer, and then selecting the location / area of interest. In order to view the Provisional ALC information, the Interactive Map scale needs to be set at 1:250,000 (or greater). The Provisional maps are designed to give an indication of land quality at a strategic level only. They do not show the breakdown of Grade 3 into Subgrades 3a and 3b, and it has a minimum map unit of 80ha. Consequently, they are not suitable for site specific assessments, for which a more detailed field survey would be required. Further guidance for protecting soils (irrespective of their ALC grading) both during and following development is available in Defra's Construction Code of Practice for the Sustainable Use of Soils on Construction Sites, to assist the construction sector in the better protection of the soil resources with which they work, and in doing so minimise the risk of environmental harm such as excessive run-off and flooding. The aim is to achieve positive outcomes such as cost savings, successful landscaping and enhanced amenity whilst maintaining a healthy natural environment, and we would advise that the Code be referred to where relevant in the development plan. Technical Information Note 049 explains the scope and basis of the ALC system, along with useful links to Regional Provisional ALC maps, Likelihood of BMV ALC Strategic Maps with guidance notes, ALC grading criteria, and Climatological data for ALC.</p> <p>The British Society of Soils Science, the Institute of Professional Soil Scientists, have a professional competency scheme which identifies minimum qualifications, skills and knowledge for practising soils scientists carrying out ALC surveys, and maintain a list of competent ALC surveyors. In addition, the following two guides provide the legislation, policies and advice that planners need to consider to reclaim the quality and structure of soil for farming use:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Guide to reclaiming mineral extraction and landfill sites to agriculture; and 2. Planning and aftercare advice for reclaiming land to agricultural use <p>Water Quality and Resources and Flood Risk Management. Natural England expects the Plan to consider the strategic impacts on water quality and resources as outlined in paragraph 170 of the NPPF. We would also expect the plan to address flood risk management in line with the paragraphs 155-161 of the NPPF.</p> <p>The Local Plan should be based on an up to date evidence base on the water environment and as such the relevant River Basin Management Plans should inform the development proposed in the Local Plan. These Plans [link to River Basin Management Plans on gov.uk website supplied] implement the EU Water Framework Directive and outline the main issues for the water environment and the actions needed to tackle them. Local Planning Authorities must in exercising their functions, have regard to these plans.</p> <p>The Local Plan should contain policies which protect habitats from water related impacts and where appropriate seek enhancement. Priority for enhancements should be focussed on N2K sites, SSSIs and local sites which contribute to a wider ecological network. Plans should positively contribute to reducing flood risk by working with natural processes and where possible use Green Infrastructure policies and the provision of SUDs to achieve this.</p> <p>Climate change adaptation. The Local Plan should consider climate change adaption and recognise the role of the natural environment to deliver measures to reduce the effects of climate change, for example tree planting to moderate heat island effects. In addition factors which may lead to exacerbate climate change (through more greenhouse gases) should be avoided (e.g. pollution, habitat fragmentation, loss of biodiversity) and the natural environment's resilience to change should be protected. Green Infrastructure and resilient ecological networks play an important role in aiding climate change adaptation.</p> <p>Coastal issues. Natural England expects the Plan to identify a Coastal Change Management Area and set out the type of policies and developments that would be appropriate in it. The planning policy guidance (PPG) gives guidance on how to define a Coastal Change Management Area as follows:</p> <p><i>"Coastal Change Management Area will only be defined where rates of shoreline change are significant over the next 100 years, taking account of climate change. They will not need to be defined where the accepted shoreline management plan policy is to hold or advance the line (maintain existing defences or build new defences) for the whole period covered by the plan, subject to evidence of how this may be secured".</i></p> <p>We would also expect the plan to consider the marine environment and apply an Integrated Coastal Zone Management approach. Where marine plans are in place, local plans should also take these into account.</p> <p>The plan should refer to the relevant Shoreline Management Plan and take forward applicable actions. Local Authorities should use Shoreline Management plans as a key evidence base for shaping</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>policy in coastal areas. The list of existing SMPs can be found here [https://www.gov.uk/government/publications/shoreline-management-plans-smps/shoreline-management-plans-smps]</p> <p>Sea level rise and coastal change are inevitable and bring both challenges and opportunities for people and nature. Sustainable coastal management needs to embrace long-term change and achieve positive outcomes for both.</p> <p>Local Plans should provide for coastal adaptation and work with coastal processes. Plans within coastal areas should recognise the need to respond to changes over long timescales and adopt an integrated approach across administrative and land/sea boundaries. A successful integrated approach should set levels of sustainable levels of economic and social activity whilst protecting the environment.</p> <p>We would also advise that Local Plans should help facilitate the relocation of valued environmental assets away from areas of risk.</p>
DOR01044	<p>We welcome the following proposals for Housing Allocations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA 1895 Former Land and Marine, Dock Road North (Housing Allocation) • SHLAA 1896 Plant Hire Depot Dock Road north, Bromborough (Housing Allocation) • ELPS 324- former Croda Prices Way Bromborough Pool (Employment Allocation) <p>We feel this land offers the potential to provide some much need car parking space. We think that our requests should be sympathetically met as the River Park itself has provided a major environmental catalyst to make it a very attractive area for investors as a place to live. Additionally, the success of the Park has resulted in a new Facility the River Park Heritage Centre which will provide a new facility for the community. We have a funded Education Officer who will have a target audience of school and community groups who will require secure and safe parking. We would like to ear mark an area near to the existing current care park on the Land and Marine Side or a plot accessible by bridge to the River Park Office (Heritage Centre under construction)</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. A larger permanent car park (Approx. 25 – 30 spaces) 2. A potential area for overspill/additional parking for special events <p>As Friends of the River Park we have the following concern about the current parking arrangements and facilities:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient Parking the permanent car park just 9 spaces • Continued lack of access to the main (Riverside) car park as the access Road is used by United Utilities all year round. Although we have been able to use this area for special events, it is the only flat accessible area on the whole river park site which is suitable for special events, stalls and attractions. • The New Heritage Centre and Café currently under construction will attract new visitors which will necessarily mean a need for more parking this is likely in the future to include school and community groups. • Current access via public transport still requires a long walk (25 minutes +) from both Port Sunlight Railway Station and a 15-minute walk from the nearest bus stop on New Chester Road, so travelling by car is a necessity for many particularly those with limited mobility or for families with younger children. • On street parking bays created on Dock Road North originally designated for busy events could be blocked or used if enough parking is not provided in any new development • When we have larger community events or if there are major River Events, there is congestion on the surrounding streets • Access in and Out of the Park - The single access route in and out of Dock Road North creates traffic congestion particularly if there are any kind of events attracting visitors from further afield who are travelling by car. We would like to ensure that new access roads would be created to ease this problem, possibly creating a circular route with two-way traffic. The Scope of Housing Development - Consideration be given for ample car parking for the householders whether single units or apartments so that street access to and from the park remains clear for both visitors and emergency vehicles and that any car parking space which is created will be for visiting the park.
DOR01045	<p>Following recent Consultations, I am still unclear about a whole range of related aspects. These can be summed up as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing Targets <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. What figures did the Council provide to the Government? Why were they 'over-inflated'? b. Has the Council a financial deal arranged with Government in exchange for a promise to build so greatly above RSS targets? c. Did DHCLG or ONS make up the 880 dwellings per annum – or is the projection until 2035 based on any evidence of potential growth? Where did these figures come from originally? d. Is the Council liaising with Government now the latest ONS household projections to have reduced the targets still further? e. Until upto- date statistics are published, has there been any actual evidence of any significant change in economic growth, population growth or new housing pressures? f. Why had the council opted to go for the high growth option arising from the SHMA report of 2016, when the Council never reached its RSS target of 250 dwellings pa over this century? g. Why can't the Council count land that has already been given planning permission? 2. Peel Wirral Waters <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Why has the Council been fixated on criticising Peel, when it knows full well when it gave it P/P that it was a 30-40 year project? b. Why didn't the Council taken on board the Company's current plans and projections for the future and use them to adjust the developments that the Company say they can undertake before 2035?

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>c. Will the Council now work more closely with Peel, to help it achieve its plans?</p> <p>d. What efforts have the Council made to cooperate with other Councils and include developments say for Liverpool Waters?</p> <p>3. Development Options Consultation</p> <p>a. It's still not clear to me what exactly the purpose was of this Consultation, other than to say the Council has 'consulted'. As the vast majority of those who take an interest and complete the forms, apart from the landowners & developers, will say either have said no Green Belt (or some part of it) should be taken for development, will this make any difference to what happens?</p> <p>b. Why was the form released, and people given the opportunity to complete it prior to the Consultation period starting?</p> <p>c. Why was the form written in such an unstructured way, which makes a fully objective analysis impossible? Given that,</p> <p>d. Who will read (assess?) the comments on the completed forms – the Council or the Government – or will there be an independent assessor? Will the summary of the replies be published?</p> <p>4. How will the outcome of this Consultation be measured - will it just be how many people attended and how many forms were completed? Will we ever know whether the overall public response to this exercise – the Consultation forms, the 22,000+ signatures collected, and the many other public responses to the media - have had any impact upon decision-making? Is there now to be a fresh Consultation, based upon the new housing targets – or have it already accepted it doesn't need to do this, as the latest target figure can already be met, without taking Green belt land?</p> <p>5. Wirral Green Belt</p> <p>a. Did the Council carry out a Green Belt survey in late 2017? If so, was it done by Consultants or 'in house'? If undertaken –</p> <p>b. What was the Brief & methodology? Was any regard given to - satisfying the 5 GB Principles/ also - Agricultural Land quality & whether it's being actively farmed? Landscape designation? Historic features etc.?</p> <p>c. If so, where are the results published and thus why was the consultation based on a meaningless 'leaked' map? What bearing do the results of any official survey have on the land parcels which are shown on the 'leaked' map? –</p> <p>d. Why was substantially more land identified on the map which was not identified in the SHLAA exercise in 2017? Than would ever be required to satisfy the inflated Council / Government targets?</p> <p>e. Why has the Langfields area been excluded from the map, given the Council's stated wish to build 160+ dwellings there, as part of the planned Hoylake Golf Resort</p> <p>Following the letter from the Leader of the Council in August, I have been taking an interest in the discussions on how the Council needs to satisfy its housing targets. I wasn't able to get to the Consultation meetings but I have spoken to people who did manage to go – but it seems to me that the meetings were called to try to convince us that the Council had no option but to release Green Belt land and to upset many people, including many farmers fearing for their livelihood. I have now heard that there seems to be little evidence that there is any need to take Green Belt land as –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • there seems to be no evidence that Borough's economy will grow anything like as fast as the Council seem to expect • we have a falling population in the Borough • the figures for the numbers of houses needed over the period of the Local Plan, have recently been greatly reduced • Peel Holdings has said that with the Council's support, they can build many houses in the area of the Wirral docklands which would go a significant way towards meeting the Council's revised target • Wirral Borough has, I gather, one of the highest numbers of empty homes in the country – which need to be brought back into use • I have also learned that there is more land categorized as 'Brownfield' available in the Borough than is included on your Council's Register. So it seems that there is no need to review the Wirral Green Belt and the Council should be directing its efforts to bringing underused houses and land back into use. It should also be giving all the support it can to Peel Holdings, to help it meet its plans. PLEASE leave our Green Belt alone! Wirral is a peninsular - "almost an island" - and we have nowhere to expand to and can ill afford to lose more open land to development. (We should be enhancing this wonderful place with more green areas not fewer.)
DOR01046	<p>Barnston Dip and Gills lane are not a suitable place for additional traffic which would be caused by an infill village. In fact, we have witnessed many accidents and near misses on both of these roads due to the narrow nature of the roads and lack of clear sight when turning into them. To add additional traffic would be foolish as many people struggle to navigate the roads as it is. We have already had problems with HGVs and construction traffic and to add to this on such narrow roads would be a nightmare scenario. We already have had the disruption of a house being built at the end of the lane, damage to our car and the loss of large trees; these areas are part of our legacy for the next generation and should be protected for them. It is very evident in our area that this is not affordable housing which is being built by the price of them, but a way that developers can cram in houses for profit at the expense of residents. The proposed executive housing off Storeton Lane being a classic case. We would ask the council to show leadership and preserve our Greenbelt; we can always move but once it has gone, it will be gone forever.</p>
DOR01047	<p>The Site is identified by the Council as forming part of a wider Green Belt land parcel (Reference SP015) as part of the overall Development Options Review but has not been proposed as a Site for further investigation for release from the Green Belt. Our client believes that the Council has erred in failing to spot the clear opportunity that is presented by the Site.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Vehicular access to the site can be provided directly to Birkenhead Road which has satisfactory visibility. This access will have sufficient capacity to accommodate all vehicular traffic associated with the site;

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • An emergency access will be provided to Fornalls Green Road, providing a further cycle and pedestrian route. A pedestrian/cycle route is also expected to be provided to Birch Road and this may also provide an emergency access for the site as well as vehicular access to a number of residential dwellings, were it deemed to be appropriate; • The site is located where there are a good range of existing local services and facilities, along with employment opportunities; • The site is well located for sustainable modes of transport. The site is particularly well located for access to the Merseyrail network, which facilitates commuter/leisure trips to Birkenhead and Liverpool; • The site is well connected to the highway network and benefits from convenient access to the M53 and the strategic road network; and • There are route options which enable traffic from the site to dissipate rather than be overly concentrated on one area/corridor.
DOR01048	<p>These representations focus on the evidence base material that has been made available for review these representations focus in part on the merits of releasing this land from the Green Belt for residential development, supported with a robust justification.</p> <p>SHLAA sites 1774 and 1776 - The following summarises the key points that [land owner] would like to raise in respect of this consultation. Have reviewed the documents comprising the 'Development Options Review' consultation and in the absence of an overarching statement or a draft Local Plan that pulls together the various strands of evidence it is difficult to gauge the intended direction of travel. Richborough also have some concerns about the methodology used in respect of the documents that have been released, in particular the Initial Green Belt Review. In the absence of a robust evidence base that establishes the housing requirement for the District as a whole, or other matters such as the distribution of development across the various Settlement Areas and a coherent and consistent Green Belt Assessment, this representation has taken an evidence-led Wirral Local Plan Development Options Review Consultation Representations on behalf of Richborough Estates 51 approach and the following summarises the key findings of the assessments that have been undertaken. In order for the Local Plan to be found sound it will need to contain a housing figure that aligns with the conclusions reached within the Council's recent assessments and supports the delivery of committed and planned economic, regeneration and strategic infrastructure improvements i.e. a housing figure of between 735 and 900 dwellings per annum (dpa) – the mid-point being broadly 820dpa. In consideration of the distribution of development across the various Settlement Areas, when applying the National Planning Policy Framework (the NPPF) (paragraph 65) resident population factor in respect of Settlement Area 7 (comprising Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Irby), an appropriate apportionment (9%) of the Council's locally assessed OAN range would be between 66 – 81 dpa – 74 dpa being the mid-point. This figure should be considered as a starting point minimum requirement and there could be a need for a greater proportion to be delivered within Settlement Area 7 because of the constrained nature of Settlement Areas 1-3 to accommodate their proportion of housing development. In this regard, Wirral Waters should not be overtly relied upon to deliver Wirral's housing requirement given the absence of any housing completions or detailed planning applications since outline planning permission was originally granted in May 2012. Justifying the need for Green Belt release Having considered the likely yield of housing from within the urban area during the 15 year plan period, with reference to historic net housing completion rates and the Proposed Housing Allocations it is clear that exceptional circumstances exist and Green Belt release is essential if future housing needs are to be met in Wirral. Richborough Estates view is that in Settlement Area 7, sufficient Green Belt land needs to be released to accommodate a minimum of 1,110 dwellings during the plan period.</p> <p>[Nexus Planning representing Richborough Estates] [Appendices included]</p>
DOR01049	<p>We believe the proposed release of Greenbelt is out of all proportion to the requirement for housing and that to take over 20% of our greenbelt is not warranted. For housing and even the largest projection of housing need would not need all of it. New housing requires infrastructure such as transport, schools and other community facilities. Without those there would simply be an increase in traffic with all the problems which that brings. Wirral's population isn't projected to grow to any great extent there is no evidence of a growing population requiring further housing. There are many homes which could be brought back into use and Wirral has many brownfield sites. We are particularly concerned with Greasby and have the following comments regarding specific sites. SP001 north of Greasby – if built on, there would be reduction in the distinctive separation of local communities affecting their character. The land is used for agriculture and livery stables, and has ponds scattered around. SP010A East of Rigby Drive – This land is predominantly prime farming land. Loss of this site is subject to very strong opposition within the area. Local people raise concerns about the documented special archaeological sites within this parcel. There is also well-evidenced flooding within Greasby during heavy rain which is at least in part due to water which comes from this land so to build over it must make that problem worse. This land keeps the settlements distinct and has great value for residents it needs to be protected for the future. The copse, recognised in the UDP as a site of Local Biological Importance, even if protected would be diminished by built environment all around it.</p>
DOR01050	<p>Ref: - Wirral Local Plan – Development Options Review Consultation – October 2018.</p> <p>Appendix 16 – Potential Infill Villages in the Green Belt – SP96 through to 110</p> <p>Specifically – SP99,100 and 101</p> <p>As a resident of Park West, Lower Heswall, I object to the proposed development of Infill villages on the stipulated Green Belt land.</p> <p>It is clear from examination of Wirral Borough Council documentation that the evidence presented to the community, and the assessments undertaken by the authority and its consultants has not been undertaken in a clear and transparent manner; as required under UK Planning and Consultation legislation. Numbers quoted to Central Government and the rationale for releasing precious Green Belt land has not been assessed correctly; in line with UK Statutory Consultation guidelines or European Union legislation associated with land use and protected species. Furthermore, the land identified for development into 'infill Villages' does not meet the criteria for release as stipulated in the UK Governments 'National Planning Policy Framework', in particular clauses:</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>84. When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries local planning authorities should take account of the need to promote sustainable patterns of development. They should consider the consequences for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside the Green Belt boundary, towards towns and villages inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>87. As with previous Green Belt policy, inappropriate development is, by definition, harmful to the Green Belt and should not be approved except in very special circumstances.</p> <p>88. When considering any planning application, local planning authorities should ensure that substantial weight is given to any harm to the Green Belt. 'Very special circumstances' will not exist unless the potential harm to the Green Belt by reason of inappropriateness, and any other harm, is clearly outweighed by other considerations.</p> <p>Evidence presented by WBC fails to demonstrate that the consequence of developing on the Green Belt Land has NOT been taken into consideration. Documentation necessary to justify the re-categorisation of Green Belt Land (SHLAA and Broad Based Spatial Option Revised Assessment Report) has not been released into to public domain allowing myself, and residents, to understand the change in land use. National Guideline and local UDP policies provide protection on land in order to ensure the character of the area is protected. The land on the west of the Wirral Way has significant ecological and social value. The wildlife species that exist within this parcel of land is unique, with the area designated both as a SSSI and RAMSAR site. Implementing any development as an Infill Village will have significant, detrimental, impact on this. Furthermore, one of the major cornerstones of land designation is to have clear separation of settlement areas. Heswall urban area is designated as Settlement area 7 whereas the area to West of the Wirral Way is designated as Settlement area 8. If development took place within the locality of Lower Heswall, within Settlement area 8, it would completely destroy any separation and the land would simply become part of the Heswall Urban area; hardly and infill village. It is quite clear, such development would have a devastating impact on the character, appearance, spatial and visual views of the area in addition to the impact on wildlife, the environment, International, European and National constraints. Finally, the councils approach to consultation fails to provide residents with all, legally required, documentation. Evidence presented fails to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify housing shortfall, demand. Figures stated for housing shortfall overstates the housing requirements and understates the planned availability, particularly in the first 5 years • Council has omitted to issue key documentation, in-particular the SHLAA and Broad Based Spatial Option Revised Assessment Report • Changes to housing figures have become available which changes the stated council proposal. <p>It is evident that the council, in agreement with private developers, have changed local planning guidelines to allow land to the West of the Wirral Way to be designated as Infill Villages and, therefore, subject to less onerous planning regulations. It is also evident that no consideration, by the council, has been given to the implications on the local infrastructure. The current roads, power, sanitation, water, lighting, communication systems are incapable of supporting any future growth. By implication Station Road, Riverbank Road, Davenport Road, Park West, Wittering Lane etc. are all minor roads that support the existing community, just, and the demands of the Wirral Way and Wirral Country Park. Any increase in traffic use, through construction and inhabitation etc., will not only have a long lasting effect on services but, most importantly, will have a significant impact on Safety; to residents and the thousands of people who access the Green Belt and nature reserves 52 weeks of the year. Documentation provided by the council, as part of the consultation, does not provide evidence as to how these, real issues, will be addressed.</p> <p>Finally, it is essential that Wirral Borough Council notes and heeds the wishes of the residents it is elected to represent. I therefore object to the proposals put forward by Wirral Borough Council.</p>
DOR01051	<p>I would like to object to the general release of green belt land in the Borough for housing development. There is enough brownfield/non green belt land available for future housing demand given the recently revised population growth projections.</p> <p>With reference to proposed 'infill villages' in Lower Heswall I have a number of objections. These 'villages' directly contradict the recent decision to use the Wirral Way as a clear green belt boundary in Lower Heswall. In addition this would: completely spoil the rural character of the area; destroy the open aspect of this section of the green belt; cause the loss of high quality agricultural land and encroach on the coastal strip and nationally important breeding and feeding sites for seabirds on the Dee estuary.</p>
DOR01052	[SAME AS DOR00770]
DOR01053	<p>I find it hard to understand the process involved in the review when already statistics and figures being used are outdated. The whole process is based around the housing need for Wirral and whether land needs to be released from the Greenbelt to help achieve the house building targets. These targets have been changed mid-process showing a considerably reduced needs figure. The leader of the council amongst others have said this now casts doubt on whether any Greenbelt at all needs to be considered for release. Bearing this in mind why has the review consultation not been abandoned? I am unable to properly comment on the review as there are still missing documents on the WBC website, the SHLAA for instance. This was apparently updated in April 2018 and yet remains unavailable, how can the public be asked for comments as part of a consultation when key documents are not available? Wirral is a very diverse area, key industrial areas to the north and fantastic landscape and areas of natural beauty to the south. The borough needs to attract investment to bring in jobs whilst protecting the tourism assets of the landscape and green spaces. I feel this balance and the drive required to achieve it has never been fully targeted by the administration instead political wrangling has stood in the way of true understanding and belief in what the borough can achieve. Wirral Waters have huge potential to put Wirral on the map, bringing both, investment for jobs and adding attraction for tourism to an area of the borough that has done neither for decades. Most of the housing need can be achieved here, with additional needs coming from brownfield or areas where planning permission has already been granted. I understand the need for a mixed type of housing i.e. apartments and houses to ensure family needs and that of others are fulfilled within the housing review. I believe the local authority should listen to the residents of the borough more genuinely, putting aside the politics involved and look at the impact on the future and a way of minimising the lifetime negative impact on the borough this review could create.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01054	<p>We consider that the site qualifies as a suitable candidate for release given:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is well contained by urbanised edges on three sides and is dominated by urban detractors including the neighbouring refinery; • Development of the site would provide a logical infill between Eastham Refinery and the Hooton Park industrial area. This would not significantly contribute to urban sprawl given the strong southern boundary of the site, and would not cause significant encroachment to the countryside; • Development would not initiate any merging with Eastham given the capacity of the site to maintain a green wedge and buffer gap in the north western corner. There is an opportunity to maintain and enhance the appearance and distinctiveness of Eastham Village Conservation Area – which is well contained itself – as part of this approach; • The site is considered to be of degraded and damaged agricultural and landscape quality and development presents the opportunity to (a) preserve and enhance the natural landscape and (b) renew previously developed land for the benefit of the local and regional community and economy, through sensitive design and significant landscape and biodiverse enhancements. Considered against other sites in Wirral borough, the Council sees the release of this parcel to represent a strategic opportunity for development, given its location to the east of the M53 motorway adjacent to the industrial border to the Mersey Estuary. Wirral Council identified that release of this parcel would not compromise the extensive area of Green Belt and open countryside located to the west of the M53 motorway. It also recognises that release of this site could be undertaken in isolation of others and would not require release of nearby parcels under consideration. We endorse this position of the Council and support the further consideration of the site for release purposes. On this basis, we have provided within this representation an outline of the • Development opportunity that the West Road site affords. The three development options which are presented in this document identify a range of approaches to development of the site. The land is well suited to residential and/or employment allocation, and at this indicative stage there is scope for development of either 95,000 sqm of all employment floorspace, or a mix of residential (between 193 and 351 homes at 20-30 dph) and employment (between 45,000 sqm and 65,000 sqm) floorspace. This representation demonstrates that development can occur sensitively and sustainability, with benefits of development at a high-level including: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - contribution towards Wirral's significant housing and/or employment needs through the development of a site which is ready for development and is the recipient of significant developer interest - the renewal of poor quality landscapes through ecological improvements including the protection and enhancement of hedgerows, trees and a TPO area, as well as the upgrading of wildlife corridors. Well-integrated designs can limit the visual presence of any new buildings, and the site is already well enclosed by a strong tree belt; • Development of a site which is demonstrated to be 'highly accessible', comparable with other sites in Wirral borough which the Council considers to be accessible. The site is well located for sustainable travel to bus and railway connections, and there is scope for bus routes to extend to the site should the need be demonstrated. Opportunities are also presented to create sustainable links through the site between Eastham village and the east of the site; • In a mixed-use scheme, development could promote a sustainable community with living, working and playing opportunities all contained within the boundary of the site, reducing the need for car travel for work and leisure purposes; • Well-located employment growth, coherently connected to Junction 6 of the M53. There will be little need for commercial vehicles and HGVs to travel through Eastham village given this strong connection to the Strategic Road Network. In addition, the site is demonstrated to be located in an area of significant spare capacity on the road network; • Capacity for outdoor amenity and public open space at a scale beyond policy requirements; • Making the most effective use of a site which is partly constrained by HSE's COMAH regulations; • Contribution of new residents and/or workers to the local economy. <p>We have demonstrated that it would likely be possible to absorb new residents within existing facilities in Eastham. Development at the site would not give rise to traffic and transportation, landscape, biodiversity, and conservation impacts which cannot be appropriately mitigated, and would give rise to significant economic, social and environmental benefits as well as helping Wirral Council meet its land requirements for development. The landowner has established considerable interest in the development of the site within the plan period to 2035, as evidenced by approaches made by at least four developers. At this stage there are no known obstacles which prevent the delivery of the site in this time period. In conclusion, the West Road site is a sustainable and good quality candidate site for development through Green Belt release, in order to support the Council in delivering the homes and jobs required in Wirral over the forthcoming plan period. We support the Council in taking the West Road site, analogous with Parcel SP051, forward for further consideration for release from the Wirral Green Belt as part of its development options review.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01055	<p>I write to express our concern and objection to the proposed building plan - Proposed Green Belt Site under site reference SP001.</p> <p>Based on the proposed numbers of houses in the development plan, I would question the statistics and principles on which this redevelopment is based. There are many areas within Wirral which could be developed which do not encroach onto the green belt land which has been designated as such, to protect the natural beauty within this area. This area of green belt has been protected over many, many years and would require chopping down many well established trees which have been supporting the environment for so long and safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. I would actually question the expected demand for housing which is suggested in the planning document over the coming years. I do not believe that the current plans are exceptional circumstances as is the requirement under any planning framework to use green belt. This area will also have an impact on the conservation area in Saughall Massie, including river corridors and the surrounding habitat. Our main objections due to loss of view and light along with the overshadowing which this would cause, resulting in us not being able to enjoy the sunshine and views. This would also result in a distinct loss of privacy and us being overlooked and this is exactly the reason why we chose this location for our retirement bungalow. The proposed housing development would add additional pressure onto the road leading to our bungalow, which would mean the quiet area we had chosen, would no longer be so and this would generate much more traffic and potential safety issues in this quiet neighbourhood. There would be additional noise and disturbance as a result of housing right behind us, which would have a significant effect on this neighbourhood and our mental and emotional well-being.</p> <p>As pensioners, we only moved into our current bungalow, just over 12 months ago after selling our family home due to some personal medical circumstances within the family. We chose this bungalow, because of its location backing onto green belt and open spaces, to support my husband's medical condition. The thought of a housing development right behind our property, is one which is causing a great deal of stress to both myself and my husband.</p> <p>We would ask that the whole plan is reconsidered with more realistic figures on the expected demand on houses and to include other areas of brownfield land.</p>
DOR01056	<p>I would like to comment on proposals to build on the Green Belt at Pipers Lane, Heswall:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council's estimate of the shortfall should be revised based on up to date figures. This would result in a significantly reduced figure. 2. The Council should demonstrate that it has fully explored the potential from <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Wirral Waters to 2035 - All non-Green Belt sites (urban and brownfield) - Creatively developing plans for reusing existing empty and under-utilised properties 3. The Green Belt site along Pipers Lane is adjacent to the Wirral Way - an important amenity for all Wirral residents to enjoy - and this area has significant beneficial and recreational use linked to the Wirral Way which would be damaged by development 4. Development on this Green Belt would damage the special character of this area 5. The Council has not adequately challenged the housing target for the Wirral and the special circumstances of the Wirral 6. Pipers Lane is single car width in parts and development would create traffic issues
DOR01057	<p>My family has always valued the open spaces we have, which are loved and appreciated by many, including our many visitors who increase revenue for local businesses. It is such a pleasure to be in the countryside within a few minutes' drive or even a walk away.</p> <p>I would like to raise my objections to the potential destruction of some of Wirral's precious Green Belt under the Local Plan; my reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is sufficient land in urban areas, which are already in need of regeneration, (in particular New Ferry) to build upon. Wirral has around 5,000 empty properties and there are brownfield sites which could be used for 12,000 homes. Labour's Shadow Housing Minister has undertaken an analysis of land granted planning permission but where no new homes have been built. North West England and London had the worst difference with only 50% new homes being built. This obviously includes Wirral Waters between Wallasey and Birkenhead which has planning permission for over 12,000 homes. This development should be pursued urgently with Peel Holdings. 2. The population projection in the Local Plan is for 12,000 homes, however new figures published last month by the Office of National Statistics suggest this should be reduced to around 7,000. 3. There seems to be an unequal distribution of Green Belt land to be built upon around Bebington and Bromborough compared with the rest of Wirral and this will spoil the character of the local area, these towns could merge destroying their local and historic nature. 4. The Green Belt under threat provides areas for relaxation and exercise for countless local people and is a safe haven for wildlife. 5. The proposed increase of 12,000 new houses will impact hugely on local infrastructure and the plan does not seem to allow for infrastructure development. Arrowe Park Hospital is already over-stretched and the current proposals to closing local walk-in centres and minor injuries clinics will impact further on the hospital. Many local schools are also over-subscribed. In addition there will be an increase in traffic which could cause major congestion. 6. Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost; unrivalled views will be destroyed, and the face of Wirral will be irreparably damaged by the encroachment of built-up areas on our countryside. 7. Adjoining areas of land could be further damaged where building works could extend causing unrestricted urban sprawl. <p>Many local people, Councillors and our local MPs are against this proposed selling off of Green Belt land and are in favour of protecting it. I am not against housing development on the Wirral and</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>this is not a case of NIMBYISM. Affordable and accessible housing, including social housing is needed, but it makes more sense to provide these houses in already built-up areas with local amenities, schooling, medical provision and established communities. However, this Plan with its proposed sites in semi-rural areas will be of particular interest to developers who will build more up-market properties and fewer affordable houses.</p>
DOR01058	<p>I am writing to strongly object to the destruction of the Wirral by building on the protected greenbelt land. People have chosen to live and work here because of the environment. They have invested in their homes, local communities and the environment. They have taken care of this unique place for those who live and work here but also for those who visit. Those people contribute to the local economy. They value the Wirral through tourism BECAUSE of the unique coastline and countryside walks, the fields and the woodlands and BECAUSE of the protected green belt. The current plans will destroy local landmarks such as Lever Causeway contributing to urban sprawl, traffic congestion, strain on local infrastructure and amenities, reduction in house prices and destroying how people on the Wirral live.</p> <p>Brownfield sites MUST be developed first. It is understandable that developers, the Council and those selling land are only interested in the highest profit.</p> <p>BUT</p> <p>What right do they have to wilfully ignore extensive brownfield sites that are available for housing at the expense of protected green belt?</p> <p>What right do they have to destroy a unique and beautiful peninsula?</p> <p>What right do they have to destroy wildlife habitats?</p> <p>What right do they have to destroy the environment that residents and visitors value highly?</p> <p>What right do they have to destroy a way of life that people have invested in?</p> <p>This wholesale destruction of the Wirral to the highest bidder is criminal. If they want to invest in the Wirral then they should invest in those areas that are desperate for housing and amenities often close to or in brownfield sites and that have been ignored.</p> <p>The people of Wirral should be able to choose their future NOT DEVELOPERS, NOT COUNCILS GOING AGAINST THEIR ELECTORATE, NOT GREEDY LANDOWNERS LOOKING FOR A WAY TO MAKE MORE MONEY OUT OF LAND THEY SHOULD BE PROTECTING.</p>
DOR01059	[SAME AS (italicized paragraph in) DOR00384b]
DOR01060	<p>I am contacting you regarding the consultancy period for possible release of areas of Landican for future development. My interest in the hamlet lies as an archaeologist and in research that I conducted during the mid-2000's, which demonstrated that the area is a uniquely preserved natural asset within Northern Wirral.</p> <p>Landican is first mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1086, proving the settlement was established during the late Saxon period. This is especially pertinent as the farming settlement still retains its Saxon and Medieval character, comprising a nucleated area surrounded by agricultural fields, many of which retain early names and field boundaries. As my investigations continued, I identified several areas of archaeological importance and filed an unpublished report with the Merseyside Historic Environment Record. These features include the recovery of a coin and several fragments of Roman pottery from a field in the centre of the settlement; coordinates 328462 385689. In contrast, the neighbouring field; coordinates 28340 385574 contains 'well preserved' ridge and furrow ploughing of medieval date, which culminates in a low bank. A late prehistoric pit firing was discovered below this bank. I have included an image of the bank and pit firing with this e-mail.</p> <p>A further area of archaeological interest lies on the outskirts of Landican near Woodchurch Road and is logged in the online 'Atlas of Hillforts' at co-ordinates SJ 2835 8610. It is recorded as a possible hillslope fort identified by aerial photography. The web address is https://hillforts.arch.ox.ac.uk/</p> <p>In short the lack of data regarding late prehistoric and Roman occupation in Merseyside makes Landican an area of Regional Importance which would require at the very least an archaeological watching brief if not an 'open area' excavation ahead of any construction. This small rural hamlet is, however, much more than a site of archaeological significance. It is the best preserved Medieval hamlet in northern Wirral, and an area of natural beauty which is enjoyed by walkers and the general public from surrounding estates and farther afield. To encroach on such an environment with housing projects would destroy the unique character and heritage which belongs to all the residents of Wirral. [additional photo received-archaeological dig]</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01061	<p>Please find below my objections to the proposed Wirral Local Plan and in particular the reallocation of some areas of Green belt to areas for proposed housing development. In particular land Parcel. SP013 Column Road Fields and woodland at Caldby Hill.</p> <p>In many areas the proposed Local Plan for the Wirral is not consistent with national policy as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework. In particular I am unsure how the allocation of Green belt at this scale across the Wirral will meet the following NPPF objectives and how the allocation of parcel SP013 specifically meets these requirements:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Planning should contribute to conserving and enhancing the natural environment and reducing pollution. NPPF, p. 6, para. 17, sub-para. 7 2. The government attaches great importance to Green Belts. The fundamental aim of Green Belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open; the essential characteristics of Green Belts are their openness and permanence NPPF, p. 19, paras. 79-92 3. The planning system can play an important role in the facilitating of social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. NPPF, p.17, para. 69 4. Every effort should be made objectively to identify and then meet the housing, business and other development needs of an area, and respond positively to wider opportunities for growth. NPPF, p. 5, para. 17, sub-para 3 5. 'Government attaches great importance to the Green Belt'. If Green Belt is to be developed, then it should meet the requirements of the NPPF to include: minimum development densities, provision of good public space, secure improvement in biodiversity 6. How would the proposed developments across the green belt address the following as identified in the NPPF 'developments should be located and designed where practical to ...create safe and secure layouts which minimise conflicts between traffic and cyclists or pedestrians, avoiding street clutter and where appropriate creating home zones' 7. Planning policies and decisions should address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment NPPF, p. 15, para 61 8. The planning system can play an important role in the facilitating of social interaction and creating healthy, inclusive communities. NPPF, p. 17, para. 69 9. The NPPF encourages the retention of the 'best and most versatile agricultural land' 10. NPPF Paragraph 69 'Planning policies and decisions ... should aim to achieve places which promote ... safe and accessible developments, containing clear and legible pedestrian routes, and high quality public space, which encourage the active and continual use of public areas' 11. The NPPF requires sustainable development and net gain for biodiversity <p>The current proposals to revoke areas of Green belt across the Wirral will have significant environmental impacts and will also put even more pressure on local services which currently are not coping with the demands from the existing population. It will also destroy the very essence of the Wirral which is seen as a destination of choice for visitors locally and elsewhere.</p> <p>At a local level, I object to the proposals for parcel SP013 which comprises isolated site Column Road Fields and Woodland at Caldby Hill. In the case of woodland at Caldby Hill this is public space. All of the above NPPF citations from 1-11(and more) detailed in the introduction to this letter are applicable to my objections for this parcel of land reference SP013.</p> <p>My objections to the change of status for Column Road Fields and woodland at Caldby Hill are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> i. Identified as Agricultural Importance in the Wirral's UDP, Identified as area of Landscape Value in the UDP ii. One of the major 'natural' open entrances into Caldby and West Kirby iii. The area borders the conservation area of Caldby reversing the character of this area iv. The Fields in conjunction with the Woods provide a quiet and tranquil area this should be retained in accordance with NPPF v. The Fields and the external tree lined borders to Column Road are important wildlife corridors from Stapledon and Caldby Hill Woods and Caldby Wildlife Collection. vi. Building on this site would mean ingress and egress either onto the busy A540 Column Road or the very busy and narrow Caldby Road B5141. This could have significant implications for road traffic. vii. Currently the capacity of Caldby and West Kirby's amenities are insufficient to meet current demand. Long waiting times to see Doctors, only two local practices, long waiting times A&E Arrowe Park, Long waiting times Arrowe Park Walk in Centre viii. How would this site address social inclusion given its isolated nature? ix. This is an isolated site there is currently no bus route serving this area of Caldby or West Kirby. Inherently there would be reliance on vehicles for residents elderly lady in her 80's currently has to walk into town as no public transport! x. Column A540 and Caldby Road B5141 are very busy and dangerous roads to cross with intermittent and non-existent pavements, ill-defined/ dangerous/non-existent cycle paths xi. How would appropriate densities be met directly on the site given the land values xii. Considerable environmental implications associated with the development of the site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Loss of biodiversity • Loss of important high quality agricultural land • Increased water run off

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Air pollution from additional cars • Light pollution • Implications for important Local Wildlife Sites and legally protected species <p>xiii. This development in conjunction with other Green belt changes would inherently create 'Ribbon Development' and encroachment between Irby, Thurstaston, Caldby and West Kirby XIV. Caldby Hill woodland Site identified as Biological Importance in the Council's UDP and is a Local Wildlife Site. Strategically important sites for the Wirral providing locally important and unique habitat areas</p> <p>xiv. Caldby Hill woodland Site identified as Biological Importance in the Council's UDP and is Local Wildlife Site. Strategically important sites for the Wirral providing locally important and unique habitat areas.</p> <p>xv. Caldby Hill woodland area identified as of Landscape Importance and provides unique landscape and aesthetic value critically important to West Kirby, Newton, Caldby and the Wirral as a whole</p> <p>xvi. Stapledon and Caldby Hill have designated Geodiversity status Development would have implications for these protected sites</p> <p>xvii. Caldby Woods and Stapledon Woods are intertwined Wildlife Corridors providing unique habitats for protected Red list species and species protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act</p> <p>xviii. Caldby Hill Woods and Stapledon Woods provide important recreational areas for the whole of the Wirral and is frequented by walkers, families, dog walkers and horse riders and are frequently used</p> <p>xix. The area has clearly identified public access .i.e. footpaths and bridleways</p> <p>xx. Removal of woodland flora and fauna loss of biodiversity, and impact on air emissions and water run off</p> <p>In particular for the whole of the site ref: SP013 I would be interested to understand what 'special circumstances' would justify the Green belt status of the site to be revoked?</p>
DOR01062	<p>I am writing to you in regards to the proposed development of Lever Causeway.</p> <p>As a local resident of Bebington I see the development of such as area as a sad loss to the local community. While I understand the need for more affordable /extra housing in the local area, I do not see this area satisfying the requirement. Especially, when there are already numerous empty properties in the local area either unsold or not on the market. Incentivising the owners of such properties to free the vacant accommodations will aid in moving the entire housing market on Wirral and freeing affordable housing for first time buyers.</p> <p>If the development of this area is to proceed, has there been any consideration towards the extra schools required and especially to the traffic system as the local roads are in a poor condition with the current volume of traffic.</p>
DOR01063	<p>The documents published for consultation recognise that exceptional circumstances exist for Green Belt release and the fact the Council have started to identify some potential sites for Green Belt release is a very much welcomed step forward. However, we do have some concerns that will need to be addressed going forward. Critically, there is no complete evidence or SA which has been released as part of this consultation process that explains why certain land parcels have been chosen. The exceptional circumstances for Green Belt review and release within Wirral are two-fold. Firstly, there is a need for Green Belt review owing to the significant step-change in Green Belt policy within the NPPF relating to villages since the current Green Belt boundary was adopted over 18 years ago and since work on the Core Strategy commenced, when PPG2 provided the relevant Green Belt policy guidance. PPG2 prescribed three potential options for how villages should be treated in Green Belt Areas; inset/excluded, entirely washed over, or washed over but with a settlement boundary. In contrast, NPPF (2018) and its predecessor NPPF (2012), does not endorse this approach and is more binary. It talks solely about villages being 'included' or 'excluded' from the Green Belt dependent on whether or not the village has an 'open character' which makes an 'important contribution' to the openness of the Green Belt. The second exceptional circumstance relates to the lack of brownfield land in the Borough and a persistent under-delivery of new homes combined with significant new housing needs. Whilst Wirral's housing need position is somewhat a movable feast, not helped by the fact that the Local Plan consultation documents do not seek to identify a housing requirement, it is imperative that the Council note that the recently published 2016 Household Projections and any standard methodology only determines the minimum number of homes needed. In addition, the distinct lack of a forward-looking development plan for the local area over the last 18 years and the associated limitations that brings in terms of household growth will have ultimately influenced the outcome of the standard methodology for the Borough.</p> <p>Site Specific Constraints & Opportunities. The site is relatively flat and whilst both parcels fall slightly away from east to west, this would not prevent the site from easily coming forward for residential development. The local topography means that views of the site are limited with the site being screened by the higher ground and residential properties to the north, east and south. Views of the site from the west are also limited owing to the limited viewpoints and extent of existing planting, including hedgerows, whilst what views there are, are already impacted by the existing buildings within the village. Whilst there are some views from within the village across the site, these are limited by the Lever Causeway avenue planting and already impacted by existing residential properties in the foreground. A Preliminary Ecological Appraisal has been prepared in respect of this site and a copy is provided at Appendix 4. This highlights that site is of low ecological value and is unconstrained whilst noting that for the site to come forward for development, only standard precautions would be required including checking for roosting bats in two trees, which could be retained within any layout. Overall, we consider the site performs a weak or no contribution to the Green Belt in the context of the five purposes and the release of the site for development and would not undermine the Green Belt's primary function. The site is clearly suitable and deliverable for residential development, something that is highlighted by the fact that the land is being promoted who have a strong reputation for the delivery of high quality homes. As such, the site could come forward either, as a stand-alone residential development or as part of a wider strategic Green Belt release on land around Storeton village.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01064	<p>The Council should not rely on any reduced figure justified by initial drafts of the standard methodology to inform its OAN, and should proceed with the required release of Green Belt land, including our client's site, without delay. The Council cannot demonstrate a five year supply of housing land as per national requirements. There are no policy constraints that materially weigh against the site's allocation for residential development. Its removal from the Green Belt would not materially harm the function of the Green Belt in this location. There are no site-specific constraints that would weigh against the site's allocation for residential development, including access, ecology, arboriculture, flood risk or drainage. This submission demonstrates that the site is suitable, available and achievable for housing development and there are no technical constraints that we are aware of that would prevent it from delivering housing in the first five years of the plan; thus making a significant contribution towards maintaining the required 5 year supply of housing land.</p>
DOR01065	<p>It is of paramount importance that the area of land, stretching from Mount Road, Bebington, either side of Lever Causeway, abutting Stanley Avenue leading round to Prenton Gold Course, skirting Storeton and Barnston and on to the M53 Motorway, is afforded the highest protection and not released from Wirral's exceptionally precious, and currently protected, Green Belt for future development. We, as a Committee, object vociferously for the following reasons:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wirral Council Meeting 15th October 2018 – Motion 3 “The Council requests that renewed importance should be attached to the protection afforded to agricultural land as the responses to the Local Plan are considered. Land that is currently in productive agricultural use should NOT be removed from the Green Belt in view of the need to safeguard future food supplies”. The motion was carried unanimously. • Collated, substantiated evidence, in the form of a Soil Nutrient Analysis, would indicate that SP030 and SP033 is prime agricultural land. The arable land in question has been farmed for decades, using a rotation of crops system, currently sown with Winter Wheat. This land is NOT used for grazing as your Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment (September 2018) would indicate, whereby it has been classed as pasture and horse grazing. There is a serious flaw in the Council's surveying system. • Mountwood Conservation Area Appraisal – 2004 - Donald Install Associates, Conservation Architects, Chester Coooned in ancient woodland with uninterrupted views over open countryside across Wirral to Wales. “Greenery predominates throughout the area and plays an extremely important part in defining its character” “The Woodland setting has been maintained” Marsh Hey Covert and other copses within this area are protected by a blanket Tree Preservation Order – No. 390 (Woodland) • Badger activity has been reported, by the Wirral and Cheshire Badger Group, as clearly evident in the copse behind Millstone, Stanley Avenue. Substantiated evidence from a submitted report which indicates that a registered Local Wildlife Sett lies within Mountwood Conservation Area and supports Badger activity between Prenton and Barnston. This vast field and surrounding area is quite obviously a natural foraging site for such protected species. • Wirral's Barn Owl Trust have verified that Barn Owls from Barnston forage on the land between Storeton and Mountwood on the fields and woodland adjacent to Stanley Avenue. • The utilisation of Wirral's Brownfield Sites MUST be accounted for first within any summary of figures. This, together with nearly 6,000 existing empty properties and Peel Holdings “promise” to continue development in Wallasey and Birkenhead, should supply an ample sufficiency of residential development accompanied by industry. Having examined the future plans for Wirral Waters, it would appear that their projections would totally enhance a very “run down”, area of Wirral, complementing • The Council's proposals envisage the release of Green Belt, of that part of the existing Green Belt, which lies to the north of the M53 Motorway, namely SP030, SP033 & SP035. A consideration based on flawed data and not clear, concise evidence. Thousands of houses not required. Any such development on this site would directly affect the setting of Mountwood Conservation Area and the woodland setting would be seriously compromised. The swathe of Green Belt which traverses the Wirral Peninsula is available, within minutes from suburbia, to all residents and the envy of visitors alike. Open countryside and its health-giving properties, encompasses an area known as Lever Causeway leading into the historic hamlet of Storeton. A stunning tree-lined landscape with a history steeped in the traditions of the Leverhulme family, built in 1912, would be lost in a concrete jungle forever. With a myriad of pathways, open fields, country lanes and commuting highways, this preposterous situation of losing precious Green Belt would impinge on the whole of the Wirral, creating a significant threat, with disastrous implications and demonstrable harm to suffer by us all. [3 photographs attached]
DOR01066	<p>We object to the current Local Plan proposed by Wirral Council which we believe to be very poorly conceived and detrimental to Wirral, Environmentally, Socially and Commercially. There are vast local areas of unused Brownfield sites available within Wirral for housing development which could be better promoted were the Authority more proactive and lateral thinking than currently demonstrated. The ownership of those brownfield sites could be amended by compulsory purchase and then developed by joint venture of the Authority with suitable housing trusts etc. Alternately the Authority could waive planning fees for proposals exceeding say 200 residential units on the sites to encourage development. Another possibility would be for the Authority to act as a third party and make their own Planning applications for development of suitable land owned by others and then push to have them developed. We understand the Authority is tasked by central Government with generating some 12,000 residential units which at an average density of 25 units per hectare equates to some 480 Hectares out of an estimated available 2000 Hectares including greenbelt. Clearly the figure is disproportionate and fails to take full cognizance of the layout of Wirral and the restrictions imposed by the road systems, transport links, coastline, and infrastructure and employment opportunities. We believe that none of the greenbelt should be considered until such time as every piece of available brownfield land has been properly scheduled and developed and that the Local Plan should be amended accordingly.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01067	<p>WE disagree strongly with our council's idea of using Greenbelt land for unnecessary housing developments. There is no infrastructure on Wirral to support this increase in population. Visitors come to Wirral specifically for Green Belt land to walk, enjoy and discover its history. I want my grandchildren on the Wirral to appreciate the countryside and be able to appreciate the land marked as SSI and some for massive historical importance. Wirral residents need the opportunity of fresh air and open spaces. I was born in Prenton and have been a resident in Wirral since 1952 and I believe Wirral would become one urban sprawl very quickly if this unnecessary deed of releasing Green Belt land became available. We went to the informative consultation at Pensby High school on September 8th and I was not impressed by the council's ideas or reasoning. The so-called consultation has based itself on fabricated figures. The council own many hectares of unused industrial land which they should consider before destroying any of our recreational vital oxygen producing green spaces. There is little industry on the Wirral and no prospect of a dramatic increase of industry. It would be tragic to change Wirral and its many beautiful village structures and countryside. I was not made aware of any settlement pattern agreed by the WBC in 2012 and I personally am aghast at such a manoeuvre. In view of many well qualified statisticians proving that there is no necessity of building on this scale or at all, perhaps Wirral should be reviewed as a special case by the government. If this is not done we will assume that the Council is using our Greenbelt Land for thier own financial gain. We are dubious of the so-called good intentions of our council.</p>
DOR01068	<p>The Wirral Council is urged to proceed with expediency from this point to ensure that the growth aspirations of the WGC can be supported and delivered. It is, therefore, suggested that this issue should be addressed by the Council with immediate effect.</p> <p>Muse supports the allocation of SHLAA 1827, SHLAA 1974, and SHLAA 2022/2023 for future residential development. Notwithstanding this, Muse respectfully request that the quantum of units listed as capable of being provided at each site be increased. As part of the early feasibility work into the future development of the above sites, have had draft concept masterplans prepared for each of the sites. The masterplans demonstrate that the following quantum of development is achievable at each location:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Eastham Youth Centre – analysis shows potential for circa 20 units. • Foxfield School – 63 no. 2,3 and 4 bed residential properties. • Wallasey Town Hall Annex North & South – 96.no. 1 and 2 bed apartments. <p>As brownfield, previously developed, sites it is important that their development potential is maximised. We assert that there is an additional site that can be developed to provide for new residential dwellings over the plan period. This should be identified as a proposed allocation as part of the emerging Wirral Local Plan. This highly sustainable Site on the edge of Birkenhead Town Centre is available now for redevelopment, being within the Council's ownership, and could accommodate circa 25 new family homes. (Refer to Appendix 1) Land at Exmouth Street Birkenhead. ELPS 074 - Notwithstanding broad support for this site, we wish to take the opportunity to assert that a more flexible approach to the Site's promotion should be taken. As a largescale remediated brownfield site, it represents a clear opportunity to act as a transition between the existing leisure uses to the south and the employment uses to the north and east. It should also be recognised by the Local Plan that the economic environment is currently challenging due to the uncertainty surrounding BREXIT. At present, and for the foreseeable future access to funding, particularly for speculative development, is constrained. It is increasingly the case that enabling development for complementary uses is required to unlock the potential of employment sites. For example, retail uses can provide a point of access and/or spine road that allows the rest of the site to be developed for employment uses. Furthermore, it is not sustainable to have any one land use provided in isolation. Complementary land uses should be provided adjacent to each other wherever possible to minimise the need to travel and therefore emissions. To be overly restrictive with site specific Local Plan Allocations can be to stifle development to the detriment of the local economy. Considering the above, request that the Former MOD site be allocated for employment led mixed use development, rather than purely employment uses. The Use Classes deemed to be acceptable on the Site in addition to employment, include A1, A2, A3, C1 and C3.</p> <p>The Sites which and the WGC have a vested interest in and agree should have a 'mixed-use' allocation to include some residential use are as follows:</p> <p>SHLAA ref. 1610 - Market research (undertaken by Muse on behalf of the WGC) demonstrates that development should be primarily residential and only contain a small element of commercial/retail uses so as to not dilute the existing high street's attraction. A high-level emerging concept masterplan for the site has identified that it Would be possible for a scheme of circa 27 new family homes with ancillary commercial use.</p> <p>SHLAA ref. 0424, 0956 and 0957 - There is a clear opportunity to kick start the creation of a new commercial and civic hub in Birkenhead, this shares the Council's ambition for Birkenhead and supports the identification of all of land parcels 0424, 0956 and 0957 for future mixed use development. Notwithstanding this support, assert that the land parcels need to come forward as part of a wider comprehensive masterplan process for the creation of a new Civic Hub to the south of Conway Park Station (this will be in the vicinity of the existing Cinema, Leisure Centre and Hamilton Buildings). This would sit alongside a new market hall, enhanced public realm and leisure and retail offer on land between Conway St, Hemingford St and Claughton Rd. Respectfully request that the creation of a new Civic Hub be specifically identified by the Council as a Spatial Priority for Growth within the Vision and emerging development plan policy for Birkenhead Town Centre.</p> <p>SHLAA ref. 2026, 2036 and 2069 - The plan at Appendix 2 shows the development potential provided by SHLAA sites 2026 and 2036. Support the Council's identification of the sites at Hamilton Square as opportunities for business and residential led regeneration Birkenhead Town Centre is highly accessibly by public transport with a wide catchment area. This presents enormous potential to facilitate growth in retail, leisure, commercial and other development sectors, including the visitor economy, in a sustainable manner, given the right planning policy background. The baseline position needs to be used to an advantage, providing an excellent platform from which site allocations can be made to transform the centre into a vibrant destination.</p> <p>SHLAA sites 0617, 1432, 1620, 2002, and 2014 all represent modest development opportunities in isolation in Birkenhead Town Centre. However, combined, these smaller sites can accommodate and contribute new residential development with some commercial/retail uses at ground floor (as appropriate) to deliver activity and interest at street level. Their development can be used creatively to support the regeneration of the primary retail and commercial areas of the Town Centre supports the identification of sites ref. 0617, 1432, 1620, 2002.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>SHLAA ref. 2007-2010 and 2096 - 2097 - support the Council's identification of the site as providing the opportunity to create a housing led mixed use development to create a sustainable neighbourhood.</p> <p>SHLAA ref. 0752 and 0478 - fully support the longer-term regeneration ambition to provide a commercial hub on the Waterfront with hotel and conference facilities, commercial office activity, alongside new residential development.</p> <p>The Council's Proposed Mixed-Use Allocation of the Woodside area is considered appropriate over the plan period as the area is envisaged as providing a clear opportunity for a series of buildings and public spaces which will:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide a range of business, residential, leisure, cultural and tourism uses. • Complement the regeneration and conservation of the adjoining historic areas of Birkenhead and the prestigious waterfront. • Re-connect the waterfront with the centre of Birkenhead, including Hamilton Square • Represent an attraction in its own right and creates a high quality and accessible environment for visitors, day and night and throughout the year. <p>Whilst the general principle of identifying proposed allocations is supported, we are of the view that significantly more work needs to be undertaken moving forward to:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> look in more detail at the way that the site boundaries are drawn, provide further consideration and potential broadening of the categorisation of the identified mixed-use sites; provide a more logical grouping and organisation so that the allocations as a whole are more logical and transparent; and translate the proposed allocations into a coherent development strategy for the Borough. To expand upon the above points; it would be a simple exercise to have all of the allocations arranged and numbered by settlement - Moreton, Bebington, Birkenhead, etc. To do so would enhance legibility and comprehension of the consultation document. Through taking a broad-brush approach to the allocations and only grouping them as being capable of 'commercial' or 'residential' led development the process is in danger of being over simplified which could result in issues for the Council and their development partners later down the line, such as SHLAA 2085 and SHLAA 2084 and SHLAA 0752 and SHLAA 0478 <p>Additional sites for consideration - In addition to supporting the allocation of the above sites for mixed use development, have identified further sites which are capable of delivering mixed-use development over the plan period. Those sites are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oliver Street Car Park, Birkenhead. • Sandford St, Birkenhead. • Ivy Farm, Woodchurch. • Marine Park, New Brighton. • Dee Lane Car Park, West Kirby. • Leisure Centre / Civic Centre site, West Kirby. <p>I have reservations about how the Local Plan process is being progressed. In particular, we would promote that a full draft Local Plan (including Broad Spatial Options or Spatial Strategy) be published and that number of the background documentation which has supported the Allocation Review Documents be made available for the public to see. Whilst we generally support and have no objection to the sites that have been put forward for allocation, we believe that the nature of the allocations could do more. Moving forward, we would request that there be more detail on the development capacity and land uses of the proposed sites. Also, for a number of the Proposed Housing, Employment and Mixed-Use Sites it would be beneficial for the Council to take full account of the wider masterplan approach which is being progressed to ensure that the Local Plan is robust and representative of the work that is being carried out by development partners across the Borough. Muse's comments and requests in relation to specific sites/allocations are set out clearly in Sections 3-5 of this report.</p> <p>[Appendices 4, 5 & 6 attached with site boundaries proposed]</p>
DOR01069	<p>I'm writing in response to the proposed development on the green belt land on the Wirral - most specifically at Barnston Dale and bordering Heswall Primary School.</p> <p>[OBJECTIONS RAISED ARE THE SAME AS DOR00868]</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01070	<p>Greasby is a predominantly residential area, the housing shortage is evident, and therefore Land off Saughall Massie Road is a suitable place for new housing development. The site is in Green Belt land and Open Countryside on the edge of an identified settlement (Greasby). Wirral Council are currently consulting on Green Belt release options, part of this site along with other land surrounding has been considered as a wider site for Green Belt release site (ref: SP001- North of Greasby). Greasby is a sustainable location for new housing, a large village containing the relevant facilities and services for sustainable residential growth.</p> <p>Figure 1. Potential Wirral Green Belt release site (ref: SP001).</p> <p>CONCLUSION</p> <p>The land off Saughall Massie Road represents a suitable site for residential development. Although development would conflict with the saved policies of the Wirral UDP, its questionable weight means that the site requires more detailed consideration. The site is considered a preferable Green Belt development site given the position of the site currently under consultation for the release from Green Belt. The site shall also provide a natural extension to the north of the village. The sites form part of a wider area being considered for Green Belt release. Our client's land could be developed either independently or as part of a wider, more comprehensive scheme. In any event, we would stress that, if the wider parcels are to be considered for release, our client's land is likely to be critical to delivery as access through to Saughall Massie Road and / or Pump Lane is required. There are environmental issues that require further exploration, including impact on biodiversity and the River Birkett corridor and flood risk, but this should not preclude any development on these sites. Regarding flood risk, given the significant shortfall in housing land and the current lack of a 5-year housing land supply, sites that have a higher flood risk need to be considered considering guidance in paragraphs 155-165 of the NPPF. Further flood risk</p> <p>[Flood risk of Greasby Brook –Map attached]</p> <p>There are environmental issues that require further exploration, including impact on biodiversity and the River Birkett corridor and flood risk, but this should not preclude any development on these sites. Regarding flood risk, given the significant shortfall in housing land and the current lack of a 5-year housing land supply, sites that have a higher flood risk need to be considered considering guidance in paragraphs 155-165 of the NPPF. Further flood risk work can be commissioned to establish the true picture of flood risk on the site and a mitigation strategy if required. Saughall Massie and Bidston Village are both designated Conservation Areas. Development is achievable in these areas so long as the scale and design of the development is in-keeping with the surrounding area and is sensitively developed. As well as a Conservation Area Saughall Massie is additionally a potential Green Belt release site. Conversion of existing buildings (both at Diamond Farm and Yew Tree Farm) can provide housing in these villages. Several sites are in Green Belt; however, Wirral is currently consulting on Green Belt release options. Some sites included are not in the recommended public consultation list, however are suitable for residential development and can be viewed preferable than some chosen for public consultation. Greasby road – consider suitability of site for new small-scale development as the area is already predominantly residential. The land can potentially be of mixed use, including car parking for the adjoining church. Strong argument for allocating land at Frankby Road as a possible Green Belt release site. Beyond edge of boundary, land could be considered infill development. As such site development would not conflict with the 5 purposes of green Belt in NPPF. Further investigation should not preclude any site development. Further flood risk work can be carried out and a mitigation strategy put in place, if required. The land can support small-scale infill housing development supporting GB6 and small-scale rural housing can support HSG2 for the potential of affordable Housing.</p>
DOR01071	<p>I am writing to object to your intentions to build on the green belt of Wirral.</p> <p>This area is unique with its area of undeveloped land running through the heart of it. From looking at the plans it looks like urban sprawl.</p> <p>Where are all the people that supposedly need these house on the Wirral, where are the jobs to support them if there are these people, what about the extra schools shops hospitals etc. The council have been told for many years that they should form a proper plan and are now panicking with the idea that you may lose control to central government you don't act now. These plans should have been made public and discussed with the people they may affect years ago, not a rushed cobbled together plan. The people of Wirral will not benefit from such urban sprawl, the only people who will are the developers and there fixers.</p>
DOR01072	<p>I am wholly opposed to the council plans to allow the building on greenbelt land on the Wirral peninsula. The greenbelt is a treasured resource and is something I feel should be protected on the Wirral generally and specifically within the area of Irby, Pensby, Thurstaston, Greasby and Thingwall.</p> <p>The National Planning Policy Framework 2018 defines the purpose of the greenbelt is</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. <p>I believe the current proposals would contravene point's a-d in the area of Irby if granted.</p> <p>a, b &c. The villages mentioned are all currently very well defined and separated by buffers of green belt and agricultural land. Building on these areas of land would result in a large homogenised area of multiple former villages which would lose their character and would encroach on surrounding countryside.</p> <p>d. I have personally seen Viking artefacts relating to the Village of Irby in Liverpool Museum and as I am sure you are aware Thingwall has a unique sign proclaiming its heritage as a Norse assembly field and Greasby has a sign proclaiming it is one of the earliest settlements in Great Britain (8500bc).</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Whenever I travel through the more urban areas of the borough I always notice that there are numerous derelict houses, which are "tinned up", also present are brownfield sites suitable for development. This shows a failure of the authority to manage and interact with registered social landlords, an unwillingness to develop brownfield sites which are more suited to residential developments than green belt sites ever could be. These factors lead me to believe that there is no exceptional circumstances present which would allow reclassification of greenbelt land in Wirral. I also wish to make comment with regard to a specific area of development under the proposals, SP060 - South of Thingwall Road, Irby. This area is a piece of land in Irby that acts as the main buffer between Irby and Pensby. I would like to highlight the comments made by Inspector D Bailey from the Department of The Environment who rejected an appeal for development of an area on the opposite side of Irby Road in 1979, and I would suggest that they are still as applicable today and to area SP060, and reinforced by the above section of the NPPF. "It seems to me that the narrow gap of undeveloped land of which the appeal site is part is important as a buffer between existing developments, and I agree with the local planning authority that this is a sensitive and vulnerable area. South of the undeveloped frontage of Townshend Avenue the land falls gently southwards, and the appeal site is in my opinion prominent to view. Any buildings on the site would in my opinion be visually obtrusive, an undesirable extension of development into open countryside". (Department of Environment ref T/APP/5094/A07088/08) Lastly I would just like to highlight an aspect of Wirral that whilst obvious is often one overlooked: We live on a peninsula, an area which is surrounded by water on three sides. This geography shapes who we are and our mindset, as such I feel we have a culture and history that is distinct from other local boroughs this culture is one of our assets and is something that is enhanced by the greenbelt presence. Our geography also means that land is at a premium, once our green belt has been built upon, we can never get it back.</p>
DOR01073	<p>I am placing my objection to stop the projected planning permission to build a vast number of new houses on the Wirral Greenbelt. The proposed plans of Building in front (Levers Causeway) and in the rear of Stanley Avenue, Higher Bebington, contravene the NPPF and will lead to unrestricted sprawl of large built up area and merging towns, Storeton Village, Higher Bebington and Prenton. The Government website quotes the preservation of Greenbelt; No merging of communities/towns/villages separated by Greenbelt. The Wirral Greenbelt, Lever Causeway surrounding land front and back of Stanley Avenue, Higher Bebington, are a peaceful haven that holds an important role in providing zone designation to retain areas of largely undeveloped, wild, or agricultural land surrounding our neighbouring urban areas. A border preventing urban sprawl and development of an area, keeping land permanently open, allowing wildlife habitats to remain and the Greenbelt acting as Air Pollution control. Wirral residents are angry with the bullish tactics of local government and the Government's. Wirral residents feel that the Council will not listen to our objections and our voices will not be heard as the Elected Wirral Council are pushing this project through come what may and against residents wishes. I believe sites have been identified in existing Brownfield urban areas to build on, to redevelop, re-occupation/refurbishment of existing houses, Urban regeneration and Eco regeneration of Brownfield sites. Build on Brownfield sites, save the Wirral Greenbelt. Protect our backyard. The actions of Wirral Councillors, if they accept this proposal, will result in the loss of our Greenbelt within the Wirral peninsula forever. The local Government and the Government should be listening to the local residents/voters who have signed petitions, voiced our objections the existing proposed plan. We all want to preserve our Wirral greenbelt for future generations, permanently. The Wirral is steeped in history with historic towns. Anglo Saxon battles sites taken place on the fields around Levers causeway plus a Victorian Quarry near Lever Causeway that supplied local sandstone to build most of the historic buildings on the Wirral. The Wirral was also The Royal Forest, for the monarchy. We have protected wildlife on these green belts. Once the Wirral's Greenbelt is targeted it is LOST FOREVER. To date, the Wirral was voted the Third best place to live in the North West and Bebington was voted one of the best places to live in the UK. Let's keep these merits by not destroying our Greenbelt. The Wirral is virtually an island surrounded by water on three sides, and the Canal, that is why The Wirral Greenbelt is so important and why it should be protected permanently for the future. Levers Causeway and the surrounding fields are the lungs of this section of the Wirral. If this land is released it would also cause destruction of the area around Stanley Avenue, Higher Bebington, noise, air and traffic pollution, destruction of roads, natural habitat, increased traffic, congestion, acres of prime agricultural land lost forever. The result would cause a damaging effect on Mountwood Conservation Area, Wildlife and existing residents. It is only the private developer that gains if the Wirral Greenbelt is built upon. The Wirral is recognised Worldwide for its natural habitat, beauty and quality of life due to the area not being over developed and it's Greenbelt Higher Bebington, Stanley Avenue, has always been a Cul de Sac, it is a quiet haven; Storeton Village and Higher Bebington are separated by Greenbelt, the natural beauty can be seen in pictures below, showing the back of Stanley Avenue and down to Storeton Village and beyond. This greenbelt are the lungs of the Wirral counter balancing the traffic from the M53 etc., the Greenbelt holds protected species of Wildlife. This present plan will ruin the Wirral Peninsular.</p> <p>For us at Stanley Avenue this proposed building plan will forever ruin the front and rear of Stanley Avenue, Higher Bebington and Mountwood Conservation Area. In Higher Bebington and Prenton, there are housingstock up for sale. At the back of Stanley Avenue the field has always been Greenbelt as the pictures below shows the uninterrupted views down Lever Causeway to Storeton and beyond that have been there since way before World War 1. Stanley Avenue has been a Cul de Sac for more than 50 years. Stanley Avenue area has been a natural local habitat for Natterjack Toads and other Wildlife. The planned building sites on either side of Lever Causeway are huge. If this land is released this would cause historic Storeton and Bebington to merge which goes again Government policy to safeguard the countryside from encroachment, destruction, noise, air and traffic pollution, increased traffic, congestion. Acres of prime agricultural land lost forever. The damaging effect this would have on Mountwood Conservation Area, wildlife and existing residents. It would destroy our neighbourhood. Instead of planning on Greenbelt the council should have been planning Wirral Urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict urban land. Think Eco. Refurbishment of existing empty housing stock and buildings. Look at improving activities and interests even more on the Wirral by making Storeton and Lever Causeway into an Anglo Saxon tourist site utilise the only existing Anglo Saxon Buildings in Storeton Village, the dig site and where the Anglo Saxon battles took place. Seasonal Medieval Falconry displays, activities. Apply for National Lottery Funding. Organise planned cycle rides around historic Wirral. Show off our Viking history, the Wirral Greenbelt Royal heritage. Save the Greenbelt from destruction, it is our backyard, our heritage, protect permanently now and future generations. Build on Brownfield sites. The local government and the Conservatives Party, could become the destroyers of our countryside and result in the over development of the Wirral, which is unforgivable.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	A signed Petition has been completed by Wirral resident to say no to building on Green Belt land and disproportionate amount of houses to be developed on Lever Causeway fields. Protect Lever Causeway and the surrounding Greenbelt [See 3 Photographs provided]
DOR01074	<p>I object to the release of greenbelt land near the Lever Causeway and Storeton Woods and in addition to the release of further greenfield sites on the Wirral. It will destroy the natural feel of Wirral as a green and pleasant retreat from what is becoming the ubiquitous Urban Sprawl.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Population Growth on the Wirral has remained largely stagnant since 1996. 2. There are approximately 5,000 empty properties on the Wirral. 3. The Wirral Waters project will also bring an additional 13,500 new properties in a 40 year period. This alone satisfies your proposals based on the above projections, it suggests that we will have an excess of properties and housing on the Wirral. 4. There are also brownfield, mixed use sites and urban areas in which we should build on. 5. Building on the greenbelt will fundamentally change and destroy the character of the area. The Greenbelt is our children's heritage and deserves to be fought for both as a natural lung and as a thing of beauty and relaxation The Lever Causeway, Storeton Woods and the open, surrounding areas give local residents a lovely area to relax and exercise 6. Natural views will be destroyed, especially on Mount Road. 7. Should further houses be built, this will also bring increased traffic and congestion. 8. Increasing the urban sprawl on either side of the Lever Causeway will destroy the aesthetic nature of the environment. 9. Prime Agricultural land will be lost. 10. I live in the Mountwood conservation area, these proposed developments will destroy its setting. <p>I wish to register my disapproval of the proposed application to build on green bely North of Lever Causeway. Wirral has brown field sites, proposed developments on dockland and existing empty housing. Wirral currently has the benefit of much enjoyed green spaces between towns and villages. What has been proposed is of little benefit to the community and the beginning of the slide towards an extended conurbation. Please resist the ugly sprawl and concentrate on the spaces we have.</p>
DOR01075	<p>Green Belt site reference SP039 (South of Peter Prices Lane, Bebington) has been under scrutiny as a potential area for development. Firstly, the official description is incorrect- the actual area described is also South of Stanton Road, which is not mentioned in the description, yet is outlined on the published plans. The area in question- Poulton Recreation Ground, is close to my house and is a popular space for recreation activities. Throughout the year this public green space is used by all ages for walking, running, exercise, training, fishing etc. and would be a substantial loss to the wider community were it to be redeveloped for housing. If we remove the green spaces from within communities, people will have to travel further away from their homes to seek the required recreation space, and this will have a detrimental effect on an already overloaded road infrastructure, not to mention the excess carbon emissions.</p> <p>Another aspect of this that is particularly frustrating is the amount of abandoned and derelict land that should be assessed for suitability for redevelopment before even a square-metre of Green Belt is touched. Owners of land that has been left abandoned for decades should be made to account for the neglect and the onus should be on them to put something back into the local community instead of leaving buildings to decay and become uninhabitable whilst they watch the land value increase.</p>
DOR01076	<p>Irby Hall and its surrounding moated site are a scheduled monument. The surrounding moated site is therefore legally subject to protection, according to English Heritage. Likewise, there is public right of way along the northern side of this site; it would be extremely unfortunate to reduce this right of way to a narrow path, when it currently provides significant enjoyment for village residents, due to the glorious views over to the Welsh hills. Something that is paramount to our village, and as such should not be developed upon. An abundance of wildlife in the fields to the rear of Irby Hall (SP059E) and the surrounding areas. This includes tawny owls and bats. Since I moved to this area, I have seen a number of great crested newts (a legally protected species) on this land For ecological reasons I implore you to protect this area of land and the land through which Greasby Brook runs. In addition there is also an ancient well to the south west of site SP059E (further information is held by Liverpool museums) / next to 26, Dawlish Road. This is also surely subject to protection?</p> <p>I do not accept that it should be necessary to build on any Wirral green belt, but in a situation when this is deemed unavoidable, areas across the Wirral should expect to lose their green belt land in a fair and proportional manner. There should not be areas that suffer more than others, while others remain unaffected. With reference to the areas of green belt land specified in my first paragraph, if the proposed sites in Irby were all developed, this would be disproportionate and inequitable as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a. Wirral's last published population is 321,238. Irby's population is 6110. Irby therefore represents 1.9% of the total population of Wirral b. Working at 30dph, the total number of dwellings that could be built on SP019B, SP059B, SP059C, SP059D, SP059E and SP060 is 1501. c. The council has stated in written correspondence that there will be a requirement for 4794 homes on green belt land as part of the local plan. This figure subsequently changed during verbal submissions at a planning meeting at Pensby High School to 7390, which was claimed to represent a 20% uplift for under-delivery's). In fact, the figure of 7390 is incorrect and would represent an uplift of over 50% from the original figure of 4794. This is a basic error, with far reaching consequences and must be immediately corrected. d. Working on the above figures, if all proposed sites in Irby were developed, it is possible to calculate the proportion of total green belt land concession provided by the community of Irby. This would be between 31.3% (1501/4794) and 20.3% (1501/7390). e. It is unreasonable, inequitable and simply unfair to expect a small rural community, which comprises less than 2% of Wirral's population to provide up to 31.3% of green belt development for

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>the entire borough.</p> <p>f. If proportionality and equality were employed, then working from the initial figure of 4794 dwellings, Irby should provide 91 homes, rather than 1501. 1501 is too high by a factor of 16.5. The above facts then give rise to concerns about the potential rising population of Irby. If 1501 homes were built, then (working with the national Mean Residents per Household of 2.3), Irby would experience a population increase of 3,452. This would be an increase of 61%. This is absolutely huge and impossible for the area to cope with! There are insufficient local amenities and services to provide for a population increase of this size. There are not enough schools, doctors or dental surgeries.</p> <p>Traffic in Irby is already high at peak times. Mainly around the junction of Thurstaston Road/Irby Road and Thingwall Road.</p> <p>The Core Strategy Settlement Areas that have been previously agreed are nebulous and folly. If Wirral residents were issued with sufficient information to form an appropriately informed opinion, they would never have been passed. They are now being used as an excuse to legitimately link separate rural communities into large urban conurbations. Irby is a rural village and it should remain that way, not be merged with Thingwall and Pensby to become an urban sprawl.</p> <p>An urgent review of Wirral's housing needs should be undertaken and the availability of brown field sites be re-evaluated, with particular reference to that owned by Peel Holdings. Re-negotiation with central government regarding time frames for housing delivery is needed, in light of the higher number of homes that Peel say they are able to deliver within a longer time scale. Were the council to proceed with current plans without undertaking the above, this would represent neglect of their responsibility to represent the best interests of Wirral residents.</p>
DOR01077	<p>Objection to the development for Fields at Heswall adjacent to Riverbank Road, Seabank Road, Manners Lane and Wittering Lane.</p> <p>Housing Requirement - I understand that ONS has produced figures indicating that the annual need for houses in Wirral should be 500 and not 800 required by the government. These numbers all appear to be too high.</p> <p>Green Belt - All the designated fields given above are in green belt and recent planning applications within the area have been refused or restricted on this basis. Allowing any significant development in the green belt would generate pressure to allow further building and could result in the borough losing significant portions of its green coastal area.</p> <p>The Wirral Way and National Cycle Network - The only full road access to the proposed sites adjacent to Seabank Road, Riverbank Road, Manners Lane and Park West is via Davenport Road. The whole length of Davenport Road and the top section of Riverbank Road are used to reach and connect 2 sections of The Wirral Way and are thus part of Regional Route 89 of the National Cycle Network. This means that walkers, joggers, children and cyclists are frequent users and therefore additional road traffic will put those members of the public at increased risk.</p> <p>Vehicular Access Problems - Alleviation of the following problems will involve very considerable cost and some are almost incurable. Station Road is already the only full road access for Davenport Road, Park West, Riverbank Road, Riverbank Close, Seaford Avenue, Hilbre Avenue, Closeburn Avenue and Marine Drive. New development at any of these will generate traffic which will use Station Road. The junction at the latter's north-east end is difficult because it has two corners with poor visibility caused by walls. If much more traffic is to use this route then the junction will need improving to prevent more accidents and excessive queues.</p> <p>Traffic that turns right from Station Road for Birkenhead, Chester, M53, etc. will join the A540 at the top of Well Lane adjacent to a roundabout. The only full road access to the proposed sites adjacent to Seabank Road, Riverbank Road, Manners Lane and Park West is via Davenport Road. This is already a regular bottleneck and to accommodate additional traffic will require re-modelling of the roundabout to include direct access from Well Lane. Since government closed so many Post Offices, that facility has gone from Lower Heswall village and subsequently the green grocer, the chemist and the butcher have all closed. Hence any new residents in developments below Lower Heswall village will be very likely to drive to most shops and increase the congestion in the main Heswall village, which is on the A540 route from Hoylake, West Kirby, etc. and hence already subjected to high traffic volumes, to which there is apparently no easy solution.</p> <p>Rail Service - An increase in the number of commuters to Birkenhead and Liverpool will cause more pollution and congestion. This could be alleviated by improving the rail service from Heswall station by electrification of the line from there to Bidston, where presently passengers have to change. There currently appear to be no plans for this.</p>
DOR01078	<p>Bellway Homes are committed to delivering 122 dwellings on land at Arrow Brook Road, Greasby, within the next 3 years, which will help to meet the borough's future housing needs. The site is a suitable location for residential development. It is a sustainable site, with very limited environmental constraints, and the site benefits from excellent access to Greasby centre, a nearby retail park and shopping parade, local schools and other employment opportunities including Arrow Park Hospital, large supermarkets and is within easy reach of Birkenhead and Liverpool City Centre. Its development would utilise brownfield land and as demonstrated within the proposed masterplan, would offer opportunities to enhance the local green infrastructure and footpath networks. The site is also unconstrained in terms of the natural, historic and physical environment and is therefore evidently available, suitable and deliverable. Overall, we agree that the Council will need to release Green Belt sites to meet the overall housing needs within the Borough over the plan period. However, paragraph 137 of the NPPF confirms that local authorities will need to robustly demonstrate that they have made as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land. The NPPF confirms such evidence will be examined thoroughly. To date, the Council have not provided a specific assessment of the site in their employment land assessment. Moreover, we have confirmed that the warehouse is now vacant and has been underutilised for a prolonged period. It is not a specifically protected employment site in the UDP and suffers from a range of physical and planning constraints that render it an unattractive B8 employment site in the modern day market for such units. With this in mind, the Council should identify the site as a proposed housing allocation in the emerging Local Plan.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01079	<p>ANY development in the Wirral Green Belt will result in the material loss of a finite resource a constriction of that vital “green corridor” and an erosion of the key purposes of the Green Belt</p> <p>Another issue I would like to address is the selection and grouping of numerous land-parcels in Area 4, which run from Prenton through Bebington, Storeton, Spital and on to Bromborough and Eastham. The relevant methodology as outlined in the planning presentations stressed the need to prioritise land release in areas already tightly enclosed by existing development, whilst also preserving the distinctive divisions between neighbouring towns and villages. That specific consideration has, it seems, informed, at least in part, some of the selection of land parcels in other planning areas in the Wirral, however it is certainly not evident in those parcel selections made in the South East of the peninsular (Area 4). The land parcels here are not highly enclosed and, as they run along the existing boundary of the Green belt and up to the M53 Motorway (from Prenton to Eastham) they effectively constitute an "urban belt " which, if developed, even in part, would merge the (still distinctive) townships of S.E Wirral into a single large conurbation. This of course would be utterly at odds with the stated key concepts of the Green Belt, namely, preventing urban sprawl and the loss of distinctive town/village identities.</p> <p>Further to the above point, on retaining the setting and character of historic settlements. Within this area, the village of Little Storeton (spo 34/35) stands on a gentle rise in the land, clearly visible from Storeton Ridge and other points. An isolated hamlet with ancient roots, a small group of medieval and later buildings which is an echo of farmstead settlement from earlier times. This small example of the way the past can reveal itself in our open landscape, historic Wirral would of course, be lost forever if the surrounding farmland is released for development .</p> <p>There are many other points with regard to huge increases in traffic impact on infrastructure etc. concerned residents will take this opportunity to rise.</p>
DOR01080	<p>(WMBC) is based on incorrect data. Latest analysis has shown that WMBC needs to revise its figures.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • A much reduced Objectively Assessed Housing Need of 436 houses per annum (ONS) as opposed to 803 • Brownfield sites available for housing, WMBC totally wrong. Refer, for example, to letter to [the Council Leader], 10.09.18 from [the Director of Peel Holdings], and the latter citing numbers of houses which could be constructed – Waters One project 500 units plus other projects. Ensure this information is made available to those responsible for decision making. • Brownfield Register has to be reviewed and adjusted. • Unoccupied residences numbers need to be included as a factor. • Availability of affordable houses within borough a further consideration • Population figures less than predicted • Objection based on need to keep land open permanently, preventing urban sprawl and encroachment on countryside • Ancient Woodland, Priority Habitat Inventory – Deciduous Woodland (England) – protection of • Updated information re. soils quality needs urgent consideration, as does review of farming practices – use of ‘the good old days’ methods being adopted to bring about enhancement of soil. Previous assessments out of date. • Protection of heritage setting <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • eg Storeton = Stortone – Domesday entry, 1086 (E31/2/2/3010) = ‘great farmstead’ • Historical context – Storeton stone walling, Storeton stone buildings = farm houses, barns, gamekeepers’ cottages, Storeton Hall Farm – abbey wall, Storeton cross. • Also, ‘Battlefields’, ‘Soldiers’ Hill’, Far Storeton Field, Near Storeton Field, Rake Hay = ‘enclosure by the lane’ = wooded area. Place names which take you to areas that hold the mysteries of what has gone before. • Habitats under threat – flora and fauna – flag iris, primrose, celedine, penny wort, ferns, grasses, harvest mice, water voles, bats, birds, thousands of small white butterflies and so much more. • Exposed sandstone features, mini-climatic features = Marsh Lane and surrounding area
DOR01081	<p>SP96 through to 110 - Specifically – SP99, 100 and 101, Lower Heswall</p> <p>Evidence presented by WBC fails to demonstrate that the consequence of developing on the Green Belt Land has NOT been taken into consideration. Documentation necessary to justify the re-categorisation of Green Belt Land (SHLAA and Broad Based Spatial Option Revised Assessment Report) has not been released into to public domain allowing myself, and residents, to understand the change in land use. The land on the west of the Wirral Way has significant ecological and social value. The wildlife species that exist within this parcel of land is unique, with the area designated both as a SSSI and RAMSAR site. Implementing any development as an Infill Village will have significant, detrimental, impact on this. One of the major cornerstones of land designation is to have clear separation of settlement areas. Heswall urban area is designated as Settlement area 7 whereas the area to West of the Wirral Way is designated as Settlement area 8. If development took place within the locality of Lower Heswall, within Settlement area 8, it would completely destroy any separation and the land would simply become part of the Heswall Urban area; hardly and infill village. It is quite clear, such development would have a devastating impact on the character, appearance, spatial and visual views of the area in addition to the impact on wildlife, the environment, International, European and National constraints. Evidence presented fails to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Justify housing shortfall, demand. Figures stated for housing shortfall overstates the housing requirements and understates the planned availability, particularly in the first 5 years • Council has omitted to issue key documentation, in-particular the SHLAA and Broad Based Spatial Option Revised Assessment Report • Changes to housing figures have become available which changes the stated council proposal.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>It is also evident that no consideration, by the council, has been given to the implications on the local infrastructure. The current roads, power, sanitation, water, lighting, communication systems are incapable of supporting any future growth. By implication Station Road, Riverbank Road, Davenport Road, Park West, Wittering Lane etc are all minor roads that support the existing community, just, and the demands of the Wirral Way and Wirral Country Park. Any increase in traffic use, through construction and inhabitation etc, will not only have a long lasting effect on services but, most importantly, will have a significant impact on Safety; to residents and the thousands of people who access the Green Belt and nature reserves 52 weeks of the year.</p>
DOR01082	<p>Land north of Leasowe Road - SHLAA Ref 0637.</p> <p>The Council must therefore identify additional deliverable sites to address the shortfall. This is irrespective of the council's Green Belt constraints and the failure of the Wirral Waters scheme to come forward as initially envisaged.</p> <p>SHLAA Site 0637 - land north of Leasowe Road. Assessment of the site within the Initial Green Belt Review Background Report (September 2018) indicates that if developed, this site would not reduce the existing separation between adjacent urban settlements.</p> <p>Drainage - SHLAA site 0637 is within a flood zone that benefits from flood defences. Please see extract appended from the Environment Agency website. This extract shows that this designation covers a wider area of the northern part of the Wirral. This has not prevented development from being granted permission and is not a constraint going forward. We are not aware of an up to date FRA in accordance with the NPPF and PPG. The Wirral Preliminary FRA 2011 stated that there were no flood risk areas ([4.5.1 & 6.0.1] [Extract from EA]. Our view is that the site should not have been discounted without further investigation from the Council on matters of flood risk, and whether some form of development in this location could contribute to housing or employment needs.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Quality - Preclusion of the site from further investigation due to being an area of high quality agricultural land is also considered to warrant further review. SHLAA site 0637 does include an area identified as high quality agricultural land, however when reviewed in context, the parcel of land is small and makes a very limited contribution to the supply of high quality agricultural land. The site sits in relative isolation in agricultural terms. Our view is that the site is not viable for agricultural purposes and its loss would not prejudice national, regional or local agricultural objectives. Further investigation by the council is requested in relation to our client's site and its removal from the Green Belt should be re-considered.</p> <p>SHLAA site 0637 is considered available, achievable, developable and suitable to make a further contribution to the housing need (and/or employment) on the Wirral. The site is well served by public transport and is accessible to a wide range of services and facilities within easy walking and cycling distances. It is considered a sustainable location in accordance with the objectives of the Framework. On this basis, we would fully support the council's re-assessment of the site and its proposed removal from the Green Belt.</p> <p>[Legal Plan Attached]</p>
DOR01083	<p>This is a representation relating to the parcel of Land North of Greasby (SP001). We provide more details in relation to the suitability and deliverability of the site in the supporting Development Statement at Appendix 1 of the representations. We have included the notes on ecology and heritage issues within our submission. We very much welcome the Council's consultation and apparent recognition that exceptional circumstances exist for Green Belt release as part of the emerging Local Plan process. We also strongly support the identification of land north of Greasby for Green Belt release and demonstrate within the representations why it is a sustainable, available, achievable and viable site. However, we provide some comments in relation to the Council's Green Belt Assessment and advocate the need to plan for more homes than the Government's Standard Methodology current advocates (noting that this approach is likely to alter in the near future), and when accounting for the significant shortfall in housing delivery that has accrued within Wirral since 2003 and prior. Additional details are required in order to come to any meaningful conclusions on the Council's preferred sites. The Council define the parcel as 'Poorly Enclosed'. We highlight a number of other critical considerations below and why the Council's assessment is too simplistic. The case of Parcel SP001, the site is just 1% shy of getting 'Partially Enclosed' rating. We note the Council have provided some analysis on this and suggested some boundary changes but the assessment fails to include the Fire Station site located within Parcel SP001, which is under construction of Saughall Massie Road to the north of Greasby. At the very least the Council's assessment should be corrected in line with the above analysis but there are other highly relevant reasons as to why we consider Parcel SP001 provides a weak contribution to Purpose 1. This would suggest that with regard to Purpose 1 alone, parcels East of the M53 should arguably be considered to make more of a contribution to this purpose. Saughall Massie Road and Pump Lane would provide much stronger and durable urban edges, which can be bolstered with landscaping to create a more sensitive boundary with the open countryside beyond. We conclude that Parcel SP001 makes a weak contribution to Purpose 1.</p> <p>Overall, we agree with the Council's conclusion that Parcel SP001 does not contribute to this purpose. Greasby is already linked to Upton and Moreton to the north and will not extend the settlement further west towards West Kirby compared to the existing position. Utilising those boundaries, the release of SP001 would not move Greasby closer to any surrounding town when compared to existing separation distances. Indeed, the distance between Greasby and West Kirby at its shortest point is circa 1,360 metres and Parcel SP001's western edge is circa 1,400m away from the existing edge of West Kirby. As such the gap would not be narrowed. The key issue is to determine if the development of Parcel SP001 would result in the merger of towns. It does not and this is accepted by the Council's assessment. An assessment of the openness of the village and its character to determine if it should remain washed over by Green Belt or inset within it. Russell Homes have commissioned qualified heritage consultants at Turley to review the site in the context of nearby heritage assets and they conclude no undue harm would be caused by the development of the site within the Heritage Assessment contained at Appendix 3. The development of the Russell Home's site would not erode these existing, narrow areas of green separation from Area 5 due to the site's location to the south. Moreover, the proposed Masterplan for the Russell Homes site clearly illustrates a significant area of strategic open space to the south of Saughall Massie Road and directly south of Saughall Massie village. This is to respect the existing informal nature of this open area of land, which is owned by the Council and seemingly accessed by the general public. In retaining that part of the site for open space, this also respects the village's setting and existing levels of separation from other parts of Area 5, and its conservation area.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Arguably that would not be the case with Parcel SP004 and SP005 and parts of SP003 but that does not mean to say the release of those parcels is entirely unacceptable in the context of Purpose 2, we would just afford those parcels more contribution if a graded approach to the assessment was applied. Pegasus Comment: Whilst we don't take any particular issue with the Council's comment, this is part of the Council's Green Belt assessment that we consider to be particularly lacking in detail or commentary (not just for this site but all parcels). The Council's Green Belt assessment does pick up on some of these issues and other constraints but not all of them. Indeed, the initial constraints assessment at Appendix 13 of the Background report is incomplete and insufficient. For instance, we note that the existing UDP does identify areas of existing high landscape value but the Green Belt assessment does not account for these areas, which impact on some of the preferred sites. In addition, there is no acknowledgement of how to experience the countryside, in the context of the Green Belt parcel and its surrounding and the quality of the open countryside in relation to each parcel, which we believe is an important consideration. For instance, some urban edges are very well screened by woodland belts and therefore you could within a green belt parcel or travelling past it and be very close to an urban edge but still feel like you are in the middle of the open countryside. Other sites have very poor urban edges, where the urban area is visually apparent, thereby eroding the experience of being within the open countryside. Other areas might be less tranquil, for instance if main roads or large industrial uses are close by or other dominant urban features such as pylons might be visible and disrupt the experience of the open countryside. The Council's assessment does not pick up on any of these considerations.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The parcel also includes other built form with the new fire station and a large equestrian related buildings present. Both represent encroachment into the open countryside and the existing buildings reduce the openness of the Green Belt within this parcel; • The parcel contains an equestrian centre which does provide opportunities for outdoor pursuits, but this is not freely available to the public and there are other similar facilities close by; • The parcel includes just one PROW. However, whilst there are signposts at either end, it does not appear to be well used as it is undefined through one field and does not connect to a wider network of PROW beyond Parcel SP001. It is also truncated by Saughall Massie Road to the north. The proposed masterplan incorporates this PROW and links it with other informal footpaths located within the northeast corner of the site and along a landscape corridor which will run along the Brooks. As such, the proposal will increase the scope for informal outdoor recreational walking, jogging etc, thereby improving access to open greenspaces and health and wellbeing; • The parcel does not include and Grade 3 or above agricultural land and none of the land is cultivated for crops meaning the site does not contribute significantly to this function of the open • It is noted that the entire parcel is covered by the Wetland Bird habitat in the Council assessment, but our own assessment carried out by E3P confirms the habitat is nowhere near as extensive as suggested and is limited to the land north of Greasby Brook. • The site can suitably come forward for development without having an impact on Wetland Birds. Specialist surveys, that demonstrates the site is available, suitable and deliverable, even if this is not delivered, there are on site solutions available for conservation and mitigation by utilising the north west corner of the site as suitable mitigation that retains and enhances this habitat. Overall, the parcel does perform some function in terms of preventing encroachment into the open countryside. However, it is not a high-quality landscape and its openness is affected by the presence of existing buildings within the parcel and a poorly defined existing urban edge to the south and east. The presence of Saughall Massie Road and Pump lane are also clearly audible and visible to the north and west. As such, one's experience of the parcel is very much an area that is enclosed by urban form and traffic rather than being in an area of tranquil, picturesque open countryside that is detached from the urban area. <p>On the other hand, it does provide some opportunities for outdoor recreation and access to the open countryside and some ecological qualities, but these are not deemed to be so significant to warrant a national or even local designation. Overall, the Parcel to makes a weak contribution to Purpose 3. Purpose 4 the Council's assessment confirms the parcel does not contribute to this purpose. We agree it performs no contribution to Purpose 4. In the case of Wirral, there are undoubtedly areas where urban regeneration remains a priority and there are other locations where there simply is no urban land left available. Bearing in mind Wirral has quite a polarised housing market, which is largely defined by the M53, we would have expected that the Council would have afforded this priority some greater analysis. For instance, the Council could have feasibly provided commentary on the extent of available brownfield land in each area and relative to each Green Belt parcels location and size. A crude but relevant example is the comparative impacts of some Green Belt release around Caldby Hill, West Kirby or Heswall compared to the release of large swathes of Green Belt land near Birkenhead. Both will have differing impacts on the urban regeneration of land with the latter likely to have a far greater impact. Clearly the Council would then be able to factor in other issues and circumstances before reaching a final conclusion but to rank each parcel as exactly the same in relation to purpose 4 results in an inaccurate and incomplete assessment in our view. In relation to Parcel SP001, therefore, the Council states that it does perform this function. As highlighted above, we accept this to a degree, but in the case of Greasby, we note that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the UDP did not allocate any housing sites for the settlement; • The Council's Brownfield Site Register (Part 1) does not include any sites around Greasby; and, • The proposed Housing Allocations document put out for consultation identifies only one site (SHLAA Ref 1292) in Greasby off Woodpecker Close for 26 dwellings on a 0.99 ha site. <p>This would indicate that there is very little previously developed land within the urban area of Greasby. The fact that the site includes an equestrian use and a large number of associated buildings, part of the site can also be regarded as being previously developed land. Overall, we consider the site performs a weak contribution to the Green Belt in the context of the five purposes and the release of the site for development would not undermine the Green Belt's primary function. The new boundaries along Saughall Massie Road and Pump Lane would create far more robust boundaries than those that currently exist, and the development would make use of land that is previously developed and rationalise a parcel of Green Belt that has already seen a degree of encroachment. Appendix 1, which also includes details regarding the socio-economic benefits of the scheme, how biodiversity enhancements and an accessible open space network can be provided through the site and confirmation that the site is accessible to a range of day to day services and can be accessed by public transport services which can be easily directly through the site.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	[Consultation response based on the NPPF's 5 Greenbelt purposed] [Supporting documents attached]
DOR01084	<p>The option of "in fill" village development of up to 117 new homes - an increase of around 75% over all the properties on Davenport Road, Park West, Manners Lane, Seabank Road, Riverbank Road and Riverbank Close will definitely have a huge impact on the openness, character and appearance of the Green Belt and would be a massive loss of agricultural Green Belt land. It would cause lasting impact on the local environment, coastal margin, its wildlife and the important recreational amenity of the Wirral Way which is used by locals and visitors, Davenport Road being a key part of the Wirral Way already well used by walkers, cyclists and horse riders.</p> <p>This development would reduce the openness of the land between the Wirral Way and the estuary and conflict with the reasoning behind continuing to include this area in the Green Belt. The development would also impact on the two local primary schools where traffic is a major problem at school run times and also the general traffic on station road and Heswall lower village. It would also devalue our property and whether you call it "infill" or not would be a huge loss to our Green Belt, in an extremely picturesque area and, of course, we would strongly oppose this plan.</p>
DOR01085	<p>Driving East along The Runnel and then North on the A540 to the Gayton roundabout, the left-hand side of the road is mainly filled with detached properties, whereas the right-hand side is undeveloped farmland. If development takes place on SP071 (and subsequently SP072&3) then this would have a dramatic impact on the semi-rural character of our area. I appreciate that your housing OAN indicates that your SHLAA does not have sufficient capacity to satisfy demand and that you are having therefore to consider Green Belt development. However I am certain that, a revision of the Plan, as long as the philosophies set out in PLAN-MAKING GUIDANCE(PMG) 13/9/18 are rigorously followed, will reveal development opportunities that are less harmful to the Green Belt around Areas 7 & 8.</p> <p>An updated SHMA rigorously applying revised NPPF guidance will identify that Wirral LPA contains 2 (sub) HMAs, namely West & East of M53 and that the former crosses the border to include the Neston area. Naturally, evidenced by your need to investigate Green Belt development together with the above discovery of a cross-border HMA & TTWA, I expect that as soon as possible, in line with PMG, that formal COOPERATION with CWAC will be initiated. One major step should surely involve an urgent updated CWAC SHMA addressing the cross-border and HMA issue.</p> <p>GREEN BELT - I anticipate that in line with PMG, CWAC and Wirral will urgently assess the housing requirements of the cross-border "Western HMA" which will be quite considerable, because the 'affordability uplift formula' for the CGLG OAN standard method will trigger the maximum uplift of 40%. Certainly I expect the requirement figure to far exceed the sum of the SHLAAs for the area. Consequently I expect CWAC and Wirral to jointly assess areas in the cross-border Green Belt that will need to be released to satisfy demand. If the GB boundary was changed so that the 'Runnel Estate' was removed from the Green Belt, then a parcel of similar size to SP071 could be developed causing less 'harm' to the Green Belt than other parcels being considered in areas 7 & 8. If more development land was required then maybe Leighton could be considered as a growth settlement with a new station on A540 with a 'park & ride' and CIL from this high viability area could contribute to improving the rail link to Liverpool.</p>
DOR01086	<p>In summary, SP019B is identified as having weak boundaries which are not considered to be durable, and the development of this site could therefore lead to further encroachment and the complete removal of the gap between SA5 and SA7. Although the hospital is located in the Green Belt the impact on separation cannot be considered to be marginal and therefore the impact identified in Appendix 11, and the Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment, is incorrect and should be amended taking into consideration the impact on separation between Settlement Area 7 and Arrowe Park Hospital.</p> <p>SP061 - It is therefore evident that development of this parcel would not be suitable due to the heritage impact in this location and therefore should not be allocated when there are more appropriate locations available.</p> <p>SP062 - The Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment confirms that it would not be suitable to release SP062 from the Green Belt independently of SP061, to the immediate north. It is therefore necessary to consider the impact of the development of both parcels on Barnston Conservation Area. The above demonstrates that all of the sites considered within Parcel SP062 are either poorly contained with weak boundaries or would close the gap between SA7 and Barnston. Development in this location would therefore be contrary to 185 of the NPPF which identifies that Plans should set out a positive strategy for the conservation and enjoyment of the historic environment. This does not comprise the most suitable location for development when other alternatives are available.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP060 achieves the highest score with regards to containment and the evidence confirms that the parcel makes no contribution to purpose 1, which seeks to check unrestricted sprawl. • The evidence also confirms that Parcel SP060 makes no contribution to purpose 2 as the development of this parcel would not result in the diminishment of the gap between the settlement areas. Therefore, SP060 plays no role in the prevention of neighbouring towns from merging. The settlements of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall are not towns, but villages, and the NPPF only makes specific references to towns. • Of all the parcels considered for further investigation, which are included in Appendix 3 of the IGBR, SP060 is one of only 9 parcels which makes no contribution to both purpose 1 and purpose 2 of including land within the Green Belt. • Whilst the development of SP060 would result in the loss of countryside uses, it would not protrude discordantly into the open countryside, and this should be reflected in the scoring for the parcel in relation to purpose 3. In light of the above, SP060 should be considered as one of the most suitable options for green belt release due to its limited contribution and the lack of superior alternatives. Our client would be willing to work with WBC, and other stakeholders involved in SP060, with a view to working collaboratively to bring the site forward for development. In the short term this could include input into the production of a holistic masterplan. The site has strong boundaries which are formed by robust urban and landscape/topographical features. • There are limited views into the site which therefore dismisses the assumption that this would appear as a discordant outtrigger which would remove the gap between Irby and Pensby. • There are no technical constraints that would prevent development and there is a willing housebuilder in control of the site.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The site can be sustainably developed for at least 200 new homes which could meet the needs of the borough.
DOR01087	<p>Land to the North of Hill Bark Road, Greasby, SP007. Representations on local plan preferred sites consultation, ecological and arboricultural desktop study, landscape and visual site appraisal, vision statements, proposed masterplan and transportation input to visioning document received.</p> <p>Vision Statement. New Care/Retirement Village will provide social and economic benefits, including cost savings to the NHS. Would provide the residential development required to boost the Wirral's housing supply whilst also providing much required healthcare facilities for an ageing population along with sport leisure development on the land to the south of the existing Greasby Juniors School. Site has not formed part of the documentation for proposed Green Belt sites for further investigation (September 2018). Statement sets out reasonings why the Council should look at this site more favourably. Local and National policy is cited. The site benefits from good sustainable access to high-frequency bus and train services and local facilities in the near by vicinity, this demonstrates the sustainability credentials of the site. Population statistics and charts are provided. In 2007 people aged 65 & over accounted for around 1 in 5 of all residents. By 2037 the share will be closer to 1 in 4. It is considered that the removal from this site from the Green Belt would not cause a 'discordant outrigger of urban development'. Whilst it would provide additional growth to the south of Greasby it is not considered to be outrigger any more so than the site north of Greasby which is being considered more suitable for release. To develop to the south of Greasby rather than the north and east of Greasby would have less of an impact on the merging of settlements. With regard to the initial Green Belt comments made in September 2018 by Wirral Council, the Agent objects whereby it is suggested to release this site for housing would result in 'outrigger' urban development and would have an impact upon the neighbouring settlement areas. The site would be much more permeable and a pleasant place for the public and local residents to enjoy. There will be routes available by foot to Royden Park and Irby Heath. The site is not restricted by any constraints or allocations apart from its Green Belt designation which should be considered positively by the Council, when comparing with other sites. A landscape and visual assessment of the site has been provided as part of the proposal which helps inform the suitability of the site for Green Belt release. The proposal is promoting the site for a multi-use scheme looking to incorporate aspects of healthcare and recreation in order to enhance its sustainability credentials. The scheme would provide clear benefits to the local area which would outweigh the requirement for it to be retained in the Wirral Green Belt allocation. The site is therefore considered to be sustainable, available and developable within the next 5 years and will therefore assist with Wirral's 5-year housing supply. The site should therefore be released from the Green Belt in the new Local Development Plan and allocated for a new mixed-use development scheme.</p> <p>Representations to Preferred Sites Consultation. Very basic factual information has been released in relation to each of the sites. No precise proposals are put forward for any of the sites such as the scale or type of development they might accommodate. There is no indication in the information provided as to what uses they would feasibly accommodate. Some if the sites include protected open land, sports pitches and golf courses. It is unclear if the Council are suggesting these sites would be suitable for alternative forms of development. No Draft Local Plan of accompanying Sustainability Assessment has been formally released. It is impossible to decipher why certain sites have been put forward over other contenders. Distinct lack of information provided as part of this consultation to make meaningful comments, we reserve our position to make further comments once the Draft Local Plan has been released for consultation. We support the Council's initial conclusions, that now is the time to review the Borough's Green Belt and that a relaxation of the boundaries will be necessary to meet Wirral's future development needs. Comments are provided on the Council's approach to producing planning policies over the last two decades, the Council's approach to site selection which is inadequate under SEA regulations and on the need for Green Belt release further to the need to meet housing needs. Disappointing that the latest consultation process does not come with any firm commitment from the Council as to the number of new homes it will seek to deliver 2018 SHLAA has still not been made available nor has the Viability Statement.</p> <p>There is no supporting Sustainability Appraisal and we are concerned that the sites that have been selected have not been done so in a robust and legally necessary manner. Green Belt assessment is quite broad brush when it comes to assessing the 5 purposes of Green Belt. Starting point is the identification of the Settlement Areas. We note that these correlate with the UDP and 2012 Draft Core Strategy area and are generally robust with regard to the main urban areas. Paragraph 140 of the NPPF states that villages located within the Green Belt should be excluded from the Green Belt if they do not contribute to the openness. There might be other smaller settlements currently washed over by the Green Belt which shouldn't be based on their existing character. This could affect settlements such as Barnston, Frankby, Saughall Massie, Storeton, Thornton Hough, etc. We do not provide an assessment but would urge the Council to do so in order to ensure a robust approach. Some might warrant being identified as separate areas rather than all being grouped into Area 8. Assessment of potential corrections to the Green Belt boundary is a correct approach there are areas of land that we are aware of on the edge of the main settlements that would warrant closer inspection. For instance, the new Fire Station at Greasby needs to be accounted for, and we question why Arrowe Park Hospital is not assessed in this regard. The initial constraints assessment at Appendix 13 of the Background report is incomplete and insufficient. The UDP does identify areas of existing high landscape value but the Green Belt assessment does not account for these areas, which impact on some of the preferred sites. No reference is made to public rights of way. No acknowledgement of how one experiences the countryside. Some reference is made to certain outdoor sport and recreation uses but not others and no comment is provided as to why the Council consider it would be suitable to release large and important golf courses from the Green Belt, when they clearly contribute to this function. Whilst the plans identify some of the ecological habitats, we find it odd that no reference is made in relation to EU and national designated areas and the proximity of some of the preferred sites to these locations. We do not consider this aspect has been considered fully. A further key omission relates to Purpose 5 – Assisting Urban Regeneration and recycling of urban land. All parcels are ranked the same and to a certain extent we agree that most Green Belt parcels will contribute to this objective. However, there are undoubtedly areas where urban regeneration remains a top priority and there are other locations where there simply is no urban land left available. Bearing in mind Wirral has quite a polarised housing market, which is largely defined by the M53 we would have assumed the Council would have afforded this priority some greater analysis. The Council could have feasibly provided commentary on the extent of available brownfield land in each area and relative to each Green Belt parcels location and size. A crude but relevant example is the comparative impacts of some Green Belt release around Caldby Hill, West Kirby or Heswall compared to the release of large swathes of Green Belt land near</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Birkenhead. Both will have differing impacts on the urban regeneration of land with the latter likely to have a far greater impact. Clearly the Council would then be able to factor in other issues and circumstances before reaching a final conclusion but to rank each parcel as exactly the same in relation to purpose 4 results in an inaccurate and incomplete assessment in our view. A final observation in relation to the preferred Green Belt parcels is that many are very large and there is very limited information provided at this stage as to what uses will be delivered within them and how. The table at Appendix 15 of the Background Report indication of each parcel's gross to net area and development capacity is helpful. We note that a number of the parcels will not provide any new dwellings and many have a 50% gross to net development ratio. It would be more helpful if more details were provided on what other policies were to be applied to the suggested Green Belt release.</p> <p>We assume some will be retained as areas of protected open space and others will be used for employment development but without that information it is difficult to determine if the Green Belt parcels chosen are suitable. What is evident is that the Council are considering 1,623 ha of Green Belt land for release but of the sites provisionally chosen, the initial assessment indicates that only 459 ha would relate to net developable land. This represents just 28% of all the preferred sites identified for Green Belt release / further review and highlights why additional details are required in order to come to any meaningful conclusions on the Council's preferred sites.</p> <p>Housing Need and Exceptional Circumstances - The Government's Standard Methodology, the Liverpool City Region Strategic Housing & Employment Market Land Assessment and the Council's Strategic Housing Market Assessment (July 2016) are cited in why caution needs to be applied why a sound, sustainable Local Plan should target a higher figure than that currently calculated using the Standard Methodology.</p> <p>Standard Methodology figures, only represent one piece of evidence in relation to the preparation of a sound development plan and represents a 'minimum' figure. It is clearly not logical to assume that 'exceptional circumstances' have to be demonstrated to justify the use of a higher Local Plan figure. Indeed, the Government's objectives are to boost housing supply and any authority that can sustainably deliver more homes will undoubtedly be welcomed. The exceptional circumstances test, therefore, must apply to any authority which chooses to justify and deliver a lower housing needs requirement as its starting point.</p> <p>There are compelling reasons and some exceptional circumstances that would warrant Wirral opting for a higher housing need requirement. The distinct lack of a forward-looking development plan for the local area over the last 18 years and the associated limitations that brings in terms of household growth will have ultimately influenced the outcome from the Standard Methodology. The affordability ratio applied to the Standard Methodology is based on borough-wide average house prices and household incomes, which ignores the distinct polarised position in the Borough which has a split housing market. Our client also has some fundamental concerns. Notably, the standard methodology removes additional economic growth and instead pegs the housing requirement to past trends and development patterns. This significantly accentuates existing inequalities across certain geographies, such as the north/south divide, but it can also be witnessed, and lead to disparities, at more local levels too, which are evidently apparent in Wirral. The standard methodology is also based on a top down assessment stemming from the government's national target of 300,000 homes per year, based on the 2014 projections. Notably, the 2014 projections were the latest available at the time in November 2017 and supported total growth of 266,000 dpa, so 10% short of the 300,000 figure. In short, the methodology is retro-fitted to achieve the top-level target. The government have acknowledged this issue. A table is provided to summarise the housing requirements and delivery. The latest figures produced by the Standard Methodology based on the 2016 Household Projections cannot be regarded as being a robust Local Plan housing target in light of the Government's confirmation that they will be seeking to alter the methodology. The Targets set within the Wirral SHMA are considered to be more appropriate to ensure a sound and robust local plan is delivered. Charts provided with claim that Housing delivery in the Borough has slowed significantly because of the lack of an up to date Local Plan and the Borough is still not delivering the numbers it was prior to the economic crash in 2006/7 despite the sub-regions employment growth in recent years. It is our view that the Council should be planning for a 20% buffer and release of sites at the start of the plan period. Any future housing requirement set out in the emerging Local Plan should also take account of the fact that there has been a persistent level of under delivery for many years and that any figure produced by the Government's Standard Methodology will mirror the past trend of a continuing decline in housing delivery despite the fact that employment growth and affordability issues point in the other directions and towards a high growth requirement in line with the Council's own objectively assessed evidence base.</p>
DOR01088	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The sites are currently in the Green Belt but there is a compelling case to allocate them for new housing development in the emerging Local Plan. 2. Both parcels of land are extremely well contained by surrounding housing and urban infrastructure including the Cross Hill reservoir and road network. 3. The development of housing on SHLAA parcel 931 would be a continuation of the linear pattern of development on the eastern side of Barnston Road. Whereas allocation of SP061 for housing development would provide the opportunity for effectively 'rounding off' the urban area. 4. The allocation of both sites for housing would have no significant impact on the purposes of including land in the Green Belt. The extent of urban sprawl is limited by the virtue of the way in which each piece of land is contained and there is no prospect that the gap which separates Thingwall from surrounding settlements will be reduced to any harmful degree. 5. There will be encroachment into the countryside but this applies to any location at the urban edge that has not been previously developed. In this case the Cross Hill Reservoir represents a significant operational development within the Green Belt. This has a strong impact on the landscape character of the surrounding surplus land. 6. It has been demonstrated that both sites are accessible to everyday services and facilities. Walking and cycling distances from the site accesses to these local services and facilities are short and the development will bring the significant potential to improve the quality of key cycling and pedestrian routes. Public transport in the form of bus routes are within easy walking and cycling distances. Overall this is a highly sustainable location for new housing. 7. There are no constraints that will prevent the successful development of the sites. Matters such as ecology, access details and the capacity of utilities will require further investigation but are not

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>impediments to new development as such. There are no heritage considerations and the degree of impact on the surrounding landscape will be negligible.</p> <p>8. There is a compelling planning argument in favour of the removal of the sites from the Green Belt and allocation for new housing development.</p> <p>[Consultation Response & Images attached]</p>
DOR01089	<p>Peel supports the progression of the LPCS in principle. This is vital to the planned delivery of the type, quantum and distribution of development in a way which contributes to meeting the Borough's needs and realising its growth ambitions. However, Peel is concerned about the assumptions made regarding housing delivery at Wirral Waters over the plan period and considers that the Council has adopted a flawed approach to its assessment of housing delivery from this strategically important development. Peel's representations are therefore focussed on how the DOR deals with Wirral Waters in terms of its potential contribution to the Borough's housing supply and wider ambitions. In preparing this response, we have had regard to national planning policy set out in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 ('NPPF2018'), associated guidance provided by National Planning Policy Guidance ('NPPG'), the Wirral Cabinet Report of 23 July 2018 and the documents and background papers that appear on the Council's DOR consultation webpage. A further representation has been prepared by Turley in respect of Peel's land in Eastham and a separate representation has also been prepared and submitted by Peel Ports Group in respect of the Port of Liverpool and The Manchester Ship Canal. The emerging LPCS will need to reflect the role of Wirral Waters in terms of its contribution to housing and employment land supply and to economic and regeneration priorities of the whole of inner East Wirral. The Wirral Waters area, comprising the Catalyst Neighbourhoods and the Partnership Neighbourhoods, is shown in the plan provided with this letter at Annex 1. It demonstrates the geographic extent and therefore the potential impact of the Wirral Waters development. The project has in turn secured significant Government support and is the only location in the UK to achieve both Enterprise Zone and Housing Zone status.</p>
DOR01090	<p>Housing supply - Rowland have determined discrepancies in housing figures calculated across the Wirral. Figures reported to Cabinet identify 2,572 dwellings with planning permission, capacity for 4,026 dwellings on potential sites, 1,100 dwellings at Wirral Waters, 750 dwellings from conversions and 900 dwellings from windfall. However, figures reported by Wirral Council at the Briefing session Presentation differ; highlighting 2,634 dwellings with planning permission, 90 proposed at Wirral waters Northbank. Inconsistencies in the evidence base are demonstrated; the Council identifies a shortfall of 4,990 dwellings plus a 20% buffer for under delivery, suggesting a shortfall in land for 7,390 dwellings, suggesting that housing supply calculations should carefully consider the delivery of sites with extant permissions. Additionally, historic trends used by the council to provide an evidence base to support their allowance from windfall and conversions do not accurately reflect the delivery of homes from these sources. Therefore, Rowland argue that an allowance for windfall and conversions should not be allowed for during the first three years of the plan to avoid double counting, as the delivery of homes from these sources reduces as sites allocated in the Local Plan come forward over the plan period.</p> <p>Proposed Housing Allocations – In order to develop a plan which can deliver against the Wirral's housing requirements, Rowland argue that it is essential to provide a sufficient range of sites to enable the maintenance of the required level of delivery throughout the plan period. By allocating more sites than are required to meet the housing requirement, this buffer mitigates under-delivery and unforeseen circumstances. Reflecting the NPPF requirement is not a maximum but a minimum figure; all sites contained within the plan should be deliverable over the plan period and planned using an appropriate development strategy that supports economically viable, sustainable development across all market areas.</p> <p>Green Belt Review – the release of Green belt through the Local Plan proves is facilitated through paragraphs 136 and 137 in the NPPF (2018) when exceptional circumstances are explored and demonstrated through the Local Plan. Rowland emphasise that without the release of Green Belt, the quantum of new development could be significantly below the identified need, increasing reliance upon neighbouring authorities to accommodate housing requirements. Additionally, Rowland encourages the development of Safeguarded land between the urban area and the Green Belt to ensure that a robust long-term Green Belt boundary is maintained, whilst also providing certainty for both residents and developers in terms of the likely location of growth beyond the end of the Plan period. Local Plans should provide triggers to indicate the release of safeguarded land if the plan is failing to deliver as anticipated. Nevertheless, in sustainable locations, Rowland supports the release of Green Belt to expand settlements in order to meet appropriate levels of identified housing need.</p>
DOR01091	<p>The Land off Boathouse Lane and Gayton Parkway.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This representation has been prepared and submitted on behalf of Bellway Homes Ltd and the landowners of land at Gayton Parkway. 2. We are gravely concerned that the emerging evidence base that appears to be shaping the emerging Local Plan will not meet the "tests of soundness" as set out in NPPF. 3. The latest consultation is centrally about a Stage 2 GB review and what sites/areas have emerged as the more favourable and preferred locations for further assessment with a view that out of these a selection of sites will offer the potential to accommodate new housing and employment growth/supply in the event any Green Belt is considered necessary to be released over the pursuant plan period. 4. The gestation period for this plan has been painfully slow and market confidence is not riding high in the very realistic prospect for additional slippage, despite and because of the threat of Central Government intervention. Bellway Homes are concerned that the failure of the Authority to have an up-to-date Local Plan has (and will continue to) undermined investment and the delivery of jobs, new homes, community and enviro-engineering infrastructure across the Borough area. 5. There appear to be a range of tensions between the Town Hall at Birkenhead and Whitehall "which are frequently being played out in public. This is not unusual but the task of delivering a sound plan is not made any easier by an additional mixture of under-resourcing, a shifting sub-regional housing market and national statistical changes. The Local Plan is caught in the middle of this fray. 6. Nonetheless, the core message seems to be that there is a desire by many in the Authority to support a brownfield first development policy and that this ought to feed the development needs of the Borough over the plan period in favour over any Green Belt release. This is a laudable strategy and is supported but it must be tempered by a recognition that not all development can be accommodated on brownfield land.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>7. Indeed, as the Authority know from other studies the Borough have limited brownfield land sources and of these most are concentrated in the eastern side of the peninsula, where many sites suffer from significant viability constraints (largely due to historic contamination).</p> <p>8. Moreover, having land in one place cannot logically serve the needs of the whole Borough and a range of key housing challenges are now considered to exist and the Local Plan must now navigate these obstacles and provide solutions.</p> <p>9. The challenges facing the Borough include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Lowering targets for new employment allocations translates into limiting the number of jobs, which equates to limiting growth and exporting jobs and therefore higher levels of out-migration. This will become a self-fulfilling prophecy because without access to jobs the trend of out migration will escalate and undermine overall sustainability of settlements. The western side of the M53 involves nil employment allocations; mainly due to lower levels of market demand and a reliance upon jobs being provided in Liverpool, Warrington and Ellesmere Port/Chester/Deeside; with little need for change economically in traditional B1/B2/B8 sectors the western part of the Wirral is now seen as a largely residential set of hubs and apart from investment in service, retail and tourism sectors this is unlikely going to change; although there are a host of educational, healthcare and traditional employment operators located in the west. Addressing Affordable housing need is not going to be done by sites such as Wirral Waters alone and the need to the west of the M53 has not been satisfied since before the 2003 housing oratorium; resulting in a whole generation missing out; new housing is therefore required to support the younger generations coming through. High density apartment style housing will also not address the need for family/executive or other forms of specialist housing (e.g. retirement living) and there is a risk that western settlements will fast become the enclave of the wealthy and dormitory of the retired...an exclusive reserve for pensioners but without the requisite means to sustain basic services/facilities. Reliance upon funding subsidy to regenerate difficult unviable brownfield sites is limited: the expense involved in remediation is significant and so there will always be sites that the market housing operators simply cannot entertain without massive subsidy from the public purse. There is a market imbalance and spatial distribution of new housing needs to be carefully considered because there is little point in “dumping” new housing in areas where market demand is low. Low levels of housing growth will impact upon economic growth and the ability to support sustainable communities and attract investment to support and fund infrastructure requirements; so whilst many may feel a low housing number is a good thing it may not be too long before they realise that their offspring are unable to live locally and they themselves are left without key services because schools, medical centres and buses all rely upon “active” chimney pots. <p>10. Worryingly, the indication is that these very scenarios may well play-out because the latest ONS Population Statistics have been published and there is a real risk that the annual housing requirement may drop from its presently proposed 803 per annum down to as low as 448 per annum.</p> <p>11. This would have catastrophic impacts upon housing and economic growth as well as the future sustainability of the peninsula.</p> <p>12. However, Bellway Homes and other housebuilders and developers understand that MHCLG will shortly release an update to the standard methodology; noting that the ONS methodology has some serious flaws, in particular with regard to its baseline (2001, 2011) data points. This is likely to provide a more realistic, increased annual requirement. In any event, it should also be emphasised that the annual requirement figure is only a “minimum target” to be met by the Authority and will be expressed as such in any policy wording.</p> <p>13. The new Housing Delivery Test is likely to result in only those sites with full planning consent being considered to constitute an Authority’s five-year housing land supply, as borne out in the recent Woolpit decision. Ultimately, Bellway Homes would hope the Wirral Council would seek to deliver more than the minimum requirement in its aspiration to deliver the housing needs of Wirral’s existing and future residents and that this will involve sites such as Gayton Parkway.</p> <p>14. The future of the Wirral Local Plan will be to ensure growth is balanced and proportionate. This includes making sure housing commitments are geographically distributed but also vested into the hands of a few key players who may struggle to deliver.</p> <p>15. In having taken the decision to undertake a Green Belt review it is the responsibility of the Authority to carefully follow the guidelines in NPPF and this will mean:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Considering a longer plan period - Identifying reserve/plan B sites - Identifying safeguarded land for future release - Ensuring all preferred sites are deliverable and all sites are assessed in a consistent manner. - Considering the sustainability of development options and selecting the best fit solution <p>16. The Green Belt Review (Stage 2) appears not to have assessed the “sustainability” credentials of the sites and we would urge the Authority to pause and carefully reflect whether their study has followed NPPF guidance and addressed this key principle as this will ultimately determine whether the plan is found to be sound or not.</p> <p>17. Bellway Homes consider that their site at Gayton Parkway offers the Authority with an excellent option for the future needs of the Borough and the settlement area of Heswall/Gayton.</p> <p>18. A host of technical studies and assessments have already been undertaken and there is nothing to presently suggest that the site is anything but deliverable and developable. Moreover, we have demonstrated that there are a range of significant public and community benefits in considering the allocation of the site at Gayton for residential use and these have been expressed in the Vision Document (June 2018).</p> <p>NPPF: Does the Evidence Base comply? Comments:</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p><u>Plan Making:</u></p> <p>Para 23. The BLR shows that an insufficient supply of brownfield sites exist so there is a need to identify future land release from greenfield sources and given the Green Belt is tightly woven around the urban areas this means identifying the most sustainable release.</p> <p>Para 31. The GBR appears to ignore obvious and logical locations for growth.</p> <p>Para 32. The GBR appears not to have addressed this need.</p> <p>Para 35. The Plan is “unsound”; for it fails to address objectively assessed need, fails to take account of reasonable alternatives, is based on flawed evidence base; and is inconsistent with the <u>Framework</u>. Bellway considers the GBR evidence base as not presently being sound, given it not being positively prepared, its lack of justification and inconsistency with NPPF</p> <p><u>Housing:</u></p> <p>Para 65. Bellway are concerned that the emerging (lower) targets for housing will fulfil the OAN and that they are not aspirational; noting that all figures should be expressed as a minimum.</p> <p>Para 67. Bellway consider its Gayton Parkway site meets this test in being deliverable with immediate effect.</p> <p>Glossary, Deliverable: We don’t consider the sites presently identified for potential GB release can claim to be deliverable.</p> <p>Glossary, Developable: We don’t consider the sites presently identified for potential GB release can claim to be developable.</p> <p>Para 72. The Authority recognise that Green Belt release ought to meet this guidance and that is welcomed; however, it is now a question of which sites perform best in meeting this test and we consider that some of the site identified for potential release fail to perform as well as the site at Gayton Parkway.</p> <p><u>Communities:</u></p> <p>Para 85. NOTE: it is important that the "emerging plan makes sufficient provision to ensure the sustainable and viable future for the Western settlement of Wirral. There is a real danger and risk that if inadequate provision is made it will effectively this will consign the communities to the west to a further generation of passive change and they become dormitories that become dependent and deliver no economic benefits. There is nothing wrong with addressing the deprivational issues to the east, but this must not be at the cost of allowing the western areas to perpetuate any imbalance. The Plan and its GBR evidence base must consider the placemaking opportunities of well-planned growth, which could provide for healthy, inclusive and safe places.</p> <p><u>Greenbelt:</u></p> <p>Para 133. We do not believe that the Green Belt Review has thus far effectively addressed these purposes in arriving at their findings.</p> <p>Para 138. The Green Belt Review has failed to take account of sustainable patterns of development; for had it done so it would have arrived at the logical conclusion of identifying the Gayton Parkway site for immediate and/or future safeguarded release.</p> <p>Para 139. The Authority have failed to follow this guidance and indeed a key error of the GBR is not yet to have identified any safeguarded land; which the Plan ought to do.</p> <p>This clearly demonstrates that the Green Belt Review (and its Development Options Paper) has so far ignored the guidance of NPPF and Bellway Homes is concerned that the emerging plan will fail to meet the soundness test of it complying with and being consistent with National Policy.</p> <p>Site Specific Concerns:</p> <p><u>Land Ownership.</u> Many of the larger sites are in multiple ownerships with no evidence of collaboration agreements in place. For example SP001 North of Greasby, SP013 West of Column Road, SP030 North of Lever Causeway, Storeton through to SP041 West of Brimstage Lane, Storeton, SP042 North of Poulton Hall Road, Spital through to SP049 South of Mill Park, Eastham.</p> <p><u>Infrastructure.</u> The larger sites, or the collection of sites that link together, are a concern as there are questions surrounding the deliverability of the infrastructure needed to support them (highways, utilities, sustainability); even a smaller site such as SP058C/D/E, East and West of Piper’s Lane, Heswall is questionable in terms of highway access capacity and ecology.</p> <p><u>Concentration.</u> The proposed allocations within Clatterbridge, Estham and Bebington are of a particular concern as well as those in north Greasby, Moreton West and Saughall Massie. These sites present not only an over-concentration of sites resulting in a saturated market, but they would also present a danger of merging settlements.</p> <p><u>Technical Issues.</u> SP048 West of Lowfields Avenue Eastham is 50% in Flood Zone 2 & 3 and is 90% covered in dense mature woodland. SP004A North of Saughall Massie is approximately 25% in Flood Zone 2 & 3. Those sites directly adjacent to the M53 will suffer from significant noise attenuation measures being needed which will reduce their capacity to deliver. SP071 Land at Chester Road, Gayton involves high quality agricultural land quality.</p> <p>Additionally, some of the sites are rather ambiguous, for example SP016 West of Meols Drive, which covers the entirety of the Royal Liverpool Golf Course. Clearly the Golf Course is going to remain and we are sure that this has been put forward as there may be some surplus land. However, it is not clear where this surplus land is, so we would question how has this site, and many of the other larger sites have been assessed and what their expected delivery outputs might realistically be.</p> <p>Having also briefly looked at a handful of the potential policy compliant SHLAA sites we would question a number of the SHLAA policy compliant sites; for example the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA 1895: Land & Marine Depot, Bromborough. This has flood issues and complex ownership issues. It has an indicative output of 78 Infrastructure. The larger sites, or the collection of sites that link together, are a concern as there are questions surrounding the deliverability of the infrastructure needed to support them (highways, utilities, sustainability); even a smaller site such as SP058C/D/E East and West of Piper’s Lane, Heswall is questionable in terms of highway access capacity and ecology. • SHLAA 0483: Green Lane, Tranmere: this is currently being used as a scrap metal recycling facility, we would predict that the ground conditions will make the development of this site financially

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>unviable: it has an indicative output of 26</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SHLAA 0716 & 0718: North Grange Road, West Kirby and east of Grange Road: this site presents highway access concerns from Grange Road, a steep hill and potentially inadequate visibility splays, with a potential ransom from Townfield Road: it has an indicative output of 38. <p>This is a sample of just three sites, but if replicated across other areas it demonstrates that the deliverability of potential housing sites are highly vulnerable. Moreover, the commentary we provided on the Brownfield Land Register in December 2017 revealed that some of the 97 sites identified involve existing / former housing sites (that have or will be demolished) as part of previous Pathfinder Housing schemes; only a handful have the benefit of an extant/expired planning permission. This reinforces our concern that the Authority may stumble into becoming reliant upon sites that are simply undeliverable.</p> <p>CONCLUSIONS</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Bellway Homes Ltd knows that the site at Gayton Parkway is “deliverable” within this plan period and is free of any technical enviro-engineering constraints. • It is a single land ownership free of any legal constraints and is available to develop as soon as planning permission is achieved given the option agreement between the owners and Bellway. • Bellway has no interest in “land-banking” the site and are not conflicted by other assets so can bring forward the site immediately, unlike several other developers on the Wirral who would struggle to deliver all their interests were they awarded allocations. • Bellway consider that the Green Belt Review provides the vehicle for not only agreeing that this site no longer contributes to or meets the 5 purposes of the green Belt but that it ought to they must be identified for release and accommodating future development either immediately or as safeguarded land. However, the current GBR is believed to be flawed and riddled with inconsistencies for it to be found a sound and robust piece of evidence base. • Bellway have, to the contrary we have found (through the assessment undertaken by Tyler Grange) that the Gayton Parkway site performs exceedingly well when it comes to favouring sites for GB release (in other words it makes a limited contribution to the purposes and function of Green Belt) and either scores favourably or out performs other sites proposed to be taken forward, concluding that it ought to be released from the GB. We must conclude that a re-assessment must be undertaken using a more robust methodology. • The Authority must treat all sites on a level playing field in terms of deliverability and developability and cannot be seen to favour sites where there are clear concerns over meeting these criteria and their availability, sustainability and overall deliverability. • Bellway Homes believes the evidence base underpinning the emerging Local Plan has not met three of the four tests of soundness. • We therefore must conclude such material to be “unsound”. • The site and its surroundings have been considered in relation to potential developmental constraints which will inform the future development of the site. The plan attached plan illustrates local constraints, none of which represent a significant limit to the capacity of the site. The site is not subject to any ecological, landscape, archaeological or geo-technical designations. • The land will achieve sustainable development in accordance with the emerging policy framework and an emphasis upon providing a series of economic, social and environmental net gains. • The scheme will deliver a positive number and meaningful contribution of 40 no. affordable housing units that can be specifically targeted at “families” and meeting the known latent need and demand in this locality through the delivery of 20% affordable housing. • The fact is that the site is located outside of the Heswall settlement boundary of the UDP, so the emerging Local Plan must decide on where new boundaries are set having undertaken a robust Green Belt Review. • The speed to which we can secure planning permission is important. • It is important to recognise that Bellway is motivated to deliver this site so that a comprehensive set of development uses can come online over a defined investment period. • The local residential market is presently strong. Not only is there an acute pent up demand for new residential dwellings, but Gayton / Heswall are particularly attractive as a destination for all types of tenure occupiers. <p>Attached is our representation and GBR landscape appraisal assessment undertaken by Tyler Grange into the Green Belt Development Options Review, submitted on behalf of Bellway Homes in respect of its site at Gayton Parkway. Complementing this submission is a collection of associated deliverability reports together with a set of pre-app meeting notes from our recent meeting with [Planning Officer] on 25 September. We look forward to receiving technical feedback as agreed at this meeting. We would also welcome the opportunity to discuss this submission further with Officers and we look forward to the Local Plan making its next stage of progress.</p> <p>Proposed Green Belts Sites for Further consideration</p> <p>The Assessment of Green Belt parcels undertaken by the Initial Green Belt Review has identified a number of sites that are proposed as suitable for further consideration. The land off Gayton Parkway (the site) is not identified as suitable for further consideration, despite the low contribution that it makes to the Green Belt and its suitability for release. This is in part due to the assessment of the larger parcel (SP089) that has been assessed, and which extends to the west beyond the extents of the existing settlement edge.</p> <p>Comparative Assessment of Sites</p> <p>The findings of the Green Belt Review for those parcels around Gayton and Heswall, including the parcel within which the site is situated (SP089) are summarised below:</p> <p><u>SP019B</u></p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The majority of the parcel is not suitable for release from the Green Belt because of the impact on openness and separation • The parcel is part of the nature improvement area identified in the LCR Ecological Network • Best and most versatile agricultural land – 0% <p><u>SP061</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best and most versatile agricultural land – 60.0% <p><u>SP062</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would not be suitable for release from the Green Belt independently of SP061 to the immediate north" • Best and most versatile agricultural land – 51.4% <p><u>SP071</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Best and most versatile agricultural land – 29.4% • Bidston Wrexham railway line could potentially form a clear, strong boundary to a revised Green Belt <p><u>SP089</u></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Part of a wider strategic separation between Settlement Area 7 – Heswall and Parkgate in Cheshire West and Chester (1.4km) and part of a larger parcel of open countryside extending further to the south to Boathouse Lane in Cheshire West and Chester • Not suitable for release from the Green Belt • Part of the remaining open countryside between Gayton and Parkgate and Neston in adjoining Cheshire West and Chester SHLAA 3046, to the south of Gayton Parkway, would reduce the separation between Gayton and Neston and introduce a discordant urban development to the south of Gayton • Best and most versatile agricultural land – 0% <p>Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The comparative review above shows the inconsistencies within the assessment made by the Initial Green Belt Review and throws into serious question whether the Review forms a robust and sound evidence base upon which to make decisions regarding the suitability of land for release from the Green Belt • Parcel SP019B to the north of the settlement is identified as making a contribution to the Green Belt, restricting urban sprawl and preventing merging of settlements, being unsuitable for release from the Green Belt. Despite this it is proposed as a Green Belt site for further consideration. • Parcel SP062 to the east of the settlement has been identified as suitable only if Parcel SP061 is released alongside it. • Parcel SP071 'Land east of Chester Road' is identified as being well contained and suitable for development. However, the assessment identifies that the parcel includes best and most versatile agricultural land. • Parcel SP089, (the larger parcel within which the site is situated), is identified as preventing sprawl and merging of settlements, despite the containment to the south by Boathouse Lane and relationship of the land to the built edge. The enclosed nature of the land and mature landscape features are not recognised. The parcel is identified as containing no best and most versatile agricultural land. <p>Conclusion</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site-specific review of the landscape and visual context and contribution to the Green Belt purposes and functions has demonstrated that, when compared against other identified land parcels identified by the Council's Initial Green Belt Review, the site scores as well, if not better than many of the other sites identified by the Review as being suitable for further consideration. • This demonstrates the serious failings of the methodology and assessment undertaken by the Council, which include the following: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Failure to consider smaller discrete land parcels adjacent to the built edge that is well contained and makes a limited contribution to the Green Belt. - Not including details in the published assessment as to how the findings have been assessed against each of the five Green Belt purposes; and - An apparent lack of consistency in making judgments about the suitability of sites for development in relation to environmental and physical constraints. • The Review is therefore not robust, transparent or replicable and cannot be considered a sound piece of evidence to underpin the local plan. <p>Recommendations</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Given the above issues with the Initial Green Belt Review methodology and the serious flaws and shortcomings in its findings, it is strongly recommended that Green Belt sites are reassessed using a robust methodology that identifies appropriately scaled discreet parcels of land and applies a clear, criteria-based assessment using defined parameters. This will allow for a robust, transparent and replicable assessment and ensure that sites identified for further consideration are subject to rigorous and proper consideration. • Having undertaken a site-specific appraisal of the land off Gayton Parkway, and a comparative assessment of sites, it is clear that the land make a limited contribution to the purposes and function of the Green Belt, and should be taken forward within the emerging Local Plan as a potential site for release from the Green Belt and further consideration. • The situation and enclosure of the site adjacent to the residential settlement edge and containment by Boathouse Lane, mature woodland and tree belts landscape and visual context, combined

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>with the potential to further enhance tree belts to form robust new Green Belt boundaries make it a suitable site for release from the Green Belt.</p> <p>[Appraisal attached] [same as above with additional attachments]</p>
DOR01092	<p>I amongst countless others in Irby and the Wirral are strongly opposed to the release of greenbelt for development. We understand that there have been numerous objections from Professors and other very qualified individuals citing reasons that the land should not be released. There are more than sufficient number of alternative sites available as opposed greenbelt - all as discussed Wirral Council Meeting 23.07.18. The brownfield sites in the Wirral should be used and invested in and in return will help grow those areas and enable them to grow and prosper. Wirral is famous for its tourism and open spaces and if these are built upon the area will negatively suffer. The local infrastructure will not be able to cope. The schools are already full and will not be able to cope. The areas are home to farmland which in turn provides income for the Borough and employment. The figures being dictated to us are generated from London and Westminster and are not the same up North as they are down South. We understand that the ONS has revised the calculated figures to 5,925....much lower than the previously quoted 12,000 homes 'required' ... utilising these revised numbers means that those houses currently in for planning plus those identified elsewhere and as part of Wirral Waters meet the required numbers and in the required timeframe .. and no greenbelt needs releasing for development and should therefore remain as protected greenbelt from this day forth as originally intended. A surplus of houses would result without even having to release any greenbelt. There isn't in fact a shortage of housing to the extent that is implied in the Borough. Death and birth rates are such that there will not be an overpopulation as is currently being attested to and further supports the fact that the required numbers of housing is half that originally noted by the Council and is otherwise covered by housing currently in for planning. It is imperative that Brownfield sites must be prioritised and investments pushed for these areas.</p> <p>Existing infrastructure is already in place for brownfield sites - there is none for greenbelt - the brownfield sites are more receptive for re-development than greenbelt and funding can be applied for and made available for any required remediation and prepping of the land for work and development.</p> <p>To build on greenbelt will massively impact already ever-present local drainage problems in the Borough (as evidenced by recent flooding and other issues across the Wirral over the last few years) and would only increase and exacerbate such problems should natural drainage be taken away and worsen flooding.</p> <p>We must avoid conurbation of existing towns and villages and prevent development sprawl and retain the individuality and history that the Wirral is famous for in its towns, villages, parks, farmland, beaches and open space. A large proportion of the release of the greenbelt actively promotes urban sprawl - to cite an example.. the release of land in Irby (adjacent Arrowe Park and along Thingwall Road) and also by Landican and behind Harrock Wood which proposed plans would destroy - all would merge Irby, Thingwall, Pensby and Landican - these defined villages must remain as part of the heritage and history of the Wirral - the incorrect numbers of future housing does not justify extenuating circumstances to justify the release of such greenbelt and therefore should not be granted).</p> <p>It will affect local wildlife, fauna and vistas.</p> <p>People need countryside as much as housing and it's something that needs protecting in lieu of the health and well-being benefits.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01093	<p>REPRESENTATIONS ON THE WIRRAL LOCAL PLAN DEVELOPMENT OPTIONS REVIEW AND GREEN BELT INITIAL GREEN BELT REVIEW BACKGROUND DOCUMENT REPORT</p> <p>I am instructed by my clients to submit representations on their behalf in regard to the site at Greenways Caravan Storage site in Thingwall. A plan of the site is submitted alongside these representations outlining the site. The site is a previously developed site which is currently occupied by a Caravan Storage facility and a residential property.</p> <p>In summary, it is considered that the methodology of the Green Belt review is flawed and has looked on an overly strategic basis. It has not looked at smaller potential release sites which could contribute positively to the housing requirement as a whole in plots which are more deliverable by virtue of not requiring comprehensive infrastructure works in accordance with Paragraph 68 of the NPPF. For example, the site in question has only been considered as a Green Belt Parcel (SP065) of almost 200Ha, which overlaps Viability Area Zones 3 and 4. Therefore, the conclusions made regarding coalescence of settlements and enclosures are fundamentally flawed.</p> <p>Housing Requirement - It is noted that Wirral Council have a requirement to provide for 12,000 residential units in the 15 year plan period which equates to 800 units per annum. It is further noted that the current consultation proposes 90 residential allocations allocating 2,403 units which include 935 at Wirral Waters. In terms of Green Belt releases, the LPA contest that a release of 7,390 units is required in the plan period, so proposes a release of land for circa 13,700 units to ensure that the target is met. This is a rate of 53.91%. However, the Green Belt releases are intended to account for not just the current plan period, but also the next plan period as well. The housing growth figures do not account for economic growth during the period. Therefore, it is considered that there will be insufficient sites for the future Plan period, and a further Green Belt review would be required at the next Local Plan stage. This would be contrary to NPPF advice at paragraph 136 which requires Green Belt boundaries to be permanent and to endure beyond a single Plan Period. This Green Belt release figures should be extended account for double which would increase a contingency for sites not coming forward in either this plan period or to account for economic growth It is proposed that the Green Belt release figures should be increased to a ratio of double which is equivalent to 14,780 residential units to be released from the Green Belt. This would equate to an additional 1,080 residential units.</p> <p>Initial Review of the Green Belt Methodology - The methodology utilised is outlined in the Initial Review document. It outlines in Section 4 at paragraph 4.1, a 3 Stage approach to considering sites. The approach outlines considering sites against three Stages –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1 - Initial assessment against the purposes of including land in the Green Belt • Stage 2 - Initial assessment of additional physical and policy constraints • Stage 3 - Initial assessment of the likely consequences for sustainable development <p>Section 5 outlines which sites have been considered and includes plans of areas shown. These are outlined to be</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Settlement Areas identified in the existing Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, which were approved by Council in October 2012 (shown in Appendix 1); • The individual parcels of land identified by the Council to support the assessment ('Green Belt Parcels', shown in Appendix 2); and • The sites in the Green Belt submitted by landowners and developers for consideration for future development as part of the annual preparation of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment ('Green Belt SHLAA Sites', shown in Appendix 3). It is considered that although the approach taken is fundamentally correct, consideration should have been paid on smaller sites within the wider area. For example, the proposed allocation site is located within SP065 – Land south of Landican. This site is noted as extending to 191.22Ha. Based on residential development of between 30 and 50 dwellings per hectare, this means that the site has only been considered if it were possible to deliver between 5,737 or 9,561 residential units – or between 42% or 70% of the entire proposed LPA housing figure (based on 13,700 units) or 39% or 65% based on the suggested figures above (14,780 units). This would represent one of the most significant strategic allocations, and it would be beyond reasonable expectation that this extent of site would be found to represent a sustainable or suitable Green Belt release in one location. However, parcel SP065 does have a lot of urban fringe development, where sites (including the proposed site allocation) represent Previously Developed Land (PDL) and whether combined or in isolation could provide a natural extension to the village without being detrimental to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. It is considered that smaller sites should be considered with an assessment being made that the potential allocation of sites. Paragraph 68 of the NPPF outlines that small and medium sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area. Smaller sites can often be built out relatively quickly due to the fact that these are manageable by a single housebuilder without the need to provide comprehensive infrastructure works. Sites that can be considered by the Green Belt review are not necessarily going to fall within the less than 1Ha bracket, but consideration should be paid to these. Due to the initial Green Belt Review document considering only large sites in totality, it is considered that it has fundamentally overlooked smaller sites, and when consideration has been paid to five strategic purposes of the Green as outlined at paragraph 134 of the NPPF, fundamental flaws in the conclusions have been reached. In order to assist, we have adopted a similar methodology to that utilised considering only the smaller site, and considered against the conclusions of site SP065 as outlined in the Appendices of the Initial Green Belt Review Background Paper. In regard to the 5 purposes of the Green Belt, the LPA conclusions on the wider SP065 site are contained within Appendix 3 of the Initial Green Belt Review Background Paper (IGBRBP). The IGBRBP outlines that it is considered the sites serves four of the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt. The only purpose it is not considered to serve is to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. This is agreed. However, considering the smaller site alone, it is also considered that the site does not serve the purposes of preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another, nor to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. This is because the site represents Previously Developed Land, and is in active use for alternative uses which could be relocated to a more appropriate location.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Furthermore, the site as an existing developed site is already well screened from the wider area.</p> <p>Therefore, the only two purposes of including land within the Green Belt that are served are to check the unrestricted sprawl of built up area and to assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Notably, Appendix 3 concludes that every site which is currently located within the Green Belt serves these two purposes. Therefore, this site would represent one of the most worthy sites for removal from the Green Belt and allocation for residential development.</p> <p>Other potential constraint considered by the IGBRBP are outlined as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site is not within Flood Zone 3 (Appendix 4 of the IGBRBP); • The site is not covered by an area of Biodiversity (Appendix 4 of the IGBRBP); • Is not constrained by WeBs (Appendix 6 of the IGBRBP); and • Does not represent the highest quality agricultural land (Appendix 7 of the IGBRBP). <p>National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) Advice</p> <p>Consideration has also been paid to advice contained within the NPPF. Paragraph 138 outlines that:</p> <p>‘When drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account. Strategic policy-making authorities should consider the consequence for sustainable development of channelling development towards urban areas inside Green Belt boundary, towards town and village inset within the Green Belt or towards locations beyond the outer Green Belt boundary. Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well served by public transport. They should set out ways in which the impact of removing land from the Green Belt can be offset through compensatory improvements to the environmental quality and accessibility of the remaining Green Belt land’. Therefore, when releasing land from the Green Belt, the LPA should consider broad location for development, and whether it is appropriate to extend a settlement. Clearly, by reference to other proposed allocations in the plan, the broad location of development adjoining Thingwall is considered acceptable. The first consideration in considering Green Belt release sites is whether the site is previously development land. The site represents previously development land and therefore this should be considered positively.</p> <p>Subsequently, consideration should be paid to public transport. The site is located off the A551 Barnston Road. There is a bus stop directly adjacent to the site access which is served by the 181 route. Furthermore, the site is a short walk from the main shops in Thingwall located on Pensby Road. There are further bus services on this route including the 22, 175 and 472 routes, alongside the shops and services provided. The site is considered to be well served in relation to public transport, and better located than other proposed allocations within the locality.</p> <p>Furthermore, it is considered the site is well screened from the Green Belt at present. Furthermore, there is built form to the south of the site.</p> <p>Conclusion - It is considered that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt Review should look to release additional land to accommodate development. The requirement to release 13,700 units to deliver 7,390 units is not sufficient to account for this plan period and the next when economic growth has not been factored into the figures. Green Belt release should be increased to 14,780 to allow for two Plan Periods and Economic Growth. • An additional 1,080 units Green Belt releases should be made • The Green Belt Review should consider smaller Green Parcels. Considering sites based on areas as large as almost 200 Ha is flawed and previously developed land on the urban fringe should be considered • The proposed site is an ideal Green Belt release site and can deliver residential development within this Plan Period. • The proposed site should be removed from the Green Belt • The proposed site should be allocated for residential development. <p>[Site Location Plan included]</p>
DOR01094	<p>I Have work in Eastham for the best part of 30years...I have always regarded the village as my home as well as my work place... it's conservation has always been maintained by the EVPA...to which I have joined its committee...To build on its Greenbelt would destroy it and create overcrowding & more traffic and pollution...we would lose our trees greenery and it's village ambience ...we have already lost its village school post office and café...there needs to be a sealed covenant on its conservation to protect it...may I suggest that a zone is placed around Eastham to prevent building...can consideration on empty homes and shops be used across wirral be an alternative...there are 9000 conservation villages across the country lets protect what we have before we lose it.....</p>
DOR01095	<p>Don't you dare even think about it, there are so many brown sites, DO NOT RUIN OUR GREEN BELT. Do you ever think about the traffic, are you all morons? Leave our countryside alone because there are plenty of brown sites that can be built on.</p>
DOR01096	<p>I am writing to lodge my objection to the proposed extension of housing into green belt land on the Wirral under the council's proposals.</p> <p>This is something that would change the shape of the Wirral to its detriment for ever. Once the green belt has gone, it has gone for ever.</p> <p>As someone who has lived on the Wirral all their lives, I object strongly to this taking place.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01097	<p>Overall, the above assessment and schedule at Appendix 5 demonstrate that the two parcels being promoted by Wallace Land Investments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • do not contribute significantly to the 5 Green Belt purposes, • are highly accessible, • are largely unfettered in terms of environmental constraints, and • would make a very valuable contribution to housing delivery in an area of greatest need and significant affordability issues. <p>Compared to the other sites assessed, both parcels fair very well and undoubtedly represent reasonable alternative sites compared to many of the Green Belt sites currently put forward by the Council for further consideration as part of the current consultation process. Whilst we will ultimately promote the sites for release from the Green Belt and allocation for housing, all we ask at this stage is that both parcels are put forward for further, more detailed consideration as part of the emerging Local Plan and its associated Sustainability Assessment on the basis that they represent reasonable alternative sites for consideration.</p>
DOR01098	<p>We object to your plans to release Green Belt land for building on fields either side of Lever Causeway and from Mount Road towards Storeton.</p> <p>There are many reasons for our objections, which include the following:</p> <p>Wirral already has at least 5,000 empty houses - Wirral has ample land in urban areas & brownfield sites to build on - Building on Lever Causeway will destroy an historic landmark and completely change the character of the area.</p>
DOR01099	<p>I am writing to provide comment on the Wirral Council's Local Plan Consultation, predominately in the environmental context.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are reports of Common Lizard (<i>Zootoca vivipara</i>) at the area adjacent to Bidston Moss where Wirral Waters plan to construct. This species is protected by the Wildlife & Countryside Act, and is rare on the Wirral, especially around Wallasey. There may also be other reptile species there, such as Slow Worm, which have been recorded in the north Wirral near Leasowe (Gunsite). • The site Wirral Waters wish to develop is scrub habitat which complements the evolving woodland habitat on Bidston Moss, with further floristic diversity that should be urgently accounted for. The biodiversity value for this area is likely underestimated. • At the same site where Wirral Waters wish to develop, there are apple trees that are harvested by the local population & myself personally. • The construction of properties so close to Bidston Moss will greatly devalue this undervalued Forest Commission land, which is becoming a rare wilderness area for the north Wirral since its transformation from a land fill site. • The area immediately west of the M53 by Upton I would judge to be too susceptible to flooding, it being a wet area. In fact I would propose restoration of the area as a wetland. The green space along the M53 in general needs protecting as it will be the corridor for wildlife to reach the north Wirral. • The area of proposed development immediately south of Bidston station, from examining records, seems to be a wetland area, and paving over this area could cause flooding elsewhere. This is also complementary to the corridor connecting Bidston Moss to the rest of the Wirral. • Where there have been losses of green space land, the council should invest in creating "biodiversity net gain" through restoration of degraded habitats, such as farmland or waste land (suggestions above).
DOR01100	<p>I oppose the re-designation of any of Wirral's Greenbelt. Greenbelt was established for the reasons set out in the NPPF. Greenbelt should never be used as a for short term financial remedy by the Council seeking to build houses to gather Council tax income. It is there to be enjoyed for generations to come and not be ruined by this one. The consultation is flawed as it uses out of date figures. The consultation should never have been started with new ONS data due out part way through the process. The new data has rendered the consultation useless. The consultation asks for comments on a review of greenbelt sufficient for 70,000 average sized homes when the ONS data suggests that none need to be built on greenbelt. There are enough brownfield sites to fulfil our need and this is where development should occur. There is no 'shortage' of band H houses as Cllr George Davies suggests. We need to bring empty properties back in to use. The Council need to work with Peel Holdings to bring Wirral Waters forward. The Council should have published the results of the public consultation into the green belt review methodology which was completed last December. They are not being open and transparent. Climate change is happening now and green belt mitigates against climate change pollution and flooding. Green Belt development encourages car dependency. We need social housing not executive houses away from public transport links. We need farmland. The Council should:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Complete a re-evaluation of the housing needs for Wirral taking into account the historical population and household numbers and trends, the recent lack of economic growth and the likely dramatic effects of Brexit on the economic prospects for Wirral. The likely economic downturn as a result of Brexit has not been factored in. A model has been chosen to suit the Council house building aims. 2. Challenge the Government's housing targets for Wirral arguing that there is compelling evidence to adopt an alternative approach to the calculation of housing needs. 3. Argue that the above factors will dramatically reduce the anticipated housing needs for Wirral and suggest a much lower figure. Look at [another respondent's] trend analysis. 4. Complete a consultation with the public to include prioritising the construction of social, starter and affordable homes on a brownfield first basis. The consultation should invite comments on inter alia compulsory purchase options for land owned by Peel Holdings and the development of a regeneration plan for that area and other areas, bearing in mind that the Wirral Waters site is eligible for substantial Government grants. 5. Complete a revised and widely agreed local plan to be consulted on in all our communities. This public consultation should be led by Councillors to ensure the voices of all Wirral's citizens are

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>listened to and acted upon according to the Aarhus convention.</p> <p>6. Oppose the re-designation of Greenbelt for house building. Reiterate its commitment to preserving Wirral's Greenbelt and to cancel the proposed Hoylake Golf Resort. The Council I am told are aiming for 'acceptance', this release of any greenbelt is unacceptable and never will be by residents.</p>
DOR01101	<p>Irish Community Care (ICC) is concerned that local Gypsy and Traveller communities, their families and other community members residing or resorting to Wirral, are missing from the public consultation processes' consideration of needs, as it stands; there being no reference to the GTAA 2014 or to the requirement to identify land within the Local Plan, in any consultation document relating to this consultation.</p> <p>From GTAA 2014, Table ES3 Summary of transit pitch requirements 2013/14 to 2017/18 identifies that there is a need for 4 transit double pitches – that is, able to accommodate 2 caravans each, to a maximum of 8 caravans. This size pitch supports cultural needs, health & safety, community cohesion and good mental health as families are not crammed together. This need has been echoed by the most up-to-date full year data that ICC has, for unauthorised encampments, 2017-18 wherein 58 people at 16 encampments were recorded, from 29/03/17 to 15/11/17. Within that data are 4 transit site requests to support the wish to stay temporarily in Wirral and highlighting a willingness to utilise transit provision. Thirteen of 16 encampments identified that no permanent residency was required as families were exercising either cultural nomadism, or travelling to ensure their entitlement to remain within the definition of "gypsy status" under the 2016 Planning Act.</p> <p>Furthermore, the GTAA recommends 7 permanent pitches up to 2019 to meet residential needs that have not been delivered.</p> <p>ICC would have wished to see reference to Wirral's Policy CS24 – Criteria for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople, within the consultation processes, as it sets out criteria for the determination of planning applications for accommodation for Gypsies and Travellers and Travelling Showpeople and highlights the need to reference more than the single GTAA document when considering Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs:</p> <p>From Policy CS24 – Revised Sustainability Appraisal Table (November 2014) "Summary Social Inclusion Statement –Positive, medium to long-term, permanent effect. The policy is likely to have positive impacts on all five elements of social inclusion".</p> <p>There are a range of positive outcomes in including Gypsy and Traveller accommodation needs within this Development Options Review:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It offers Wirral an opportunity to address the now delayed GTAA 2014 accommodation needs requirements (4 transit pitches and 7 permanent pitches to 2019); • Inclusion of the above Traveller site pitches within the newly released greenbelt land minimises the impacts of development upon that land, in that they impact less than bricks and mortar housing would and can be screened more effectively. • The size of the required sites will have less impact upon the visual amenity and effect of the greenbelt, than bricks and mortar housing. • Small caravan sites have been passed in greenbelt land in a range of local authorities surrounding Wirral with positive effects upon community cohesion thereby addressing Quality of Life within CS24. • Local Plans must identify land, where need is identified; and lacking this there is a reputational and legal risk of having less suitable planning application decisions, and decisions on encampments taken out of Wirral Council's hands. Including GTAA accommodation provision into the wider delivery of accommodation through release of green belt land, mitigates this risk as it meets the local authority requirement. • ICC has statements from Wirral Travellers identifying that it is the access to space and "fresh air" which is a significant factor in their decision to live within the Borough (just like many settled community residents we are sure). • Utilising greenbelt to deliver Traveller accommodation requirements will be most likely to be suitable and culturally acceptable, improving Traveller community quality of life, and therefore significant in improving the outcomes for the most excluded community in Wirral. • Utilising greenbelt also ameliorates the impact of a Traveller site upon the activities of both communities, offering Travellers access to suitable space without Wirral Council having to deliver sites within already overcrowded conditions in built up areas. (See also the statement below from CS24 which is addressed by this application of land use) • ICC are able to support Wirral Council community consultations with both settled and Traveller communities, required to ensure the most positive outcomes possible within the GTAA and Local Plan processes, and addressing concerns from Policy CS24 – Revised Sustainability Appraisal Table (November 2014) • "Summary Social Inclusion Statement. Quality of Life"...but uncertain effect on general attractiveness owing to the uncertain impact on local perceptions, even if relevant safeguards are secured through Policy CS21 (New Housing Development) and Policy CS43 (Design, Heritage and Amenity)". ICC has been able to demonstrate positive outcomes with community Residents groups in Cheshire, working with Cheshire West Council prior to the development of the Gypsy Traveller sites there. <p>ICC supports the statement made by Cabinet within the Core Strategy Local Plan - Report of Further Consultation on Housing Need and Land Supply Council Meeting. The report sets out the results of the review of development options approved by Cabinet in February 2017 (Minute 96), where the Cabinet noted that "The recommendations contained in the report, if approved, could support the delivery of the Wirral Plan pledge for good quality housing which met the needs of residents; and Wirral Plan Housing Strategy objectives to build more homes to meet the Council's economic growth ambitions and improve the quality of the housing offer for Wirral's residents. ICC would add that by including Gypsy Traveller accommodation within the pledge to deliver good quality accommodation, Wirral are meeting the pledge inclusively, addressing the most pressing needs, saving money in eviction costs and reducing community frictions.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01102	I disagree that there is any need for Wirral Council to redesignate any Green Belt land for the development purposes. This is based upon the view that incorrect figures and methodology has been used to establish that there is a shortfall. The baseline figures are incorrect, the population is shrinking not growing and the buffer added for additional houses should of been part of the baseline not increase it. More specifically SP062 development would merge 3 housing areas, Heswall, Barnston and Prenton, removing special character of an historic town. The land is prime agricultural use, contains a river corridor and both public and animal right of ways all of which are prime green belt factors therefore even if some sites should be chosen this should not be one selected.
DOR01103	[SAME AS DOR00455] Levers Causeway is a local historical landmark. The tree lined causeway is exceptional it encourages local people to exercise in a safe way walking, running and cycling. The cycle path which the council installed some years ago with great pride is a well used amenity and building alongside will make it fundamentally unsafe.
DOR01104	Both my wife and I object to the plans that have been put forward for the proposed use of Wirral's green belt. Where will our "green and pleasant land" be by the time all these plans have been implemented? One of the biggest problems is that there are not enough suitable premises for single people. Many properties which in years gone by were starter family homes are now inhabited by a single person (the young are equally if not more prevalent in this type of accommodation) and yet this is promoted by giving a single person occupancy reduction. There are many empty properties unused in the area. So many more reasons to object but not enough time to list them all. The Wirral is only a small area are the plans pro rata in comparison to other areas who can afford the amount of land without impinging too much on the amount left of their green belt? They will still have plenty of land around them.
DOR01105	While appreciating that Central government has required consuls to identify green belt area for development, I do not agree with this policy and hope you can oppose it. The SE and London may need to impose this po lift but the NW, doing other things, has more need to redevelop run down urban areas and brown field sites seen abundant in Birkenhead. Please give Birkenhead a face lift and do not build on green belt.
DOR01106	Brackenwood Golf course. We would like to register our concern and opposition to your plans for the Proposed Green Belt Site under site reference SP038 . There has already been an impact on increased traffic due to the new doctor's surgery opening on Brackenwood Road. Access to Teehey Lane from Mount Road via Bracken Lane is now an extreme challenge at times due to the volume of cars parked along the road as the surgery car park is full. Aside from the present challenges we face on a daily basis, any development of the golf course would result in chaos on a number of fronts. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Adverse effect on the residential amenity of neighbours, by reason of (among other factors) noise, disturbance, overlooking, loss of privacy, overshadowing, etc. (but note that this does not include noise or disturbance arising from the actual execution of the works) • Unacceptably high density / over-development of the site. • Visual impact of the development. • Effect of the development on the character of the neighbourhood. • The proposed development would be over-bearing, out-of-scale or out of character in terms of its appearance compared with existing development in the vicinity. • The loss of existing views from neighbouring properties would adversely affect the residential amenity of neighbouring owners. • The development would adversely affect highway safety or the convenience of road users due to what could be a huge increase in traffic, travelling along roads/networks that weren't designed for this volume. • Massive impact on local wildlife. We have bats, woodpeckers, hedgehogs, owls to name but a few that visit our garden coming across from the woodland areas around the golf course.
DOR01107	I write to express my complete opposition to the proposed plans to build over the green belt lands of the Wirral. I am amazed that such plans could ever progress so far and I can only believe that unthinking philistines are behind such proposed wanton destruction. It is all too simple to build over green fields and destroy the character of the Wirral forever. I can not believe firstly that there is such a demand for new houses or secondly that there is not a viable alternative.
DOR01108	I strongly disagree that there is any need for Wirral Council to consider the redesign action of any green belt land for development purposes, specifically Strategic Parcel 062. As the analysis paper attached clearly concludes, there is absolutely no case for building on green belt Strategic Parcel 062 .
DOR01109	We write to voice our objection on the proposal to sell of various acres of land adjacent to Lever Causeway for housing development. As Prenton residents of 45 years, we have been fortunate enough to enjoy the green spaces on Wirral. The creep of housing has of course been evident but to date has not bitten into the green belt that separates the Prenton area from the mid Wirral via the Lever Causeway. This separation we believe is vital, as any loss of the Causeway will only encourage further development south of the Causeway to either side on the Mway and ultimately towards Barnston. Consider as well the enormous strain to a very congested road system in the area and you have a recipe for severe congestion and even more pollution. If there were any compelling figures to suggest that this proposal was necessary, I would be keen to see them, but from my own studies no such information can prove this point. Furthermore, there are still many brownfield areas that could be delivered for housing. Also just take a hard look at what is happening to high streets all over the UK including the Wirral. Come up with a plan for redeveloping these areas without just grabbing our green heritage which you as our elected representatives have a duty to preserve for future generations. The Causeway is a unique glorious avenue of green which MUST BE PRESERVED .

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01110	<p>Concerns regarding the proposal to lift the greenbelt area in Higher Bebington involving the area from Claremont farm to Prenton Golf club also covering Storeton village and the Lever Causeway - to enable houses to be built.</p> <p>My concerns are:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are other brownfield sites on the Wirral which would be more suitable • Storeton Road and Lever Causeway are busy main roads and adding additional housing developments on these would cause chaos • The proposal would obliterate acres of countryside which, at the moment, act as an essential 'green lung' to the Bebington and Birkenhead areas • Once we destroy this countryside it will be gone for ever <p>I have lived in Higher Bebington most of my adult life (73 years) and regularly walk down the Lever Causeway and related areas, as do countless other people. I appeal to you to reconsider your plans and keep the Wirral Greenbelt in place.</p>
DOR01111	<p>Objection to the proposed extension of housing into green belt land on the Wirral under the council's proposals.</p> <p>This is something that would change the shape of the Wirral to its detriment for ever. Once the green belt has gone, it has gone for ever.</p>
DOR01112	<p>We would like this site to be part of the proposed housing allocation on the basis that the site has been sterilised as a industrial site in its former occupation by the surrounding residential development ie Wirral Waters One which cuts off access to the basin for any transport.</p> <p>In addition the local electrical infrastructure cannot support any expansion due to insufficient capacity available within the distribution network despite there being a sub station on site this can restrict the possible tenants and employment.</p>
DOR01113	<p>Given the amount of brownfield sites available in Birkenhead and elsewhere I am deeply perturbed by your plans to build on lovely green field sites such as Lever Causeway. What are we going to leave for our children and grandchildren if we continue to decimate the countryside on our small island (and smaller peninsula)?</p> <p>Please re-think your policies before it's too late for us all. The greed of developers and back handers to local government officials should not see the majority suffer.</p> <p>What are your intentions for the aforementioned land? I pray that you do not build.</p>
DOR01114	<p>Formally register my objection to the WIRRAL BOROUGH COUNCIL'S CURRENT PROPOSALS (AKA The Wirral Plan) for building on Green Belt generally, in in particular against the inclusion of releasing the green belt around Barnston Village, for the following reasons</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads, drainage, sewers, schools, doctors, amenities and infrastructure around Barnston cannot support such a development • Traffic Management is a key concern, the roads into and out of Barnston are of limited capability – increased usage would create a very real risk of increased serious incidents and even loss of life • The land around Barnston is very susceptible to flooding, any development will greatly increase this situation • Barnston is a separate village, surrounded by farmland and woods, if development around Barnston is allowed to take place then the Village will lose its identity. Barnston will be merged with Pensby and Thingwall via urban sprawl. I believe this breaks a "rule" to prevent neighbouring villages and towns from merging into one-another. Any view that Barnston and Pensby or Thingwall is already "one" is a cynical misrepresentation of the truth. • Dramatic and negative impact to the wildlife and their habitats (biodiversity) – we have a wide range of wildlife and habitats in and around Barnston including bats, owls and diverse birds and mammals • Dramatic and negative impact (disturbance and destruction) to historic footpaths and leisure opportunities in the area • Thingwall reservoir must be taken into consideration as an increased risk factor resulting from such close development • My understanding is that land may only be removed from the Green Belt under "exceptional circumstances", but the proposals fail to meet the Green Belt criteria as laid down in the National Planning Policy Framework • The Green Belt is enjoyed by ALL Wirral residents – accessible due to the size of the Borough – contributing to Development on the existing Green Belt farmlands will destroy the unique and separate character of existing villages, resulting in excessive urban sprawl • There are a number of active farms around Barnston, the land is currently in continuous use for livestock and agricultural (i.e. cattle, beans and haymaking). Any development of the land will resulting in these farms becoming unviable and hence threaten currently active agriculture and may breach agricultural policy • My understanding is that The Wirral Plan is driven by the government plan to produce affordable housing. People who live in this area are either retired or commute, there is not the demand in this area for affordable houses. If the greenbelt is released to developers they would not produce affordable houses <p>With regards to the plan generally</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Such development will forever change the nature of the landscape and environment to such an extent that The Wirral will lose its special character – the very reason why people choose to live and visit here would be lost • This would greatly impact tourism and leisure opportunities • I do not believe the Wirral has the demand for the housing numbers proposed within the plan (both in terms of projected future population and job opportunities)

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I have attended many meetings and considered the background to the plan – I believe that the methodology (baseline, buffer, future projections etc) used to calculate the numbers needed is fundamentally flawed • I believe there is sufficient brownfield sites around the Wirral to that could support the development needed • It may be more expensive to develop brownfield sites, but any “extra” cost would be worth the preservation of the key attributes that give The Wirral it’s character – once the greenbelt is lost it is irreversible, it will be lost to future generations. I urge you to not let this happen “on your watch”, please do not let this be “your legacy” • The issues that have delayed Peel Holdings development of Wirral Waters are not insurmountable – it is worth a concerted effort to overcome these issues to enable a large percentage of any required provision of housing to be placed at Wirral Waters in order avoid the long-term, irrevocable damage represented by the alternative (i.e. release of greenbelt) <p>I understand the need for more housing, and I understand that the council must produce a Plan to submit to Central Government. I also understand that The Plan is driven by a standard formula that has been applied across the UK despite the fact that clearly “one size does not fit all”. I do not believe that numbers resulting from this standard formula when applied to The Wirral is appropriate for The Wirral and I urge the council to rethink the current proposals. The key concern is not that houses will be built but where they will be built at the expense of the environment, the nature and the character of The Wirral. Hence, I especially urge the council to vastly reduce any proposal to release greenbelt and to greatly increase the focus on the use of brownfield sites and use of empty houses, plots and large buildings to create homes (houses and flats).</p> <p>On a personal note, we have had the pleasure of living in Barnston Village here on The Wirral for over 20 years and raised our children here. We moved from a large, urban area and was attracted by the peaceful, quiet nature of the area whilst still being served by the amenities appropriate to the population. If the proposed development resulting in the release of greenbelt around Barnston goes ahead we will be looking to move out of The Wirral and I am sure many others will be of the same mindset.</p>
DOR01115	<p>(SHLAA, 2018) (SP0716 and 0718) the land at EP1</p> <p>With regard to the environmental role, the release of this site for residential development would ensure the efficient and effective use of an under-utilised site within the settlement boundaries of West Kirby. The site is highly sustainable in terms of proximity to public transport options and key services, and its release for housing would relieve the development pressures on more sensitive greenfield sites across the Borough. The environmental dimension of the proposed development would be satisfied. We consider that the proposed development would comprise sustainable development for the purposes of the NPPF. Wirral Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) 2016 The Wirral SHLAA 2016 identifies the sites at EP1 as being Category 3 sites and available for housing over the long-term (SP0716 and 0718). The site is suitable for residential development within the early part of the plan-period and would address the Borough’s substantial housing needs in a highly sustainable manner.</p>
DOR01116	<p>Strongly oppose the proposed release of Green Belt land across the Wirral. The reasons for my objection are detailed as follows;</p> <p>Social & Economic - The release of Green Belt has been proposed to support the local plan to build approx. 12,000 new homes across the Wirral by 2035 to address the need for affordable housing and to help the Government implement their modern industrial strategy. As you know the Office of National Statistics has released revised figures which support the case that this original figure is inflated and that the actual housing need is significantly less. Why release Green Belt land if the very reason for releasing it cannot be objectively justified? When we are faced with uncertainty about how the economy and the housing market will be affected by Brexit after March 2019, building thousands of homes which are not required does not seem a logical or financially sound decision to make.</p> <p>Ecological - There will be a significant impact on the birds and animals that inhabit these areas - as you know they provide a natural habitat for a variety of birds and other animals, who rely on the hedgerows, trees and vegetation for food and shelter.</p> <p>I live adjacent to the green areas under threat to the North of Gills Lane and West of Barnston Village and observe on a regular basis a broad range of birds that one would not see in such numbers and as frequently in a more suburban setting. Extensive development of Green Belt on the Wirral will displace numerous species that are already declining in numbers. The green areas of the Wirral should be protected for future generations to enjoy, once this land is built on it will be gone forever.</p> <p>Political - I have been advised that the Labour Councillors who govern the administration of the council are intending to vote for the release of Green Belt land to ensure that they remain in control of the local plan and avoid direct intervention from the Conservative government. I ask the question – how can 2 wrongs make a right? If releasing the Green Belt means that it will be easier for property developers to purchase it in the open market the council will be giving control away to private businesses when the volume of houses actually required does not justify this course of action. As we have seen with Peel Land & Property, private developers often have their own agenda which is not always transparent or in the best interests of the local population.</p> <p>Personal - My neighbours and I will be personally affected if building goes ahead on the land on the green fields to the North of Gills Lane and West of Barnston Village. As residents of we are surrounded on all sides by Greenbelt. One of the key factors that influenced our decision to buy a home in this location was the amenity provided by the surrounding green areas. Our houses were originally built for agricultural workers and were not designed to exist in a built up setting. We all have small, shallow back yards which face out onto the green fields. If back to back development takes place we will be deprived of the quiet enjoyment of our homes. With limited space to the rear of our houses there will be a significant reduction in privacy, we will be hemmed in by and over looked by other houses.</p> <p>The option of selling my home is limited as it is highly probable that the number of potential buyers will be reduced due to the proposed release of the green belt. There are already 2 houses up for sale in the road that have been on the market for some considerable time. Many people would be put off purchasing a home in this road with the prospect of large scale construction taking place</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>immediately next to where they would be living.</p> <p>It is also highly probable that the value of the houses in the road will be adversely affected by both the release of the Green Belt and any future property development on that land.</p> <p>Congestion and disruption - Should development take place the volume of traffic along Gills Lane will increase significantly. Gills Lane is a narrow road which was not designed for heavy traffic, it is already used as a “rat run” with motorists regularly driving at speed and in a manner which is dangerous to others. Any future increase in population will increase the volume of traffic and the risk of accidents on Gills Lane.</p> <p>Flood risk - Existing sewage pipes on Thorncroft drive regularly cause problems – several times a year United Utilities have to come and clear up raw sewage from our drives and garages when the pipes under the road become flooded. I am concerned that building additional homes on the surrounding fields will increase the risk of flooding as surface drainage will be affected.</p> <p>Boundaries - I have been advised that legislation was passed in recent years that sets down which boundaries are “recognised” and which towns are considered separate, and that because of this recent legislation the villages of Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston are not recognised as separate.</p> <p>However these villages have been recognised as separate by generations of local people over centuries. In addition, postal addresses, local maps and road signs also represent these areas as separate, in which case I believe there is an historical precedent which should be considered when looking at the prevention of neighbouring towns merging into one and other. In reality these 3 villages will merge if the Green Belt is built on, regardless of whether recent legislation regards Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston as separate or not.</p>
DOR01117	<p>Objection to the ill thought-out Wirral UDP encroach upon Green Belt along the M53 Corridor. Certainly within the Bebington/Clatterbridge area it takes no account of the heavy congestion it will place upon all essential services and gives inadequate consideration to infrastructure relating to major utility and transport needs for housing development and area expansion. Importantly It ignores work started by a US study in 2007 and reported on at that time regarding the dangers of domiciling within 500 mtrs of motorways. Reported in news papers at that time a Department of Health spokeswoman said: “This evidence will be considered amongst other evidence of possible ill health from motorways or other Vehicle emissions. We will look into whether this needs further investigation.”</p> <p>Surprisingly, 11years later and with nothing apparently done, the research reported in 2018 from King’s College London and St George’s University of London have endorsed the dangers highlighted in the US Study and linked the dangers of Dementia cases to Diesel fumes. Indeed the very latest research results carried out by Queen Mary University London also in 2018 were highly significant and presented to the European Respiratory International Congress. With headlines such as “Air Pollution can reach the baby in the womb” who would be surprised! In relation to this a spokesman for the Department of Environment, Food and Rural Affairs said “Air pollution is a top environmental risk to human health in the UK and while air quality has improved significantly since 2010 we recognise that we have more to do”.</p> <p>So, while air improvement is a National objective do we take it that this policy does not apply to the Wirral when giving consideration to the UDP? In addition and with the knowledge of this significant health risk, who would want to buy a property within 500 mtrs of the M53? For the UDP to endorse housing expansion next to the M53 Corridor, the decision to plan for this appears to border on gross negligence, blinkered and flawed thinking. It also reveals a total lack of due diligence on the part of the planners and their supporting politicians in having no regard for the latest reported health issues. In particular those now known from contact with the dangerous emission of exhaust particulates.</p> <p>From the personal view point it’s comforting in the knowledge that within the present legal climate in the UK, those knowingly and having ignored the facts in their deliberations and decisions can be take out of retirement and put on the Stand to explain the consequences of their actions. Even though it may be many years after they took cavalier attitudes with the health and welfare of other people’s lives and those of their children.</p>
DOR01118	<p>Formally reject your plans for the removal of the car park adjacent to the main village adjacent to the shops and library. This would be a total disaster for the village and destroy trade and dissuade people from visiting the local shops and amenities. It could also pose a safety hazard due to the lack of parking facilities.</p>
DOR01119	<p>(Green Belt Parcel: SP058C / SHLAA Ref: 0642)</p> <p>The Site is available for a residential development at the earliest opportunity. Tesni have a legal interest over the land, and there are no environmental or technical constraints that without appropriate mitigation should hinder development. The Site is in a sustainable location served by existing local services and located in an area where there is an identified need for housing for families, the elderly and those seeking affordable housing.</p> <p>Furthermore, our viability appraisal of the land and its development potential / value (and assuming market conditions remain fairly buoyant) suggests that there is unlikely to be any problems in delivering the full policy-compliant level and type of affordable housing) where it has identified that there is a large underlying need for more affordable properties in Heswall.</p> <p>Reliance on large strategic sites may or may not deliver the housing in a timely manner the new NPPF policy framework supports a focus on small and medium sites as making an important contribution to requirements, as they are often built-out relatively quickly.</p> <p>Tesni would therefore request that the site is allocated for residential development in the Local Plan and would be pleased to have further discussions with the Council over the merits of the site.</p>
DOR01120	<p>Figures released by the ONS, along with the empty homes we have in Wirral clearly demonstrate that there is no need to build on green belt in Wirral, and that includes the plan to build executive homes as part of the councils Hoylake Golf Resort folly</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01121	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The council must include all brown field land suitable for building dwellings to mitigate the use of green belt land. To this end it is paramount that the whole of the Wirral Waters scheme are included in any targets for housing units along with the existing empty housing stock. 2. If Green Belt land has to be released for housing to meet any targets then it should be firstly allocated according to its proximity to main transport and public transport routes to provide access for residents to jobs, schools, shops and other public amenities. 3. The Green Belt land which must be protected at all costs is that which is <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prime agricultural land which is farmed each year • Adjacent to the River Dee to preserve access to the Estuary which is a Site of Special Scientific Interest as notified under Section 28 of the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981 • Adjacent to the Wirral Circular Trail, one of the recognised 'jewels in the crown' of Wirral Tourism attracting people to our peninsula to enjoy cycling and walking. To preserve the green belt land adjacent to this leisure facility is necessary if your statements "If you're looking for a ride with stunning views.."and "is predominantly traffic free..." taken from 'visitwirral.com' are to be maintained
DOR01122	I'm protesting against building on/over Lever Causeway. I feel this is harming the environment and wildlife that is situated around Lever Causeway, it has always been a rural area. This will be a shame for future generations to experience such a splendid country walk when we have so many other urban areas to build on.
DOR01123	<p>I vociferously defend our environment at every opportunity. It may come as a surprise that I don't completely agree with most people who are currently very angry at the latest threat to our greenbelt. Most people are probably under the illusion that preservation of our greenbelt is important to protect wildlife and our environment, but that is a total misconception. Some people undoubtedly also believe that the current state of our countryside is natural and the way that it should be. These misconceptions are certainly believed by the majority of 'nimby's' who rarely even visit their local 'countryside'. The reality is that most of our open 'countryside' is far from 'natural' and farming practices are extremely harmful to our wildlife and environment. Our naturally occurring countryside is mostly broad-leaved mixed woodland, supporting a rich bio-diversity, whereas most farmers' fields are nothing more than 'sterile' and barren, and devoid of any biodiversity at all. What is more, farmers' livestock is responsible for approx. one sixth of all 'greenhouse' gases, whilst at the same time farms do nothing whatsoever to counter the harm that they are doing, which also includes pesticide and fertiliser run-off into local waterways etc. This is despite farmers receiving immense E.U. subsidies to encourage them to be more 'environmentally friendly'. e.g. They have been paid to 'set aside' land i.e. to do nothing with areas of their land to allow it to naturally re-colonise for the benefit of wildlife etc. Unfortunately they have taken the money and continued farming as 'normal' with no consideration for the environment whatsoever, and this has been despite them being far too successful at food production already. In the past, this has led to food 'mountains' which have then later been wasted and destroyed due to shocking 'protocols' prohibiting the food being distributed to more needier parts of the world. You may have now realised that I am not a supporter of our local farming community, indeed I despise the local farmers who regard their own livestock as nothing more than 'meat, milk and money'. I love and respect all animals, and I stroke and even sing (yes, I did just say that!) to the local cows whenever they are close enough to the footpaths bordering the fields. They certainly enjoy my visits, and my dog also has a great mutual respect with the cows. I think it's disgraceful that humans still eat these animals in the 21st century when there is no need at all. Unlike most objectors to the current proposals, I regularly visit my local 'open countryside' which in reality is not open at all. I think that it is utterly immoral that human beings are often 'herded' down narrow and dangerously muddy footpaths alongside fields, with nothing more than a barbed wire fence to grab hold of if we slip over. Some of these fields, including the nearest field to my house, are massive and used for nothing more than growing hay to feed the cows in the winter, all of which is not good for the environment. If there was just one tree absorbing carbon in the fields, and providing some shelter and respite from intense sunlight for their cows and sheep in the summer, I might not be so critical of the farmers. My stance is mostly due to all of the confrontations, however, that I've had with belligerent, arrogant farmers in the past who consider the public as intruders and a 'nuisance' that they don't think they should have to tolerate. My view is this:- It's far better to build 'garden towns', complete with new planted woodlands within the developments, on the less productive and most environment-damaging fields, rather than try to pack even more housing into urban areas which have little or no open space for the locals to enjoy already. Those new houses will have gardens that some residents will want to plant trees into; indeed I think that everyone who has a garden should be compelled by law to have trees etc. Wildlife 'corridors' could be designed into the plans enabling wildlife to thrive and spread naturally in ways that are almost impossible across barren fields. The only issue for consideration should be whether there are already trees, vegetation, wildlife etc., and if there isn't any there should be!</p> <p>If there are brownfield sites which have reverted to a 'wild state' due to 'neglect' the wildlife there is usually more abundant than in the farmers' fields, and therefore far more important ecologically etc. Wildlife doesn't care what is or isn't 'greenbelt'; it doesn't look at a map for the 'green' coloured-in areas or follow a 'sat-nav' to find a place to forage or consider suitable habitat! I don't care what is officially greenbelt, after all there seems to be no differentiation between barren fields or dense woodland e.g. the community area on Fishers Lane, Pensby, that has a massive sports field plus a much smaller area of woodland is considered greenbelt of uniform status, despite the field being very costly in maintenance, both financially and environmentally (mowing squanders fossil fuel and contributes immensely to atmospheric carbon), as opposed to the woodland that costs nothing yet contributes immensely and positively to the environment, especially in 'locking-up' carbon and filtering pollutants etc. I don't believe there's any necessity to build 1000s of new houses on the Wirral, but if this government forces our council to build so many then please build on those awful fields instead of squeezing houses into cramped areas that the locals value due to trees etc. present. Such wildlife 'oasis' areas are much loved and treasured in major cities by locals and should be protected by local councils. Please keep me informed and I will welcome any councillors 'feedback' from my comments, so forward this e-mail on to anyone who may be interested if you wish. I'm sure that some people will be very surprised!.</p> <p>[Photo included]</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01124	I disagree that there is any need for Wirral Council to redesignate any Green Belt land for the development purposes. This is based upon the view that incorrect figures and methodology has been used to establish that there is a shortfall. The baseline figures are incorrect, the population is shrinking not growing and the buffer added for additional houses should of been part of the baseline not increase it. More specifically SP062 development would merge 3 housing areas, Heswall, Barnston and Prenton, removing special character of a historic town. The land is prime agricultural use, contains a river corridor and both public and animal right of ways all of which are prime green belt factors therefore even if some sites should be chosen this should not be one selected
DOR01125	To formally submit my objections to the above plans for the following reasons: - The strain on local services- schools, health, transport- are already at breaking point with no plans to improve these. - The land identified is mainly agricultural and/or protected woodland that is heavily visited and recreationally used by the local and wider population. The removal of both of these could have devastating impact on the local area and businesses. - There are a multitude of brownsites suitable for use- either in the surrounding area or in the wider Wirral areas.
DOR01126	I believe we're fortunate in Wirral to still possess a large area of Green Belt providing, thanks to its footpaths, publicly accessible breathing space, significant biodiverse wildlife habitat (particularly the locally unique Dibbinsdale and Plymyard Dale) and productive farm estates whilst at the same time having one of the finest urban development sites in the UK at 'Wirral Waters'. It is deeply regrettable, in the light of these adverse Green Belt proposals that the site's owner has effectively sat on their holding for the last 12 years and are only now showing signs of progressing their promises in a meaningful way. I can't be alone in thinking that the best way of meeting Wirral's housing needs, especially in the light of both a declining population and perhaps questionable conclusions based on flawed statistical analysis, is to progress Wirral Waters to its fullest possible extent providing as it should precisely the kind of high quality, high density mixed use urban development the borough (and Birkenhead in particular) so conspicuously lacks. This should be in addition to utilizing all other realistic brownfield sites as well returning to use as many of Wirral's unoccupied properties as possible. Such an approach must surely be preferable to the alternative - an irrevocable loss of so much of the precious green spaces which still serve to define Wirral and help make it such a special place to live.
DOR01127	[SAME AS DOR00455]
DOR01128	I object to building on Wirral Green Belt land.
DOR01129	In conclusion based on the review of the evidence to support the allocation of the Bromborough Wharf site for long-term employment use and the evidence in relation to housing needs and supply we conclude that the site should be allocated for residential led mixed use on the basis that: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Large scale employment uses is not viable or deliverable due to a lack of demand and viability • It will support the housing needs and housing land requirements of the Wirral in the context of a lack of a deliverable 5 year housing land supply and to avoid the unnecessary development of Green Belt • It will improve the setting and environment of the adjacent Bromborough Pool Conservation Area and Coastal Zone SSSI • It is located in a sustainable location for residential development and will contribute to the 3 dimensions of sustainable development – economic, social and environmental through significant benefits • It is available and deliverable for residential led development and its allocation will assist Wirral Council in meeting its challenging delivery trajectory early in the Plan period.
DOR01130	I strongly oppose proposals by Wirral Borough Council that it will use current green belt land for the construction of new housing as part of the Local Plan. I would like to know what merit a “one-size-fits-all” approach taken by Central Government in calculating new housing requirements has in Wirral - which clearly doesn't need 800 new homes per year. Can someone please explain what the thinking is behind this and why an alternative, bespoke calculation specific to Wirral's own population changes can't be used?
DOR01131	I am writing to object wholeheartedly to the prospect of a large developer who has paid Vyners for the option to buy the field north of Diamond Farm. The farmer uses this field to graze his cattle and without it, the farmer would not be able to continue running the farm. Diamond Farm is in the Conservation Area of Saughall Massie village. Saughall Massie's long standing heritage has been in farming and Diamond Farm has been a working farm since 1911. This is a perfectly functional and productive farm with cattle being raised for beef. The present farmer's father before him nurtured dairy herds for many years before retiring. On retirement the farmer's sons, and other farm workers employed there, took over management of the farm. The present farmer and all his workers, who have worked on this farm for years, and wish to remain, would all be put at risk of losing their livelihoods if this purchase went ahead and, no doubt, these men will have families who depend on their income. If this farm was uninhabited or derelict, then there might be a case for a wealthy land owner seizing it to add to his national house building portfolio. However, I believe for this to happen, under these circumstances, would be morally wrong. From my knowledge, wealthy land barons and house building companies (example Vyners and Wimpy), own land for building on across the length and breadth of the country. They have secured land for this purpose in Saughall Massie before now - so much so - that what was once fields of agricultural land, as far as the eye could see, is now a series of housing estates and developments with small areas of green belt or green space sandwiched in between. To take away this working farm and replace it with yet more housing would totally alter the essence of this historic, agricultural, 'semi-rural' Conservation Area. This is because Diamond Farm and the visual aspect of its cattle grazing on the pasture land is the most important feature which characterises this village. Referring to Saughall Massie's Conservation Area and Appraisal / Management Plan, in section 3.4.2 it states "agricultural land and related features are seen throughout the Conservation Area and are important in distinguishing Saughall Massie from the many suburbanised historic villages in Wirral". A further document entitled "Living in a Conservation Area" under the heading 'Planning Constraints' there is a sub-heading: What is a Conservation Area? The second paragraph reads: - Conservations Areas are very much part of

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>the familiar and cherished local scene. Every area has its own distinct character derived from its landscape, historic development, use, building materials and particular features. The individual buildings, street furniture, open spaces, trees and gardens will all contribute to create the particular character of the area as a whole. To expand a little more it goes on to say that "The open fields around the village form an attractive setting for the Conservation Area and are critical to its continued agricultural use and character. There are many hedgerows and trees within and adjacent to fields which are important both visually and ecologically. The agricultural land outside the Conservation Area is also critical to its setting and visual character. In section 7.0 - Summary of Special Character - it states that Saughall Massie is a village of Anglo Saxon or earlier origins. From reading selected areas from all of these documents I have been able to establish that Diamond Farm, its barn and a farm building behind this, are all listed buildings which lie within the Conservation Area. The pasture land to the immediate left of the farmhouse on Saughall Massie road is likely to be greenbelt. This boundary line can be seen on the Conservation Area map. The pastureland where the farmer grazes his cows / heifers at the rear of the farm buildings falls within the Conservation Area. A Conservation Area (as defined in section 69 of the planning - Listing Building & Conservation Area Act, 1990) is "an area of special architectural or historic interest, the character or appearance of which is desirable to preserve or enhance."</p> <p>Finally, the point I would again like to make is that Diamond Farm, its cows grazing on the land around and about us as we pass taking a stroll, is the most predominating feature of Saughall Massie village's Conservation Area. This single trait reinforces the idyllic, tranquil, historic and semi-rural character of the village. It literally forms a large part of this hamlet's life and soul to its residents and visitors passing through. To strip all of this away would be equivalent to removing the soul from the heart of this historic village.</p>
DOR01132	<p>I am writing this to tell you of my disgust at the plans to use Wirral green belt to build houses. I live in Eastham and agree totally with likely outcomes that the Eastham Village Preservation Association have stated in their leaflet about this matter. Presumably you will be familiar with the association's concerns. Green belt is green belt and should not be used for other purposes. Please withdraw these proposals.</p>
DOR01133	<p>The Government's housing policy has recently been criticised therefore there is always the possibility of central Government changes and revision/reversal of policy - there would be no turning back the clock if Green Belt land is released for development to the detriment of Wirral residents.</p> <p>The calculation of future housing requirements on the Wirral have been challenged, given the limited employment expansion opportunities and falling population generally. If the families moving into the proposed new houses are commuters from outside the Wirral, this would place strain on our increasingly busy roads and overstretched hospitals/services. Assurances by developers to address these concerns are frequently not carried through as they are later claimed not to be viable.</p> <p>In particular, I object to the release of any Green Belt land to the east of the M53, however attractive to developers, which would remove the last areas of open countryside between the motorway and urban areas - one look at the map of Wirral highlights that open/recreational space is at a premium in east Wirral compared with the west of the M53. Please do not agree to building on Green Belt land to satisfy the developers and the current Government's policy.</p>
DOR01134	<p>This entire consultation process has been flawed: As myself, my husband and my mother were unable to access the E-tickets to book to go to the presentation session at West Kirby Concourse (the final session), and were told that we would not be admitted without this, the 'presentation meetings' became entirely exclusive.</p> <p>Due to using this system, the consultation meetings were NOT accessible to the general public. Many other people have had similar problems accessing the tickets. The consultation should be re-run according to the guidelines of the Aarhus Convention; ie full public participation when all options are open.</p> <p>Meanwhile, myself, my husband and my mother have joined the 23,000 signatories in signing the petition AGAINST building and development on Wirral's' greenbelt.</p> <p>We totally oppose building on Wirral's' urban greenspaces or the greenbelt. Wirral Councils' threats to concrete over our Greenbelt.</p> <p>According to European law, (and thus the laws of Britain as we stand); the Public Consultation on the 'local plan' is a process to be undertaken; 'when all options are open' (ref; Aarhus Convention). Instead, it has been more of a; 'Here's what we're thinking of doing with your greenbelt, fill in a form if you are ok with that'.</p> <p>The so-called consultation has based itself, and is still ongoing, based on figures which are fabricated: Surely this now renders the entire process as void.</p> <p>The Council has not operated in a 'fair and transparent manner' which it is lawfully obliged to do. Even the Forward Planning Manager over-viewing the process has denied all knowledge that the process is well underway to re-classify huge numbers of our urban greenspaces as 'brownfield sites', despite them never having been developed. Is this re-classification legal? Brownfield sites are those which HAVE been previously developed. In the lead-up to this; how many thousands of pounds of tax-payers money has been spent on cutting and felling the mature trees of Wirral, which previously stood in many of these parks and green spaces? And how much has been spent on this consultation whilst using inaccurate figures? (Not forgetting the millions spent on the biased consultation for a golf resort.)</p> <p>As Wirral currently has 4,600 empty properties, and the population is decreasing, there is no requirement to build more. The Council own many hectares of unused industrial land which they should consider for building, before they consider destroying any of our recreational, vital oxygen producing green spaces. After all, it's only extra profits to the developers that are threatened then. Although, they have to live too... taking away our oxygen will ultimately take all our lives. Why were the council housing stocks, with all the attached land included, sold to Magenta Living for just one pound? The Consultation is unlawful on many levels, I accuse Wirral Borough Council of breaking the law on numerous counts. This is a matter for a proper and thorough investigation to prosecute those responsible and give the people of Wirral cast iron assurances that all its green spaces will be protected in perpetuity.</p>
DOR01135	<p>Proposed development on the green belt land on the Wirral - most specifically at Barnston Dale and bordering Heswall Primary School. I live in Heswall and my child attends Heswall Primary school. I would like to raise my objections to the proposed development of the green belt land. [OBJECTIONS RAISED ARE THE SAME AS DOR00868]</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01136	<p>[SAME AS DOR00455] with additional comments</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The local authority should place emphasis on Peel Ports to build a minimum 1000 homes as part of the Wirral waters scheme next year. 2. The Birkenhead town centre is in a state of substantial urban decline. More ambitious urban city planning opportunities to regenerate this area should be prioritised. 3. The proposed scheme is unsympathetic to the surrounding architecture and natural landscape. 4. Existing green spaces and conservation areas including Storeton locally are fully utilised for recreation and the impact and extent of the proposals would cause disproportional and irreversible damage. 5. The scale and massing of the proposal is grossly disproportionate to the local urban and natural landscape. 6. There are regularly traffic incidents including recent fatalities on my own road regrettably and on current roadways associated with this proposal. Increasing traffic would undoubtedly increase the likelihood of further incidents on such long open country roads.
DOR01137	<p>Reference: Local Plan SHLAA 0716 North of 90 to 92 Grange Road, West Kirby</p> <p>I write with reference to the inclusion of the above within the local development plan as an option for the construction of housing.</p> <p>I believe that this development is inappropriate for several reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) It is on an already extremely busy main road into West Kirby that is also key pedestrian route for children travelling to the town's two grammar schools. b) It will exacerbate traffic congestion and pollution on this stretch of road. c) It will remove a small but vital 'green lung' within the town.
DOR01138	<p>I would like to preface my response to the local plan by highlighting recent figures released by the Office for National Statistics which suggested that the future housing requirements for Wirral were unlikely to be anywhere near the 12,000 set out in the local presentations, but more like a maximum of 5,000. I will highlight later in my response how some of this 5,000 can be achieved without resorting to Green Belt, but I believe that the difference in figures (which was known by Wirral Council prior to the launch of the consultation) is a material consideration which significantly affects the consultation. I therefore would like to submit that the consultation should be declared invalid/void due to:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the difference in housing requirements is clearly a material consideration which makes the consultation flawed • there should have been a clear communication to residents during the consultation meetings that the requirements had changed, the lack of which means that the council has not complied in a fair or transparent manner which it is legally required to do in such consultations <p>My comments on the plan as was presented at Pensby High School last month are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt sites proposed for release would permanently remove the character and landscape of the Irby, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston areas, which appear to be disproportionately targeted. Releasing all of the currently identified areas would result in the merging of those 4 villages with no boundary between the edges of the new developments and Heswall. National policy suggests that Green Belt land should check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • The current plan under consultation would do the exact opposite of that for these areas. In fact, it would contradict each of the 5 principles of the green belt highlighted on slide 21 of the consultation presentation. I understand that in 2017, Irby, Thingwall and Pensby were brought in to the same settlement area which would make no actual requirement to keep them separate - however, I believe that doing so would contradict the purpose of the Green Belt land and contradict the requirement for protection against urban sprawl. • The amount of land identified in the Irby area alone would place a significant strain on the infrastructure of the Village. With current primary school provision and the assumption that the housing built on the land would be for families and therefore result in a high number of additional school age children, the primary schools that have Irby within their catchment area would all struggle to accept such a high number of extra children. • A running theme through this consultation is that the land identified has been highlighted as suitable for the building of residential dwellings - nothing in any of the documentation that I have seen or at the Consultation meeting that I attended made any reference to the effects on infrastructure. I have mentioned education provision but other public services (e.g. primary healthcare services) would also struggle to cope with additional people without extra capacity being created. Using the primary health care example, there are only two NHS GP practices in the IPTB area - West Wirral Group Practice (which also takes patients from Woodchurch) and Heswall and Pensby Medical Practice. It is not possible that those two practices could cover the additional patients that releasing all of the identified land would generate. • The proposed sites would exponentially increase traffic numbers through Irby, again having a material effect on the character of the village, again, in opposition to the purpose of green belt land. • The IPTB area currently has little opportunity for employment and so residents would be required to travel for their business. In addition to the increased traffic as highlighted previously, it would focus traffic on routes already congested at peak times (Thingwall Corner roundabout, Arrowe Park Junction, Heswall crossroads amongst many others). Slide 9 of the Consultation presentation clearly shows that no land on the IPTB side of the M53 corridor has been identified for employment allocations, which will clearly not be able to mitigate these congestion issues but exacerbate them. Most people would therefore be employed in the greater Merseyside region, providing those areas with additional benefits that should be retained by Wirral. A recent BBC article (https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/science-environment-45956792) highlighted the impact of such irresponsible developments and the knock on effects which are considerable from a green / environmental perspective. The issue of lack of employment opportunities within the proposed development areas is further highlighted as your own Annual Monitoring Statistics state that Job

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Density in the Wirral is an issue, below all relevant averages. It also states a fall in new employment floorspace in 2017, providing no evidence that additional employment opportunities are materialising. Increasing residential dwellings exponentially without a corresponding release of land for business development is irresponsible and reckless. [New item added]</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Using the revised ONS figures, I believe that there are several ways in which approximately 5,000 residential dwellings would be created over the 15 years that the plan out for consultation would cover. Firstly, I understand that at least 2,000 could be built via currently identified brownfield sites. Additionally, despite the figures identified by the Council in the consultation presentations, Peel Holdings estimate that a minimum of 3,000 dwellings could be built on the Wirral Waters site (much closer to employment opportunities, with the ability to improve infrastructure to cope - see above points), if not more. That is around 5,000 dwellings minimum, without including any plans to renovate the huge number of currently unoccupied houses within the Wirral area - a FOI request by me to you states that in 2017 there were over 4,500 properties, of which almost 2,000 were classified as long-term empty. Releasing these dwellings could go a long way towards not needing to use Green belt land and has been identified previously by Wirral Council members as being suitable to meet the entire waiting list for Wirral social housing (acknowledging that the mix may not be entirely suitable). (https://www.wirralglobe.co.uk/news/14152900.rescue-birkenheads-empty-properties-to-house-all-those-in-desperate-need-of-a-home/). In fact, your own Annual Monitoring Report states that there are 12,000 privately owned dwellings which were categorised as Category 1 hazardous - I would argue that if a small proportion are uninhabitable, addressing this issue would result in an increase to housing stock availability (even 10% would mean 1,200 additional dwellings). Additionally, the Consultation meeting presentation suggested that there was outline planning consent for 13,000 dwellings on the Wirral Waters site, which should be enough to meet the inflated target. Allowing for slippage and altered plans, it would still more than meet the required housing figures based on recent ONS statistics. Your own Annual Monitoring Report for 2016-17 (page 16) highlights that the working age population in Wirral has remained fairly steady since 2006, with the 2016 working age population being only around 800 higher than that in 2006 (fluctuations in 2011 / 2012 acknowledged). Similarly, the number of children in Wirral has remained fairly constant, being as 256 lower in 2016 than in 2006 (again, subject to fluctuations - however these bookend figures are actually the highest recorded in the ten year period). This would suggest that demand for housing from current Wirral residents and those that grow to be of working age within the next 10-15 years is remaining constant and could only be affected substantially by migration in to Wirral from other areas. I fail to see how that migration could ever reach the level where 12,000 dwellings are required (one additional home for every 15 people currently of working age). In addition, your Statistics suggest that the population increase is actually being driven by retired individuals, the very people who over the next 15 year period covered by the Local Plan would actually release housing by downsizing or via ill health / death (apologies for the morbidity). These population figures do not appear to match your inferences that an additional 15,000 households (increase of 10.6%) would be seen by 2037. The interpretation of these statistics, along with other data suggest that release of Green belt land could result in over supply. I welcome the declaration at the Consultation meeting that the Council are employing a Statistician to review housing requirements and population estimates and would very much like to see the outcome of that work. Your own Annual Monitoring Statistics also state that Wirral had the fastest growing visitor economy in the City region in 2017 - I would argue that the proportion of Green Belt space would contribute significantly to that total, with the release of Green Belt land likely to result in falls in tourism income. Slide 21 states that 'Once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified'. I would suggest that all of the information above would suggest that at the very least, further work and consultation is needed to revise the actual housing requirements taking these in to account. At most, it would suggest that there are now no evidenced, justifiable or exceptional circumstances for the Council to allow development on Green Belt land for the 2020-2035 period. The contribution of the Green Belt land of Wirral to the allure of Wirral as a desired location to live, with towns / villages routinely making lists of the best places to live (https://www.thetimes.co.uk/article/heswall-wirral-best-places-to-live-brxjsnqpk and https://www.wirralglobe.co.uk/news/15125335.bebington-crowned-the-most-desirable-place-to-live-in-england/) should not be underestimated or overlooked. Such statistics, although sometimes tenuous, bring additional money in to the area and provide much needed exposure to a small metropolitan area surrounded on three sides by water and living in the shadow of Liverpool. I implore you to take a holistic view and ensure that ill-informed destruction of the 'crown jewels' of Wirral is not destroyed when there is no justifiable need to do so."
DOR01139	<p>I'm hugely frustrated and disappointed to hear that part of Brotherton Park and Dibbinsdale Local Nature Reserve (one of the areas of green space which makes the Wirral such a unique place to live) is even being considered to be obliterated for the Local Plan. An area like that piece of woodland is irreplaceable. Have you visited it? It's beautiful, especially at this time of year, with the yellow leaves polka-dotting the ground and the low-lit river separating the pathed area where people can walk from the land where nature flourishes unhindered. Because it's so beautiful, loads of people go there, and walk dogs and look at trees and show children nature, like we're encouraged to do: 'Get out in the great outdoors! Don't stay at home watching the telly! That's loads of people who won't be able to go to that piece of woodland near where they live, if there are houses there instead. I'm not a town planner, so I don't have any good ideas about where to build extra houses. What I do know is that we erode easily accessible green spaces at our peril. People won't want to visit the Wirral if it is crusted over with concrete. Locals will feel discontent, with their views of brick and tarmac, because people feel better when they have nature around them. History is full of beauty being destroyed to the detriment of future generations. We will not improve the future of the Wirral or its people by destroying the wonderful things which exist in its present.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01140	<p>Objection to potential development of green belt land in Wirral for new homes to be built. This is on the basis that the figures released as part of the consultation which stated that the Borough requires 12,000 homes within the period specified has been undermined by other projection forecasts. Having attended one of the consultation meetings, it became apparent that the council has already considered some areas that have been put forward for consultation as sites for further investigation were already deemed as unsuitable for development, leaving people unclear as to whether they should still submit representations about those areas. It was confirmed at the meeting I attended by council officials that there were 4600 empty homes in Wirral. It is unclear how these homes have been factored into the local plan and these should be a primary focus along with development of brown field sites before any consideration of development of green belt should be considered. The Wirral is known as the 'leisure peninsula' and the impact of developing green belt land will negatively impact on the image of the area, the needs of those that live within it and the health benefits afforded by green spaces to those residing in the Wirral. There appears no need for the 12,000 new homes initially proposed within the consultation, and there are better alternatives than utilising green belt to meet housing needs. Affordable housing is required, but should come within the use of empty homes and brownfield development, which is where this would be expected to come from. Development of green belt land will not realistically lead to development of truly affordable housing. I consider the consultation process to be flawed given the information provided as part of this seems to have been confirmed as inaccurate by both Government projection and council officials.</p>
DOR01141	<p>My objections to the crazy and unnecessary plan by Wirral borough council to build on our precious and much needed green belt land.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local population growth figures do not substantiate the housing targets set by the council. A figure of 393 is a more realistic figure not the 800 being used originally nor the 500 being used now. 2. There are over 5000 empty properties that could be used. Why aren't they being used? 3. Use of brown field sites with capacity of over 18000 units should be used first. 4. Additional schools, shops, doctors' surgeries, dentists etc will need to be built for such population growth. Has this been considered? Who is going to pay for this? 5. Current roads are already congested. Has any thought been given to this? 6. If this green belt is opened up now, in 20 years' time will more be required? When does it stop? 7. There will be a loss of biodiversity and access to woodland, fields, bridle ways etc? 8. Quality of life will be hit. Who wants to live in a concrete jungle! I thought this was the leisure peninsula. 9. What employment opportunities are there going to be for these new neighbourhoods? 10. New housing built on green belt land is hardly going to be for first time buyers. Building a few hidden smaller houses at the back of huge developments isn't the answer! 11. The unique character and charm of villages and towns will be lost due to urban sprawl. 12. High quality farmland used for producing food will be lost forever. <p>Maybe if the British government did as it said it would and reduce immigration to more reasonable and sustainable levels we wouldn't have this problem. The "housing crisis" is only happening because of this. As this isn't going to change and we need more housing, building big expensive housing to make land owners and property developers even richer isn't the answer!</p> <p>The council needs to stand up for the people of the Wirral and for its future generations. We need to use brown field sites and existing housing to solve this problem. There's huge areas of land at 12 quays which needs to be redeveloped! Do it!</p>
DOR01142	<p>As a result of the opening up of Green Belt land one of our local farms has already gone out of use making a big change in Barnston Village. The owner of the land hopes to use the policy to make money out of his land. Not only has a farm gone out of use but also the farm shop & restaurant have had to close as they are also on that land. In a small village like Barnston this makes a great deal of difference to the life of the village if this sort of outcome is reproduced in other villages it will be a great loss to the community.</p>
DOR01143	<p>Tesni welcomes this opportunity to contribute to the Development Options review process. Tesni welcomes the consideration of Parcel SP060, and would support its wholesale release and allocation for housing. Notwithstanding that, Tesni requests the Council to give due consideration to the release of their land interest at Oldwood Farm, Irby Road, Irby, and its allocation (in its own right) as a housing site capable of accommodating around 42 dwellings. The land is already in established residential use, suburban in character and appearance, and is served by its own access onto Irby Road. It contains a detached house and a series of outbuildings and a paddock. It flanks the northern settlement edge of Pensby, where we have suggested the Green Belt boundary ought to be corrected to reflect how it is drawn elsewhere. The site is an appropriate and discrete release site and its allocation for housing would represent the logical rounding off of Pensby's settlement boundary, with negligible impact on any of the purposes of Green Belt. The mature boundary trees and hedgerows along the south-west and north-west boundaries would be retained and/or supplemented / replaced as part of any housing scheme, such that new housing would be barely perceptible when viewed from the wider public domain and key interfaces. This part of Wirral is not a landscape of particular note, quality or value. The Council's own assessment suggests it is of only moderate quality. According to the Council's assessment, the site is located in one of the 'Areas of Highest Accessibility', which lends further weight to the sustainability credentials of the site. The Tesni site is not in a high flood zone and is not an identified 'Core Biodiversity Area'. It is not located in a Conservation Area and contains no listed structures (nor are there any close by). The site is suitable, available and deliverable in the short term, with a committed and reputable developer in place. We have also raised concerns in respect of the sustainability credentials of other parcels of land around the same settlement because we contend that these will have far more severe impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt (and for other reasons), and those ought therefore to be discounted from the process.</p>
DOR01144	[SAME AS DOR00455]

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01145	<p>After reviewing the link on to the proposed developments I've been shocked at the amount of new houses planned. The schools/emergency services/hospitals are already being pushed to their limits, not to mention the sorry state of the roads, I was wondering if the council had considered this in its plans. I'm honestly shocked that the council would want to develop on green belt when there is so much developed land already abandoned on the Wirral.</p> <p>I hope my points are not discarded as they were not received before the 26th as these are genuine concerns I think a lot of people will have.</p>
DOR01146	<p>Representations are submitted in relation land interests at Newhall Centre, Heswall. Planning application will be considered at planning committee shortly.</p> <p>Questioned whether WBC have properly identified parcels in the way they proposed as if they had, the site at Newhall Centre would be expected to be part of a much smaller parcel which has a strong boundary to allow a logical and reasonable assessment of it. This should have been reassessed by the Council and the site included as a smaller Green Belt parcel, such as SP071 or as its own parcel. Despite these comments, WBC has not amended the Green Belt parcels. What is unclear from the Initial Green Belt Review Background Report is why the Green Belt SHLAA sites and Green Belt parcels are not considered suitable for the release from the Green Belt and as such why SP072 and specifically, the brownfield site at Newhall Centre, Heswall has been excluded for further assessment. The Council's consultation does not provide clear information on how it has identified Green Belt sites for further assessment and why certain sites have been excluded. Furthermore, by excluding sites for further consultation without knowing where housing is most needed could be problematic the spatial strategy might identify a need for a number of houses in Heswall and the surrounding area however the Initial Green Belt Assessment has already excluded sites in the area from this. There is no robust evidence provided to justify why the site is excluded from further Green Belt Assessment. The site is located within has good accessibility for pedestrians and cyclists and is well connected to public transport links. The site provides an excellent opportunity for redevelopment of an underused previously developed site that will provide high quality, much needed housing. The site is deliverable and available and suitable for housing. Development on this brownfield site would make a positive contribution to the housing supply in Wirral and should be considered as a housing allocation. WBC has insufficient land to meet local need. Newhall Centre is sustainable and deliverable. Reserves the right to provide further representations.</p>
DOR01147	<p>I object very strongly to the use of green belt land for new development. The council should look to add more units at a higher density to the Wirral Waters and to make use of the plentiful brownfield sites on the Wirral.</p>
DOR01148	<p>House Builder promoting the allocation of a site at Vineyard Farm for up to 500 houses to the south of Bebington and have commissioned a Vision Document, Landscape Appraisal, Green Belt Assessment, Ecology Assessment, Arboricultural Assessment, Highways Technical Note. Soils & Agricultural Land Classification, and Topographic Study. Unlike other site options in the vicinity, it does not depend on the release of large swathes of additional land to create a logical boundary at the M53. It makes no substantive contribution to the separation of free-standing settlements. Intends to make an early start would therefore make a significant contribution to five year housing land supply. A number of Council evidence base documents are not yet publically available. Reserve the right to consider further information. There have been changes relevant to the calculation of housing need in NPPF, NPPG and household projections. Council cannot sensibly progress the Local Plan on the basis of an annual housing requirement of 488. Flaws in the methodology are outlined. Government has now launched a consultation into reviewing the methodology. Circumstances of Wirral are outlined, high concentrations of poor stock, particularly in east Wirral, compared with the remainder of Merseyside Wirral is relatively unaffordable, Need has been examined through the SHELMA, the SHMA and Local Housing Needs Study (2016) arrived at an OAN of between 875 and 1,235, latest housing requirement would have severe implications for economic growth and would indeed not sustain existing levels of employment. Preparation of the plan should proceed on the basis of a requirement for at least 800 dwellings per annum. Information on housing supply and urban capacity provided. Supply must take account of the effects of future clearance to ensure ongoing net housing completions at the required level. Whilst cleared sites may be redeveloped for housing, this is not necessarily the case. Including a proportion of greenfield development opportunities within the housing supply will mean that volume housebuilders who are an essential contributor to boosting housing delivery will have additional suitable outlets in the area. Significant numbers of dwellings can be delivered early in the plan period, with opportunity to achieve a range of house types and sizes and no viability constraints to the delivery of affordable housing. Concludes that the site performs particularly strongly out of the Green Belt options in terms of being available now, a suitable location for development now and with a highly realistic prospect that housing will be delivered within 5 years.</p>
DOR01149	<p>Land North of Lever Causeway.</p> <p>There is an error in your Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment September 2018. On page 52 the agricultural land use for SP030 has been classed as pasture and horse grazing. In fact, the land under SHLAA1819 on site SP030 is actually used for farming arable, and has been for many, many years. Recent soil reports show the site as containing very good quality soil. SHLAA1819 has already had a crop harvested this year and is currently growing winter wheat. The land further down Lever Causeway between Marsh Hey Covert and Little Storeton Village is also being farmed. Therefore a very large proportion of SP030 is actually used for arable farming and not horse grazing as indicated. At a Council Meeting on 15 October, Motion 3 was voted on and carried unanimously. The first paragraph of this motion reads, "This Council requests that renewed importance should be attached to the protection afforded to agricultural land as the responses to the Local Plan are considered. Land that is currently in productive agricultural use should not be removed from the Green Belt in view of the need to safeguard future food supplies."</p> <p>I have attached a photo of the field in question. It was taken on 17/6/2017. As you can see, it's full of wheat. I've also attached a screen shot of page 52 of the Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment.</p> <p>Also, as this parcel of land abuts Marsh Hey Covert, and covers an area between Marsh Hey Covert and a copse behind Stanley Avenue, the notes should also include that the area may include supporting habitat, as there is evidence of badger activity, owls and bats in this area. The areas also give protection to other local wildlife whose natural habitat will be eroded by any development.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01150	<p>Land East of Manor Bakeries, Reeds Lane, Moreton, Proposed employment allocation ref: ELPS 024 / SHLAA reference 1978 within the emerging Local Plan for the Wirral is strongly welcomed (site plan enclosed). Initial technical evidence on: design, highways, flood risk & drainage, and ecology has been undertaken to help inform the potential quantum on the site. There is no evidence at this stage that suggests the site cannot come forward for development. The site-specific matters such as flood risk can be appropriately mitigated through the design process. The site can provide circa 38,000sqft of employment floorspace. This site, along with the site to the south (covered in a separate representation) will complement each other and provide a cohesive public realm offering social and economic opportunities within the settlement area of Moreton, which together can deliver a total of over 70,000sqft of employment floorspace and approximately 100 homes for the Borough. On the opposite side of Reeds Lane, lies a further proposed employment allocation ELPS 070 / SHLAA reference 0407 (Peninsula Business Park, Moreton). This site is not relevant to this representation; however, the clustering of similar uses within this suitably accessible location would provide positive economic competition and is welcomed.</p>
DOR01151	Local Planning - Glossary attached. [Existing Site Plan Enclosed]
DOR01152	We are writing to protest very strongly at the idea of the planners in your department, to build houses on the only car park in Bromborough Village. How do you expect the shops and businesses to survive without somewhere to park? The whole scheme is totally ridiculous and undemocratic.
DOR01153	<p>GREEN BELT PARCEL SP040 and Options: Poulton Lancelyn I wish to object to the release of SP040 (SHLAA 1942) land between Brimstage Road and Old Clatterbridge Road for housing development. The NPPF requires that Green Belt land will only be released for development under 'very special circumstances outweighing the resulting harm' (para. 145). I will argue, based on the council's own Development Options Review objectives and criteria, that development of this site will create significant harm for residents and the environment. For example, using the NPPF harm classes : Detrimental impact on Protected Sites: high biodiversity areas & tree preservation areas. Destruction of Heritage Assets: part of the Brunanburh battle site; probable Roman farm; possible Neolithic standing stone groups at Needwood Farm site (Brakenwood). Flood Risk: Risk of grey water/sewage contamination of M53. On several criteria, housing development will be contrary to council objectives and highly detrimental to local residents. In summary please note the following objectives and decision criteria for Site-Specific 'sustainability appraisal' have been considered here as being particularly relevant to SP040. Environmental Protection & Enhancement; Wirral Council Heritage Strategy; To minimise the risk of flooding and other natural hazards; To maintain and promote a locally distinctive sense of place; To protect and improve the attractiveness of the area In pursuing all of these 'official' Wirral Council and National GB policy objectives housing development on SP040 would be detrimental. In summary, on key issues of importance</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Overall nature of the site: it is classed as 'rural farmland' in recent council area character studies. The site has ~31 acres with 91% classed as 'best & most versatile' agricultural land; it is classed as 'not enclosed' and has a 'durable non-urban boundary' of 90% on the council's own definitions. However the only 'urban' perimeter consists of the large, well wooded gardens of Claremont House. 2. To reduce the impact of traffic intrusion in residential areas: the site is surrounded by traffic and accident 'hot spots' with poor access onto the B5137, Brimstage Road. There is no access to the south. The main bottlenecks are west at Junction 4 and east at Spital Crossroads. SHLAA 1942 could host ~380 houses which implies ~600 cars joining Brimstage Road. These additional cars would be a disaster in terms of noise, pollution and accident risk. 30.6% of traffic accidents here are classed as involving 'death or serious injury'. There is a high proportion of old people and a poor bus service already. 3. Services: primary schools are oversubscribed already. Surgeries and dentists are very busy. Some dentists have refused NHS patients. An additional ~380 houses will make things worse with even longer appointment waiting times. Spital station parking is already saturated by commuters. Bus services are poor. 4. To minimize the impact of flooding: SP040 slopes down to the M53. Nearby current houses (Claremont House, Poulton Royd, Claremont Farm) rely on cess pits. Large volumes of surface, grey and sewage water from ~380 houses would need to be pumped uphill. Pumping failure would flood the M53 with runoff / sewage. One assumes a 'sewage farm' would not be permitted for the same reasons. " 5. To maintain and improve biodiversity and natural habitat: The site is bounded by or adjacent too 'official' core biodiversity zones. 50% of the northern boundary along Brimstage Road / Junction 4 roundabout is a core biodiversity zone. The veteran trees in the garden area around Claremont House and the boundary to the north east appear on the tree preservation map. 80% of the southern boundary (Old Clatterbridge Road) is adjacent to the core biodiversity area bounding SP042. Parcel SP040 is also part of a 'nature improvement area' in the Liverpool City Region Ecological Network Survey. 6. To protect and improve the attractiveness of the area: destruction of hedges, veteran trees and woodland would not improve attractiveness. An additional ~600 cars and the associated, noise and pollution will not 'promote wellbeing'. Nor will further stressing of local services. Nor will a year of building site disruption. 7. To maintain and promote a locally distinctive sense of place: site has a mix of landscape types with fields, hedgerows and woodland. It is adjacent to Claremont Farm which has a popular farm shop and café and runs well attended rural themed events. The Wirral Council Landscape Character Study for Clatterbrook & Dibbin Valley classes the area as 'rural farmland' and notes that

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>'distinctive landscape features are strongest in the south' (including SP040). The survey conclusion is 'enhance'. Development would not be consistent with the WCLCS. SP040 is part of a wildlife corridor east of the M53 stretching from Storeton / Prenton in the north to Raby Mere in the south. Developing SP040 would sever the corridor. Adding SP039, SP042 and SP044 to the development as the Initial GB Assessment suggests would destroy the corridor and local quality of life due to traffic congestion and pollution, potentially from thousands of cars, and the swamping of local services. The counter suggestion of SP038 – SP040 and SP042 – SP046 development represents even worse vandalism to local quality of life and the environment.</p> <p>8. To conserve local heritage: SP040 is part of the nationally important Brunanburh battle site. Historians now see Brunanburh as more significant than Hastings. The centre of the battle field is just north of the SP040 boundary at Spital Heath (Brakenwood Golf Course) (1/4 mile north). The area is historically rich and largely unexplored archaeologically with a Saxon (and possibly pre-Christian) church site at Bebington; the Roman Quarry at Umberstones Covert (1/3 mile north west); the standing stones and possible cairn circle at the Needwood Farm site (Golf course; 1/4 mile north west) visible on 19th century OS maps; similarly the standing 4,600 houses from another source, depending on which of the above forecasts was taken. However Peel Holdings have recently declared in the media that they will build 2,700 dwellings at Wirral Waters over fifteen years and up to 6,500 dwellings subject to agreement about support for infrastructure development from local and central government.</p> <p>Taking the larger post brown field residual need of 4,600 houses we are left at most with a need for (7,000 – 2400) – 2700 = 1,900 houses on the Green Belt. However the council proposed release plan covers ~7.6 square miles and ~4,900 acres. At a typical NW region density of 14.6 dwellings per acre this land could support ~71,000 houses. In reality only 2.7% of the Green Belt land on the release plan would be needed accepting the updated, 7,000 houses scaled 'official' target. I have not factored in here the 6,000 empty properties known to be on the Wirral. In recent years the council has recovered ~300 per annum. Overall the proposed release of 4,900 acres of Green Belt land is surely irrational. I submit that if a truly necessary three or four percent of Green Belt 'release plan' land needs to be selected for development it would be perverse and irrational to develop land parcel SP040 for the strong reasons given. Any such release would be challenged on these grounds. We note the options 40.1 / 40.2 discussed in the Initial GB Assessment just released, to include SP040 in a group of parcels SP038 – SP046 which would destroy the GB corridor east of the M53 and threaten Dibbinsdale SSSI and the quality of life of thousands of Wirral residents in a single action. This would be not only unnecessary and irrational but insane."</p>
DOR01154	<p>This type of development will swallow up farmland and wildlife habitats while increasing air pollution, flood risk and car dependency. The land currently is a habitat for a wide variety of wildlife, including hedgehogs, bats, pheasants, owls, woodpeckers and many species of birds. When protected countryside is released to developers, it's not low cost housing they build, but executive homes for the most wealthy. 84% of homes built on Green Belt in recent years have been for the middle or top end of a market that is already unaffordable for most people unless they already have access to existing housing wealth. Misguided calls to build on Green Belt result in millions of people losing valuable access to countryside without doing anything to tackle the housing shortage. The current proposal to build new housing in Greasby, illustrates this fact perfectly. Releasing parts of the Green Belt for housing should always be a last resort. In the rare instances where this needs to happen, the homes built must be affordable for local people on average incomes or below, and on land already well-served by public transport. Because the people who use it are these areas that are most important of all, as the front line against sprawl, and the most accessible countryside for the communities who would benefit most from the enormous health and wellbeing benefits it offers. We must do all we can to protect and enhance the Green Belt in a way that benefits as many people as possible. People need both good affordable housing and access to nature. If we use land well we can do both. There is still much more we can do to make our town and city centres more attractive places to live. Investing in these areas would represent much better value for public money than simply servicing more building on Green Belt land. This country's treatment of our land, its ownership and value, the way the construction economy works and the dysfunctional nature of the free market when applied to housing, are the real factors behind the chronic housing problems we face. However, there are solutions that do not involve taking away our access and opportunity to connect with the natural world, and enforcing Green Belt protection forces us to look for more sustainable locations for housing.</p>
DOR01155	<p>I wish to object to the building on the green belt on Wirral. Firstly we do not need the number of houses suggested by the council. There are numerous empty houses in the area, there is brown land suitable for building on and finally much of the land around and in Lever Causeway is used for agriculture. Please listen to the people who use these areas for walking and recreation. We need these open spaces.</p>
DOR01156	<p>I strongly object to any plans that would remove parking on this site if developed for housing. If there was to be no parking facility, people would not come to the shops in the village and it would badly affect the retailers' businesses.</p> <p>I object to the possible changes to Bromborough Civic Centre site. The details are so vague that it is not possible to know if this is for housing or a revised civic centre and library. This is well used by local residents and would be greatly missed.</p>
DOR01157	<p>Your Council should give weight to the following environmental matters when considering a parcel of land for allocation.</p> <p>Flood Risk [Flood Risk Guidance notes included]. There are areas in Wirral benefiting from flood risk protection in the form of formal flood defences. The condition of defences, the standard of defence and breach /overtopping scenarios are an important factor when an allocation is proposed in such areas. As such for planning purposes, the protection offered by a formal flood defence does not necessarily reduce the risk level of the flood zone.</p> <p>Main river network [Guidance note provided]. The loss of developable land to provide this buffer strip may impact the sites ability to accommodate a specific quantum of development.</p> <p>Biodiversity [Biodiversity guidance provided]. We maintain a general opposition to culverting of watercourses because it involves the destruction of river and bank side habitat and the interruption of a wildlife corridor, acting as barrier to the movement of wildlife (including fish).</p> <p>River Basin Management Plans (Water Framework Directive) [river basin info provided]</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Source Protection Zones [source point info provided]</p> <p>Land contamination & waste sites - Allocations located on known historic landfill sites or sites with known or suspected previous contaminative use, should be highlighted because they will require specific measures of investigation and remediation which could impact the economic feasibility in delivering a development. Allocations in close proximity to landfill or waste sites will need serious consideration with regards to matters such as odour and noise. For this consultation we have not mapped the allocations against regulated waste sites with the exception of Bromborough landfill.</p> <p>Specific Comments for the proposed housing allocations</p> <p>SHLAA0483. 13 Green Lane (Scrapyard), Tranmere. Previous use would indicate the site is likely contaminated.</p> <p>SHLAA1513. Former Monarch Works, 91 Bermuda Road, Moreton. The site lies on the edge of the fluvial Flood Zone 3 for Arrowe Brook. The Council may wish to consider closer examination of the risk (including climate change) pre-allocation or through a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>SHLAA1518. Former Seacombe Ferry Hotel, Seacombe. The site lies on the edge of tidal Flood Zone 3 for the adjacent River Mersey. The Council may wish to consider closer examination of the risk (including climate change) pre-allocation or through a flood risk assessment.</p> <p>SHLAA1895. Former Land and Marine, Dock Road North. The site has significant outlines of Flood Zone 2 & 3 across its developable area. Application of sequential and exception test will be required.</p> <p>At the planning application stage a flood risk assessment will be required to ensure any new development has appropriate standard of flood protection and necessary mitigation measures included in the development design.</p> <p>Bromborough Landfill has a number of gas monitoring locations which should not be impacted by development.</p> <p>SHLAA1896. Plant Hire Depot, Dock Road North. Bromborough Landfill has a number of gas monitoring locations which should not be impacted by development</p> <p>SHLAA2078, SHLAA2079. Wirral Waters, Northbank East. The sites are located immediately adjacent to Flood Zone 2 and 3 within East Float Dock. Site-specific Flood Risk Assessment is likely to be sufficient to determine flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA2081, SHLAA2082. Wirral Waters, Northbank West. The sites are located immediately adjacent to Flood Zones 2 and 3 within East Float Dock. Site specific Flood Risk Assessment is likely to be sufficient to determine flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>Specific Comments for the Proposed Employment Allocations</p> <p>ELPS024. East of Manor Bakeries, Moreton</p> <p>Site is within FZ's 2 and 3 for both tidal and fluvial flood risk, although the site is considered to be benefitting from existing defence structures up to the required standard of protection. However, the site is in close proximity of the site to the River Birket flood defence embankments and therefore the concern is the immediate impact a failure of those defences would have to any buildings and occupants on the site. While the allocation of employment here accords with the NPPF, further analysis of structural failure (breach) of the defences, the sequential location of buildings and premises on the site and necessary flood mitigation/residual risk would need to be identified in detail within the site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)."</p> <p>ELPS031. Twelve Quays - Morpeth Waterfront</p> <p>Some areas of the site fall within Flood Zone 2 and 3, however the area of the site most susceptible is more likely to be along the River Mersey frontage from some overtopping/spray."</p> <p>ELPS070. Peninsula Business Park, Moreton</p> <p>Site is within FZ's 2 and 3 for both tidal and fluvial flood risk, although the site is considered to be benefitting from existing defence structures up to the required standard of protection. However, the site is in close proximity of the site to the River Birket flood defence embankments and therefore the concern is the immediate impact a failure of those defences would have to any buildings and occupants on the site. While the allocation of employment here accords with the NPPF, further analysis of structural failure (breach) of the defences, the sequential location of buildings and premises on the site and necessary flood mitigation/residual risk would need to be identified in detail within the site Flood Risk Assessment (FRA)"</p> <p>ELPS081. Birkehead Dock Estate, former RHM Mills</p> <p>Site is shown to have some areas within FZ 2 and 3 (however this is listed as fluvial flood risk and not considered credible, given the lack of interaction with the River Birket). Limited scope site-specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in more detail."</p> <p>ELPS125. Tarran EI, Tarran Way North</p> <p>Site is within FZ's 2 and 3 for both tidal and fluvial flood risk, although the site is considered to be benefitting from existing defence structures up to the required standard of protection. However, the site is in close proximity of the site to the River Birket flood defence embankments and therefore the concern is the immediate impact a failure of those defences would have to any buildings and occupants on the site. While the allocation of employment here accords with the NPPF, further analysis of structural failure (breach) of the defences, the sequential location of buildings and premises on the site and necessary flood mitigation/residual risk would need to be identified in detail.</p> <p>ELPS217. Tenth Streets - Phase 1, Berner Street, Birkenhead</p> <p>The site is shown to have some areas within FZ 2 and 3 (however this is listed as fluvial flood risk and not considered credible, given the lack of interaction with the River Birket). Therefore this allocation should be treated as FZ1</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>ELPS242. Slack Wood, International Business Park The site is predominantly in FZ1 but proximity to the River Mersey could lead to an increased risk of tidal flooding over time (through climate change). Site-specific FRA would determine this in more detail.</p> <p>ELPS324. Former Croda, Prices Way The site is within FZ3 from the adjacent Dibbinsdale Brook and at significant risk of flooding. However, for employment purposes the site would be suitable subject to a detailed site specific FRA that would specify the necessary flood protection and mitigation measures.</p> <p>ELPS328. Former Pallet Yard, Birkenhead Road Site is shown to have some areas within FZ 2 and 3 (however this is listed as fluvial flood risk and not considered credible, given the lack of interaction with the River Birket). Limited scope site-specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in more detail.</p> <p>ELPS357. Former Mobil Oil, Wallasey Bridge Road. Site is shown to have some areas within FZ 2 and 3 (however this is listed as fluvial flood risk and not considered credible, given the lack of interaction with the River Birket). Limited scope site-specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in more detail.</p> <p>ELPS415. Former Eastham Sand Site is predominantly in FZ1 but proximity to the River Mersey could lead to an increased risk of tidal flooding over time (through climate change). Site-specific FRA to determine in more detail."</p> <p>ELPS417. Former Gas Holders, Dock Road. Gas works and storage sites are known to be highly contaminated and require high levels of specialised remediation.</p> <p>Specific Comments for mixed use allocations</p> <p>ELPS087. Wirral Waters, Tower Quay. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>ELPS129. Wirral Waters, Hydraulic Tower. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA0020. Former Grand Hotel, Marine Promenade. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3. Site-specific FRA would likely determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail with regards to climate change.</p> <p>SHLAA0478 (ELPS108). Rose Brae, Church Street. Site is predominantly in FZ1 but proximity to the River Mersey could lead to an increased risk of tidal flooding over time (through climate change). Site-specific FRA would determine in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA0752. Woodside Regeneration Area. Site has significant areas of tidal FZ2&3 within it. While the land coverage already contains existing residential development, careful consideration needs to be made as to whether further residential development within a significant flood risk area is to be repeated. Sequential and exception testing to be undertaken.</p> <p>SHLAA0753 (ELPS267). Wirral Waters, Marina View. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA0754 (ELPS265). Wirral Waters, Sky city. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA0755 (ELPS266). Wirral Waters, Vittoria Studios. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA2050 (ELPS054). Vacant Land at Clatterbridge Hospital. Western part of the site has the Ordinary watercourse Clatter Brook passing through it and currently contains significant areas of FZ2&3 within the site boundary.</p> <p>SHLAA2068 (ELPS008). East of Typhoo, Moreton. Site is within FZ's 2 and 3 for both tidal and fluvial flood risk, albeit the site is considered to be benefitting from existing defence structures up to the required standard of protection. However, the issue here is the very close proximity of the site to the River Birket flood defence embankments and therefore the concern is the immediate impact a failure of those defences would have to any buildings and occupants on the site.</p> <p>SHLAA2080 (ELPS086). Wirral Waters, North Bank East, Tower Road. Site lies immediately adjacent to FZ 2 and 3 within East Float dock. Site- specific FRA is likely to be sufficient to determine in flood protection and mitigation measures in more detail.</p> <p>SHLAA2085 (ELPS045). Former Gas Depot, Hind Street. Gas works and storage sites are known to be highly contaminated and require high levels of specialised remediation.</p> <p>Greenbelt Sites for Further Investigation. While we have reviewed the greenbelt sites for further investigation, because no allocations are being proposed on the greenbelt parcels at this stage we have no site specific comments to make. Instead we direct you to the 'general principles' discussed earlier in this letter. We would make the following additional comments for your consideration: The proposed greenbelt sites for further investigation states developments will protect river corridors, Dibbinsdale Site of Special Scientific Interest, Local Nature Reserves and a number of Local</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Wildlife Sites and habitats. In terms of future allocations or development principles of nature conservation shall be required. This shall include linear natural habitats such as the river network and supporting habitat, coastal waters and standing waters such as ponds and coastal waters (including the four bathing waters located on the Wirral). [Defra 25-year plan quoted; Link of Defra 25 –yr plan provided]</p> <p>Proposed Green Belt Boundary Corrections</p> <p>We have no comments to make regarding potential green belt boundary changes.</p>
DOR01158	<p>Having considered the proposals outlined on your website and at the public meeting at Hulme Hall, I wish to register my objection to your Development proposals in the strongest possible manner. My reasons are many, varied and considered, and are outlined as follows:</p> <p>Vineyard farm is a viable and valuable part of the local community and produces a range of much needed agricultural foodstuffs which serves both the local community and those further afield. Through the high quality of its land, Vineyard farmland provides significant and much needed high quality oxygen levels to enhance local air quality, thus meeting one of the demands of the recently published Agricultural bill (September 2018). This is only one of the reasons that it is imperative we obtain guarantees from the Council to protect our farmland from the clear greed of the local developers and their shareholders. I understand that at least one of the buildings on Vineyard farm is listed and subject to a preservation order. I am concerned that this will be at risk of irreparable damage in the event of construction. I am also aware that the site of Vineyard farm has a significant historical importance, both locally and nationally. My research has indicated that Vineyard farm could be the site of the Battle of Brunanburh (937AD), consequently it is important that we preserve this area for both the current and future generations.</p> <p>The infra-structure serving the population in the Poulton area is at its maximum now, and cannot be expected to meet additional demand without significant disruption and expensive upgrade. I understand that amenities serving the current housing demand would require major investment and improvement to meet any more. The proposed resulting disruption to the local community is intolerable. There is a wide range of flora and fauna which is enjoyed by many, throughout all seasons of the year, with each playing an important role in the food chain. This meets yet another target laid down in the aforementioned Agricultural policy.</p> <p>Vineyard farm provides sustained long-term employment for a number of local people, both on the farm and in the associated support services.</p> <p>Currently, the traffic levels in the Spital/Poulton area are rapidly spiralling out of control. Being a major access point to junction 4 of the M53 motorway, the area around Spital crossroads is struggling to cope, particularly during the weekday peak periods of 7:00-9:00am and 4:00 to 6:30pm. Additionally, owing to the fact that it is also a major access route to the Croft retail park in Bromborough, the ensuing traffic chaos continues throughout the weekend. Not only do we have a constant stream of traffic, but the resultant noise and fuel pollution is exacerbated, challenging the local air quality. Additionally, as a result of this, the accident rate in the area has increased markedly. We cannot tolerate any more.</p> <p>I understand that the local schools, general practitioners and dentists are currently at maximum capacity, with long waiting lists for many. For instance, as you are probably aware, there is a significant fall in the number of GP's available nationally, and Wirral is suffering like many other areas of the country. This will have a major impact on patient treatment, in this area. I am also aware of the fact that the local schools are over-subscribed. There are long waiting lists for all and this has meant that many parents are having to resort to driving their children to schools out of the area, causing even more road traffic chaos (see earlier).</p> <p>I understand that the recently updated and published analysis of housing demand for the Wirral peninsular for the period 2020 to 2035 is only 7155. This is a reduction of over 40% on the original and flawed estimate of 12000, suggested earlier. I expect this to fall even further, reflecting the reduction in the Wirral population. Net migration into Merseyside, including Wirral, is now falling and expected to continue (Liverpool Echo, 23rd February 2018) it was reported to be down by 1000 in 2017. Additionally, I understand that nationally, the birth rate from 16-24 year olds has also fallen (The Independent 20th November 2017). In addition to this, it is expected that Brexit will have significant further impact to reduce the population of the Wirral. As a consequence of this new forecast, an average requirement of only 477 units per annum, during this period will be required. At the council meeting on Monday 15th October, the deputy leader of the ruling labour group proudly announced that currently 200 houses per annum are being put back into the housing market by the council. I understand that the council have somewhere between 4000-6000 housing units under their control which can still be put back onto the market. The recent independent report by Sky News (Friday 21st September 2018) confirms that this housing stock is affordable and of sufficient quantity to meet current demand. Additionally, I understand that there are over 100 "brownfield" sites identified locally, many of these now under the control of Peel Holdings Group and other private enterprises, that could provide more housing units than is necessary to meet the shortfall. If the Wirral Waters project is eligible for "significant" government grants, why are these projects not being encouraged by Wirral Council?</p> <p>Further research has indicated that a Housing company also has around 1600 unused housing units under their control. Why are these not being utilised? What is going on here? I am also aware of a fall in the economic growth on the Wirral peninsular, and the long-term viability of some of the regions larger employers is unknown to us at the moment. For example, two of these are in motor industry (Jaguar Land Rover and Vauxhall Peugeot). Both of these employ a number of people from the Wirral, both directly and in associated supply industries. Both have recently announced and implemented changes in their production schedules. If either or both of these firms scale down or close production (BBC website, 11th September 2018), this will have a major impact on the local population and subsequent housing demand, causing many to leave the area. Additionally, there are no guarantees that the quantity of these jobs or employment skills would be replaced. It is clear that nationally we are fast becoming a service-based economy, thus producing need for less manual employment, and this is evident in our local industries too.</p> <p>Upon reviewing your published plans, it is quite clear that any housing project of this scale on this land would further eliminate the delineation between Spital and Bromborough. Both communities would lose their identities, thus becoming one large area of urban sprawl. Neither community want this to happen, as any development would only serve to mar the character of the area.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Previous applications to build houses in this area have highlighted the fact that damage and subsequent loss of local wildlife would be sustained. The area surrounding and adjacent to The Vineyard farm has been designated of significant scientific interest. Any large scale industrial building project will have a massive detrimental impact to the area. The local area sustains a variety of wildlife including the rare red-legged Pheasant, Canada geese, Woodpeckers, Bats, a variety of birds of prey including Owls, Buzzards, Sparrowhawks. All of these species and many more thrive and provide much pleasure for the local population, largely due to the vital oxygen producing high quality farmlands of Vineyard farm. Loss of this environment would have a major detrimental effect. As expressed earlier acres of valuable farmland would be decimated and this would be catastrophic for the local economy. The high quality soil and air quality currently produced would be lost forever, meaning that it would never to be recovered resulting in a major negative impact on the local economy. Access to the Vineyard farm area is predominantly via the Spital crossroads. However, there are also a large number of people who use the route via Dibbinsdale Road as a short-cut towards Junction 4 of the M53 and beyond. This route takes them over a small bridge over the river Dibbin. I am aware that civil engineers have previously deemed this bridge to be weak, and in view of the current volume of traffic using it, have designated it unsuitable for high volume traffic. However, on many occasions, I have also witnessed large HGV traffic using it, in contravention of local traffic regulations. This problem will only increase, in event of any building project, resulting in an increase in traffic of both HGV's and cars. Clearly, the bridge will not be able to sustain this, and will collapse, causing long term chaos and disruption throughout the wider region. During the Wirral Council meeting at Wallasey Town Hall on 15th October 2018 "I understand there was a clear majority vote of 59 votes to 0 in favour of Motion 3 "Keeping the builders hands off our farmland". In view of this, your observations would be appreciated.</p>
DOR01159	<p>I write with concern and in objection to the proposals to build homes on the following green belt sites; SP019B (East of Glenwood Drive Irby), SP059B (Land at 41 Thurstaston Road, Irby), SP059C (Land at 59 Thurstaston Road, Irby), SP059D (Land at 61 Thurstaston Road, Irby), SP059E (Rear of Irby Hall), SP060 (South of Thingwall Road, Irby). I have particularly strong concerns regarding any building on site SP059E (Rear of Irby Hall) and I am of the opinion that this site should be immediately disregarded as a potential site for development. Thingwall Road is the centre of Irby village. When walking past the shops the southerly view from Thingwall Road over the fields to the rear of Irby Hall, towards the Welsh Hills, framed by the Anchor public house, is the essence of our village. It is a view valued so greatly in fact, that it is regularly featured on advertisements for Wirral Tourism etc. It would be unacceptable to our community to lose the most picturesque aspect in the entire area. Irby Hall and its surrounding moated site are a scheduled monument.</p> <p>The surrounding moated site is extremely large and is subject to protection. Likewise, there is public right of way along the northern side of this site; it would be unacceptable to reduce this right of way to a narrow fenced off path, when it currently provides recreation and significant enjoyment for village residents due to the glorious views over to the Welsh hills. SP059E is classified as high quality agricultural land and, as such, should not be developed. In addition, all the sites mentioned in my first paragraph are classified as high quality agricultural land. I have observed a large amount of wildlife in the fields to the rear of Irby Hall (SP059E). This includes tawny owls (which I have seen nesting in this area). Furthermore, over the last 3 years, I have seen a vast number of great crested newts (a legally protected species) on this land and to the front and rear of my property. I have seen juvenile, mature and hibernating individuals. I have provided photographs of great crested newts on my property within the last 6 weeks on 2 occasions to ITPAS and these have been independently verified by a great crested newt expert. It is known there is a breeding population in Backford Road Pond. I also believe there to be a breeding population in the pond to the north of my property (along the public right of way leading to the Cottage Loaf public house and Royden Park). I believe that these 2 populations are continuous in the fields immediately bordering my property to the south-westerly aspect. There is an ancient well to the south west of site SP059E (further information is held by Liverpool museums). Green belt land may only be deemed appropriate for development if there is a clear and defined boundary to such development. There is no such boundary available to site SP059E. This is very concerning, because without such a boundary there is a danger that further green belt land could be submitted for development to the south-westerly aspect of SP059E (a completely unacceptable situation to our community). Any development within Irby must be undertaken in partnership and consultation with ITPAS. If development has to be conceded on any of the following sites; SP059B, SP059C, SP059D, SP059E, then I would implore the council to make the following commitments; Greasby Brook runs to the south-westerly aspect of all these sites and development must not proceed within 50 metres of it for ecological reasons. I would like written assurances that development will not be permitted in a south-westerly direction beyond Dawlish Road or within 50 metres of Greasby Brook for a number of decades. Without this written into policy, there would be a danger of losing yet further green belt land, resulting in building beyond the current village boundary, which would be completely unacceptable to our community. If those written assurances were forthcoming, then some limited development within sites SP059B, SP059C, SP059D might be acceptable, although this should encompass housing to a depth of one dwelling along Thurstaston Road.</p> <p>If development within Irby village is inevitable, then the previous (with appropriate written protections as indicated) may be acceptable. In addition to that, a lesser number of dwellings to that currently proposed could be accepted on sites SP019B and SP060. If the latter 2 sites did undergo some minor development, it would be considered essential for the council or developer to provide some land for public recreational space within both areas. This would need to be consulted upon with Irby residents and ITPAS. While I do not accept that it should be necessary to build on any Wirral green belt land, in a situation when this were deemed inevitable, communities across the Wirral should expect to concede their green belt land in an equitable and proportional manner. There should not be areas that suffer more than others, such that some communities suffer an irreversible deterioration of their collective quality of life, while others remain blissfully unaffected. With reference to the areas of green belt land specified in my first paragraph, if the proposed sites in Irby were all developed, this would be disproportionate and inequitable in the extreme as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Wirral's last published population is 321,238. Irby's population is 6110. Irby therefore represents 1.9% of the total population of Wirral. Working at 30dph, the total number of dwellings that could be built on SP019B, SP059B, SP059C, SP059D, SP059E and SP060 is 1501. The council has stated in written correspondence that there will be a requirement for 4794 homes on green belt land as part of the local plan. This figure subsequently changed during verbal

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>submissions at a planning meeting at Pensby High School to 7390, which was claimed to represent a 20% uplift for under-delivery.</p> <p>d) In fact, the figure of 7390 is incorrect and would represent an uplift of over 50% from the original figure of 4794. This is a basic error, with far reaching consequences and must be immediately corrected.</p> <p>e) Working on the above figures, if all proposed sites in Irby were developed, it is possible to calculate the proportion of total green belt land concession provided by the community of Irby. This would be between 31.3% (1501/4794) and 20.3% (1501/7390).</p> <p>f) It is unreasonable, inequitable and simply unfair to expect a small rural community, which comprises less than 2% of Wirral's population to provide up to 31.3% of green belt development for the entire borough.</p> <p>g) If proportionality and equality were employed, then working from the initial figure of 4794 dwellings, Irby should provide 91 homes, rather than 1501. 1501 is too high by a factor of 16.5.</p> <p>I have subsequent concerns about the potential rising population of Irby. If 1501 additional dwellings were built, then (working with the national Mean Residents per Household of 2.3), Irby would experience a population increase of 3,452. This would be an increase of 61%. There are insufficient local services to provide for a population increase of this nature. There are not enough schools, general practitioners or dental surgeries. In addition, there is no facility to improve the road system around the east side of Thingwall Road. This area becomes extremely congested. On a personal level, I am a consultant orthopaedic and trauma surgeon at Alder Hey Children's Hospital in Liverpool. I need to be able to reach the emergency department within 30 – 40 minutes at all times to provide life or limb saving care to children. Development on the scale proposed would render this impossible. I have many colleagues who live in the area and work in similar emergency specialties at our hospital and other neighbouring ones. The current traffic flow along Irby road, leading to Thurstaston Road is too congested and unsafe for families. I am aware of life-threatening injuries that have occurred recently as a result of this. A massive increase in our local population would make this even less safe. If it becomes necessary for Irby to concede green belt land, then an acceptable number of dwellings should be agreed. The Core Strategy Settlement Areas that have been previously agreed are nebulous and folly. If Wirral residents were issued with sufficient information to form an appropriately informed opinion, they would never have been passed. They are now being used as an excuse to legitimately link separate rural communities into large urban conurbations.</p> <p>Irby is a rural village and it should remain that way. I have read and digested all the information regarding the local plan and attended a meeting at Pensby High School. It is my opinion that the formulation of a local plan should be suspended while an urgent review of Wirral's housing needs is undertaken and the availability of brown field sites is re-evaluated, with particular reference to that owned by Peel Holdings and re-negotiation with central government regarding time frames for housing delivery in light of the higher number of homes that Peel claim to be able to deliver within a longer time scale. Were the council to proceed with current plans without undertaking the above measures, this would represent gross neglect of their duty to represent the interests of Wirral citizens. With the recent resignation of the council leader, it is not acceptable for an issue this important to be presided over by outgoing leadership. The local plan should be suspended with immediate effect.</p>
DOR01160	<p>I am writing to object to any plan whatsoever to use existing Green Belt for housing development. I am not entirely sure just how much requirement there is to build additional housing and to some degree will accept that there is a need. However to consider using Green Belt for any future development when there is other land available is not acceptable. Even minimal use of Green Belt for house building would be the thin end of a larger wedge which will gradually see Green Belt disappearing entirely. Once it has gone it has gone it is irreplaceable. We would not demolish a listed building and I would argue that at least a listed building could be replicated; we could not do that with Green Belt. The present adult population owes it to future generations to protect this land. I would argue that this is particularly relevant on the Wirral Peninsula, where we are surrounded on 3 sides by the natural barriers of the Mersey, Dee and Irish Sea. We are fortunate to live in a special area and the reason it is special is because of much of its' Green Belt, to begin to change that would be verging on an irresponsible criminal act.</p>
DOR01161	<p>Please note my opposition to the potential development on green belt land in the borough for reasons as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Whilst understanding that the communities of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall have now been reclassified as an entity (without notification to the inhabitants), thus avoiding the requirement of green belt land to separate the villages, it would be tragic if these became just one suburb of Birkenhead. 2. Infrastructure: For every house built this is akin to putting 5 vehicles per household every day. This includes not only the vehicle/s belonging to each house, but also the service vehicles servicing each property. There would be a substantial increase in traffic, resulting in further measures such as traffic lights to deal with this increase. There would be a potential gridlock on many routes. I have lived locally for over 25 years and have noticed the substantial increase in vehicles, and especially light commercial vehicles in the past 10 years. This will be minor compared to such as we could now face. Central England has already been heavily affected - with a near example being Nantwich which saw a sharp increase in development over the past 15 years and now is highly congested around the town, with transit times to and from the area at least double to those prior to the period. Further, the pressure on the local hospitals already stretched will be too much for these to cope. 3. Employment - Where will the jobs emanate from? Or will the new occupiers being just commuters to Liverpool and Chester? The A540 and M53 routes at peak times are at a near standstill and cannot cope with any further volume of traffic. Again, this increase has occurred in the recent past. 4. Loss of habitat - The green belt adjoining my property is home to bats, hedgehogs, voles, ducks, and even pheasants...buzzards, skylarks and kestrels to name just a few. These will be decimated.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01162	<p>As concerned residents who have lived on the Wirral all our lives, my wife and I strongly object to the proposals set out within the Wirral Local Plan Development Options Review Documents which are currently the subject of public consultation. Our objections are set out below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing needs target proposed for the 15 years of the Local Plan is greatly overestimated and has been calculated based upon out of date statistical analysis. This has been confirmed by the recent publication of future housing needs figures produced by the Office of National Statistics. The adoption of a lower housing needs target will avoid the release of significant areas of Green Belt land within Wirral for development and ensure that future housing and employment sites are located to regenerating existing Brown Field sites as set out in the Government's National Planning Policy Framework. 2. For the Proposed Green Belt Sites for Further Investigation - Parcel References SP042 (North of Poulton Hall Road) and SP043 East of Poulton Road, Spital) the existing surrounding highway network is totally inadequate to safely and efficiently accommodate the levels of vehicular traffic that will be generated by these sites (either individually or collectively). Access from the east is unavailable due to the location of the Liverpool to Chester railway line and there is no suitable location for the construction of a new road bridge. Access to the sites from the south and west is by very poor standard rural lanes which as totally unsuitable to accommodate any increase in vehicular traffic. Due to the topography of the area any improvement of these lanes to an acceptable standard to safely accommodate development related traffic would be hugely expensive and beyond the economic scope of the two sites. Finally, access from the north is via Poulton Road which already suffers from peak time congestion at the Spital Crossroads. Poulton Road, Church Road, Brimstage Road, Spital Road and Junction 4 M6 Motorway all currently experience significant peak time traffic congestion and the local highway network cannot accommodate the levels of vehicular traffic that will be generated by these proposed sites. The extent of the current traffic congestion is such that any proposed highway improvements proposed a part of the Local Plan developments would still not ensure that safe and congestion free access would be achieved for these sites. <p>At the public meeting held at Hulme Hall Port Sunlight on 10th September 2018 I asked the Officer presenting the Local Plan proposals if any highways/transportation analysis had been carried out on the impact of the developments proposed. In his response he referred to a document produced by Mott MacDonald Consultants and stated that this would be available to residents. As a retired Transportation Planner I formally request a copy of this document so I can better understand how the Council proposes to manage the transportation implications of the proposed Local Plan developments.</p>
DOR01163	<p>We are members of Barnston Conservation Society and want to submit our objections to the release of precious Wirral green belt for the proposed house building programme which has been a subject for discussion over recent months. The Chair of the Society, has already submitted a detailed document to the Council highlighting the objections to the Council proposals and we want to add our names to this objection rather than repeat the details again in this email.</p> <p>It is evident from this document that there are sufficient allocated brown field sites available to accommodate the number of new homes needed for projected requirements. The appropriate bodies should be pushed to deliver their housing promises on these sites. The number of homes required is over exaggerated for the change in population on Wirral and the infrastructure for roads, services, schools, medical etc requirements would not be sufficient to support these homes. The whole structure of villages on Wirral would be destroyed and would not be in the best interests of all residents of Wirral. In addition, valuable farm land would be lost for ever, and farming should be encouraged rather than discouraged by land owners who appear to only be after quick financial returns. We will all regret this loss in farm land if we proceed with this land release. In summary, we are totally against the proposals for releasing the identified sections of green belt land on Wirral for the construction of homes, and we want you to add our voice to thousands of others on Wirral.</p>
DOR01164	<p>I am writing in response to the consultation of the proposals to include numerous greenbelt sites across Wirral in the Council's Local Plan for housing development. I strongly object to the proposals to make greenbelt land available based on the fact that the housing need projections on which the proposals are based have already been found to be massively incorrect. I understand that the most recent ONS figures indicate that only around 7,000 houses will be required over the next 15 years rather than the 12,000 on which the proposals are based. This revelation should, in itself, be enough for the Council to put a halt to the proposals and go back to the drawing board. I find it odd that the council is instead choosing to continue with a consultation based on misinformation. In view of the correct housing need estimate being little more than half the original estimate, the housing needs for the next 15 years can without doubt be met entirely through development on brownfield sites across Wirral (which are estimated to have enough space for as much as 18,000 homes). There is no need to develop on greenbelt land full stop. I further understand that Wirral currently has around 5,000 unoccupied properties. These, in themselves, are almost sufficient to meet the housing needs and should be utilised instead of greenbelt land. The vast majority of the sites are (unsurprisingly, given their greenbelt status) picturesque areas. Clearly, any housing built in those sites will have added value and will be sold at a premium. These will not be affordable houses by any stretch of the imagination. Building on the greenbelt will destroy the unique character of the areas of Wirral where the proposed sites are situated. Unrivalled views will be lost and habitats for wildlife destroyed. It also follows that the infrastructure and amenities in many of the areas where development is being proposed are not sufficient to cope with such a significantly increased number of residents. Finally, I understand that Peel Holdings have committed to building 1100 at Wirral Waters over the next 15 years. This will of course reduce the number of houses needed, and should therefore be taken into account. I also have some specific points about proposals to remove the land to the north of Gills Lane, Pensby from the greenbelt. As a resident of Thorncroft Drive, the road that dissects the greenbelt land on the north side of Gills Lane, I strongly object to its inclusion in the proposals based on the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I understand that one factor to be taken account of when considering removing greenbelt status is the need to avoid merging villages and towns so that they lose their distinct identity. Building on the north side of Gills Lane would have the effect of merging Pensby with Barnston at one end and Thingwall with Barnston at the other. So it would effectively merge three villages and they would lose their identities.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The local infrastructure and amenities are not sufficient to cope with 500 plus additional residents • Gills Lane is already a dangerous road for a couple of main reasons. Firstly, in my experience as a daily user, it is a heavily used through road on which cars regularly exceed the speed limit. This is despite the fact it has a number of blind corners and very narrow passing points. Secondly, Gills Lane has no pavements for much of its length, which makes it hazardous for pedestrians, particularly when considering the point above. The only pavement runs between Thorncroft Drive and Pensby Road and this is very regularly covered by overgrown hedges because the current landowner just does not maintain them, despite residents regularly reporting this to the Council. This forces pedestrians to walk onto the road at a particularly dangerous part of the road where it narrows at a blind corner, for example when two pedestrians meet, one has to step on the road to give way to the other. It is only a matter of time before this will result in a serious accident. If houses were to be built on the land at Gills Lane, there would be massively increased traffic and pedestrians and this would clearly exacerbate these problems. • Gills Lane is a country lane with a unique character. It offers lovely views across the fields that are included in the proposals towards Cross Hill Reservoir and beyond to the Liverpool skyline. It has also long been associated with horses and equestrianism. Horses currently graze on the north side of Gill Lane. If houses were built on the fields identified in the proposals, this uniqueness, the views and the horses would be lost. • The area identified on the north side of Gills Lane includes a field to the rear of Thorncroft Drive, which is currently part of Wirral Donkey Sanctuary. This field is used for grazing by donkeys and horses that are owned by the sanctuary. If this field was made available for development then the sanctuary would no doubt close, which would put the lives of the animals and the future of a community asset in jeopardy. • I understand that the field mentioned in the previous point above has, beneath it, a major pipeline running from Cross Hill Reservoir. Clearly, building on this field would restrict access to this should any works be needed. • The rear gardens of the vast majority of the houses in Thorncroft Drive are very small and shallow. However, the fact that they back onto open spaces gives the impression they are larger than they are and makes them bearable for the residents. If the fields either side of Thorncroft Drive were built upon, this would have a major adverse impact on the quality of life of the residents there. • There is abundant wildlife within the fields to the north of Gills Lane. This includes birds that are rare in these parts such as goldfinches and pheasants. Building on these fields would destroy their habitats. <p>[Proposed SHLAA0716 green space designation, maps and photographs attached]</p>
DOR01165	Representation now withdrawn.
DOR01166	<p>Response of Thornton Hough Community Trust Ltd response to Development Options Review: Thornton Hough Community Trust Ltd is concerned about the potential for the council to redraw the green belt boundaries to satisfy projected housing need in the area and how the Development Options Review consultation unfolded. It was clear at the time of the consultation meetings that the council was awaiting updated statistical information and therefore these meetings took place projecting flawed data. The Trust is aware that in order to form a worthy local plan that the council needs to consider all land areas in the peninsula, however it would appear that insignificant weighting has been given to areas where development is already in the process of obtaining planning permission or could attract planning permission – Wirral Waters and existing brownfield sites. It appears too easy to try and “rob” green belt land for development. Clearly these sites are favoured by developers as costs on these sites would be lower, but has the council seriously considered the monumental impact the loss of green belt would have to Wirral. This is an area that another council department tries to sell as a “leisure peninsula”. You cannot have both – a flourishing tourist industry and a concrete jungle they don’t go hand in hand. It is clear from the latest statistics provided by the ONS that the population of Wirral will not increase dramatically over the next 15 years therefore there will not be a dramatic requirement for new dwellings. It will increase even more slowly unless more employment is attracted to the area. At the moment Wirral is no more than a cul-de-sac; it cannot expand as it is surrounded on three sides by water. The existing infrastructure is struggling to support the population. Roads remain in poor condition whilst the number of vehicles increases, street lighting remains unlit, Arrowe Park hospital is a challenge, bus routes are cut or removed, there is talk of closing “walk-in” centres and yet the council wants to build houses on green belt land. At present the rural/green belt areas are where services are the most vulnerable or non-existent. Why is the council not regenerating areas where houses exist but are empty, a figure that ranges between 4000 and 6000 empty units that could be brought back into habitable use. Is it 4000 or is it 6000, how can the figure vary by 50%? Why is the council targeting green belt land, surely the council’s job is to protect those areas. None of it seems to make any logical sense except possibly to destroy what is, in fact, an asset, for the financial gain of some greedy landowners who probably don’t live in Wirral and are only interested in financial</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	enrichment. Shame on the Council for supporting such ideas. There is no requirement for the council to release green belt land to provide for the projected housing need for the next 20 years and therefore there is no requirement to redraw the existing green belt boundaries, these have been in existence since 1983 and these areas are what make Wirral such a special place and give a breathing space between the industrial areas of Ellesmere Port and the city of Liverpool. In addition we are certain that the council has the financial wherewithal to assist in the development of brownfield sites, empty properties and the development at Wirral Waters since it has recently voted to lend £26MILLION to fund the potential Hoylake Golf Resort, something which is still an idea. Who is underwriting this loan as should the golf resort fail then £26m is a lot of rate payers money to recoup?
DOR01167	I am writing to you to express my outrage at the way Wirral Council are planning to release large areas of this beautiful peninsula to developers for housing. Even if houses are not built during the period of this administration the land will always be at risk of development once it is released. It is not a reversible process. As the recent figures from the Office of National Statistics confirm, 12,000 houses are NOT needed, as there are already 6,000 unoccupied properties in the area. In my experience, if there is not an obvious answer to a question, the answer is usually 'money'. For example: 'Why is Wirral Council planning to release green belt land to developers, when there are adequate brown belt sites and unoccupied properties in the area?' I am particularly concerned about the Lever Causeway, Mountwood and Bebington areas, and the plans to release fields in this area. The fundamental character of this area would be destroyed FOR EVER, if houses were built here. There would be unrestricted sprawl, with historic Storeton and Bebington merging. The area's elevated position currently provides unrivalled views, which would be totally destroyed. Any building would cause substantial detrimental visual impact on the remaining Green Belt. There are no services in the area, such as schools, shops or health centres to service the needs of a large population. The main road through this area is only two lanes wide, so traffic congestion and its accompanying air pollution would be present. Mountwood is a Conservation Area and its setting would be destroyed. Please don't blame the Tories for this. You have had years to consider this and have done nothing about it. Peel Holdings have issued a statement requesting you start being truthful about your negotiations with them. I have been a long standing Labour Party member, but have already resigned over the ridiculous plans to impose Dog Bans (Public Space Protection Orders) on the Wirral. I feel the Local Authority is playing 'fast and loose' with our future and it makes me sick. Who was it that made this statement last year – the Leader of the Council, that's who. What a hypocrite. "I am not prepared to allow our green belt land to be built on. I am resolute about that commitment. It is the jewel in Wirral's crown and greatly valued by our residents. " (Wirral Globe 16th February 2017). It is a Jewel which can be sold off, evidently.
DOR01168	We have reviewed the consultation documents and note that the above site is excluded from the proposed housing, employment, mixed use or Green Belt release sites, upon which comments are sought. We have reviewed the consultation documents and note that the above site is excluded from the proposed housing, employment, mixed use or Green Belt release sites, upon which comments are sought. In March 2018, we submitted comments requesting the following regarding the site: Removal from the Green Belt; and we also noted that given the scale of development already on the site and its prominent roadside location, we feel that the site could potentially accommodate a range of uses, without impairing the openness of the Green Belt, including (but not limited to): A Public House/Restaurant; A Hotel; A Children's Day Nursery; Retail; or Residential/Care/Health related accommodation. We continue to hold the above views, and request that these be considered again in light of the ongoing assessment of how best Wirral's future development needs should be met. We note that various much larger and more prominent sites are proposed for further development/allocation consideration locally, including SPO40 – Land North of Clatterbridge Road, Bebington. This is a large area of open fields accommodating minimal development currently. Contrast this to my client's site, whilst Green Belt, this is an enclosed area, adjoining extensive existing development and itself accommodating a range of uses. We feel that sites of this nature are better suited to redevelopment, creating lesser harms to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. We look forward to reviewing future consultation documents, but ask again that the Council consider fully the merits of accommodating alternative and more intensive forms of development on our client's land, which can be achieved without harming the character or function of the local Green Belt.
DOR01169	List of Petitioners, 4 letters attached [SAME AS DOR00208]
DOR01170	Yesterday we completed and sent our feedback via your comment section on the web page. However, since then we have done some further research and would now like this submission, which corrects some errors to supersede the one previously submitted: We are writing to you as residents of Lower Heswall, in order to register our concerns regarding both the proposed inclusion of Green Belt land west of the Wirral Way, within the Draft local Plan and the Consultation process relating to the Draft Local Plan. To be clear we are not N.I.M.B.Y's we accept that Wirral Council has a statutory duty produce a plan and to ensure that there is sufficient housing stock to meet the needs of the community going forward. We also accept that some of that housing may as a last resort need to be built on Greenfield sites. That said, the land west of the Wirral Way, provides sweeping and largely uninterrupted views towards the shore line of the River Dee and across to the Welsh hills. These views are one of the reasons why the Wirral Way it is so popular with walkers, cyclists and horse riders alike and why it is such an important leisure asset for the residents of Wirral and for tourists from further afield. In addition the fields and river meadows provide important wildlife habitats. Aside from the protection of the local environment and wildlife habitats, Government guidance on local consultations sets out the principal that information relevant to the proposed plan should be made available to the public, in an accessible format. It is clear that there are discrepancies between the figures published by Wirral Council and the Government relating to housing needs of Wirral. Also, that not all documents relevant to a genuine consultation/engagement process have been made available to the public. Specifically, the Broad Spatial Option Revised Assessment Report, the Development Viability Baseline Report and the Strategic Housing Availability Assessment. Therefore, as members of the public we are not able to make fully informed judgements relating to the Local Plan. Nor too, we submit are the Council given the need to clarify the housing numbers required. Failure to publish all relevant information may well breach national guidance and certainly undermines confidence in the Council behaving towards the local community in an open and transparent manner. The owners of land have a perfect right to sell their land, to whomsoever they choose and we understand that the triangle of land in the Lydiat has been sold to a property company and family members of a property investment limited company. There are also concerns that land west of the Wirral Way may also have been sold. If this is the

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>case it suggests to us at least that there has been some sort of communication between the parties above and the council. Frankly, it stretches credulity that a property company and or individuals would invest significant funds in land unless they have received at least tacit assurances that they will be able to develop that land at some point. The fact that the two properties being built on the Lydiate triangle have been priced in excess of £800,000, does not suggest that any but the most limited amount of social housing would be built in Lower Heswall or its environs, given land values in the area. Given that developing Green Field sites is more cost effective and profitable for developers and given that any sale of land is undoubtedly known to the Council and has relevance to the local community we would be very interested to know if land in addition to that on the Lydiate has been sold on our area and if so, why the Council did not make the sale of land widely known as part the consultation process. The statement by [the Council Leader] to the effect that both the Council and the Government 'know that we do not have enough brown field or Urban land to enable house building on this scale,' is clearly flawed and open to challenge until such time as the Government produce concrete figures relevant to Wirral rather than those based upon a national formula and the Council rectify their own flawed calculations.</p> <p>Whilst we accept that the housing plan contained within the Wirral Waters, Master Plan will not necessarily provide for all of Wirral's housing needs there is no doubt that it could make significant inroads into the overall numbers needed, when they are finally known. Peel Holdings have stated that they are committed to building some 13000 housing units (a fact that the Council has misrepresented), but also that their plan requires input from the Council and other partners surely the Council has an obligation to push this programme forward as a matter of urgency. Ensuring that vacant housing stock is brought back into use is another area where the Council needs to be more proactive to ensure that wherever possible these properties are made fit for habitation and included on the overall figures for housing stock. We feel that the council have an obligation to ensure that the use of existing vacant housing stock is maximised and that Brownfield sites are developed to their full potential before considering any building on Green Belt land. The houses west of the Wirral Way in the Heswall area may be included within the boundaries of Lower Heswall, they are clearly not integral to the Village itself do not have any form of central commercial or social spaces and Seabank Road and Parkway aside the few houses on the other roads including Davenport, Riverbank Road, Manners Lane, Wittering Lane and Banks Road in the main boarder one side of these roads so we would like to understand how the designation of 'Infill Village' can be applied to these roads, without stretching the meaning which the Planning Portal states is the 'infilling of a small gap.' This is clearly a strategy to circumvent planning restrictions and strikes us as at best underhanded. Access is another concern should any large scale housing development take place. The existing access to the area under threat is limited to Station Road in the Lower village. The housing at the crossroads where Station Road meets Gayton Road, Village Road and Wallrake restricts driver visibility. The other access to the fields in question is via Delavor Road/Wittering Lane/Banks Road. The junction of Delavor Road and Thurstaston Road is already a risk as there is no clear junction priority and the junction is very close to St Peters Primary School an increase in the volume of traffic would only increase the risks. Below I have included an extract from a Government publication which I think provides the framework within which our concerns are raised. Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government July 2018 Publication The National Planning Policy Framework Page 28-29 'Open Space and Recreation' Quoted. We believe that in light of the above concerns it would be inappropriate for the Council or the Ministry of Housing, Communities and Local Government to sanction any house building on Green Belt land at least and until the real extent of need is identified. Wirral has a justified reputation as a leisure destination, we trust that the Council want to maintain that reputation and ensure that any encroachment onto Green Belt land is actually needed and if it is that it is done with reference to the wishes and concerns of the community local to any area under threat of development.</p>
DOR01171	[SAME AS DOR00455]
DOR01172	Representations made to the Council's current consultation on the Development Options Review of the Core Strategy Local Plan [Full report attached].
DOR01173	I wish to raise very serious concerns about the need for so many new homes in this borough. We do not need 12,000 new ones while 11,000 properties stand empty across this borough. Any new homes built need to have green bins provided free of charge - any attempt by people to levy a charge for new green bins will end up adding to the fly-tipping headache. Please note that removing bat roosts is illegal.
DOR01174	<p>I am writing to raise strong objections to the shambolic proposals to include numerous greenbelt sites across Wirral in the Council's Local Plan for housing development. While I have a number of general points to raise about the proposals to make greenbelt land available for development, I will also make a number of points specifically about the proposed inclusion of one of the sites the Council has identified – North of Gills Lane, Pensby (Map SP061 in the consultation documents). General points about proposals to make greenbelt land available for development: I strongly object to the proposals to make greenbelt land available generally based on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The housing need projections on which the proposals are based have already been found to be massively incorrect. I understand that the most recent ONS figures indicate that only around 7,000 houses will be required over the next 15 years rather than the 12,000 on which the proposals are based. This revelation should, in itself, be enough for the Council to put a halt to the proposals and go back to the drawing board, not continue with a consultation based around misinformation. 2. In view of the correct housing need estimate being little more than half the original estimate, the housing needs for the next 15 years can without doubt be met entirely through development on brownfield sites across Wirral (which are estimated to have enough space for as much as 18,000 homes). There is no need to develop on greenbelt land full stop. 3. I understand Wirral currently has around 5,000 unoccupied properties. These, in themselves, are almost sufficient to meet the housing needs and should be utilised instead of greenbelt land. 4. The vast majority of the sites are (unsurprisingly, given their greenbelt status) picturesque areas. Clearly, any housing built in those sites will have added value and will be sold at a premium. These will not be affordable houses by any stretch of the imagination. 5. I understand that Peel Holdings have committed to building 1,100 homes at Wirral Waters over the next 15 years. This will also reduce the housing need and this should be factored in to the projections. The Council should also make much stronger efforts to encourage Peel Holdings to greatly increase the number of homes that they will be building over the next 15 years.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>6. Building on the greenbelt will destroy the unique character of the areas of Wirral where the proposed sites are situated. Unrivalled views will be lost and habitats for wildlife destroyed.</p> <p>7. The infrastructure and amenities in many of the areas where development is being proposed are not sufficient to cope with an increased number of residents. Specific points about proposals to remove the land to the north of Gills Lane, Pensby from the greenbelt:</p> <p>I strongly object to the inclusion of the land on the north side of Gills Lane in the proposals based on the following points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I understand that one factor to be taken account of when considering removing greenbelt status is the need to avoid merging villages and towns so that they lose their distinct identity. Building on the north side of Gills Lane would have the effect of merging Pensby with Barnston at one end and Thingwall with Barnston at the other. So it would effectively merge three villages and they would lose their identities. 2. The local infrastructure and amenities are not sufficient to cope with more residents, never mind 504 as proposed! 3. Gills Lane is already a dangerous road for a couple of main reasons. Firstly, it is a heavily used through road on which cars regularly exceed the speed limit. This is despite the fact it has a number of blind corners and very narrow passing points. I have been told that, officially, there have been no major traffic accidents in recent years. However, those of us who have lived in the area for many years will recall several accidents down Gills Lane going back decades, including at least one fatal accident. It is also known that there have been accidents that have gone unreported (for example, there is a hole in a fence near to Thorncroft Drive where a car clearly came off the road a couple of years ago). Secondly, Gills Lane has no pavements for much of its length, which makes it hazardous for pedestrians, particularly when considering the point above. The only pavement runs between Thorncroft Drive and Pensby Road and this is currently (and very regularly) covered by overgrown hedges because the current landowner refuses to maintain them, despite residents regularly reporting this to the Council. This forces pedestrians to walk onto the road at a particularly dangerous part of the road, where it narrows at a blind corner, it is only a matter of time before this results in a serious accident. If houses were to be built on the land at Gills Lane, there would be massively increased traffic and pedestrians and this would clearly exacerbate these problems. 4. Gills Lane is a country lane with a unique character. It offers lovely views across the fields that are included in the proposals towards Cross Hill Reservoir and beyond to the Liverpool skyline. It has also long been associated with horses and equestrianism. Horses currently graze on the north side of Gill Lane. If houses were built on the fields identified in the proposals, this uniqueness, the views and the horses would be lost. 5. The area identified on the north side of Gills Lane includes a field to the rear of Thorncroft Drive, which is currently part of Wirral Donkey Sanctuary. This field is used for grazing by donkeys and horses that are owned by the sanctuary. If this field was made available for development then the sanctuary would no doubt close, which would put the lives of the animals and the future of a community asset in jeopardy. 6. I understand that the field mentioned in the previous point above has, beneath it, a major pipeline running from Cross Hill Reservoir. Clearly, building on this field would restrict access to this should any works be needed. 7. The rear gardens of the vast majority of the houses in Thorncroft Drive are very small and shallow. However, the fact that they back onto open spaces gives the impression they are larger than they are and makes them bearable for the residents. If the fields either side of Thorncroft Drive were built upon, this would have a major adverse impact on the quality of life of the residents there. 8. There is abundant wildlife within the fields to the north of Gills Lane. This includes birds that are rare in these parts such as goldfinches and pheasants. Building on these fields would destroy their habitats. <p>I appreciate you taking the time to read this email and I hope that you can understand the severity of this situation.</p>
DOR01175	<p>I am writing to express my deep upset at your current plans for the house building needed on Wirral. The plan contains the intention to build a massive swathe of homes from the top of Lever Causeway to the line of the M53 motorway some distance beyond the village of Storeton. I am very aware of the need to build new homes. I have two grown up children who have now moved away from the Wirral and both struggled to get on the property ladder. However, your plan is excessive and unnecessary. I believe it to have been rushed through at the last minute to meet a Government deadline and is inaccurate in so many ways. I have recently joined an action group and if the plans go through as they stand presently, our action group will fund raise to mount a legal challenge at every step. The green belt is designed to stop a massive conurbation sprawl. The Wirral's green belt is somewhat unique in that it does not circle around a city as other green belts do. Ours is more of a line splitting the Wirral and allowing nearby access to green spaces. It is a corridor segregating the Wirral. Once breached, there is no going back as we are constrained by the coasts either side. Unlike an inland city, we cannot move the green belt to a larger diameter circle further out. Your plan would submerge our historical little village in those modern houses so loved by the mass building property developers. Our already busy roads - already crowded at rush hour - would grind to a halt. There are plenty of brown field sites along the banks of the Mersey and the council needs to better work with the Owners to speed up their plan. Green field destruction should be considered a last resort and not an easy option.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01176	<p>I am writing to object to the proposal to release areas of Green Belt land for development. The large areas of Green Belt are particularly valuable, as Wirral has so few large, quiet areas of open space that are not impacted by traffic and human activity with the consequent effects on wildlife. I am concerned about the loss of habitat and the impact the subsequent development (and fragmentation of the Green Belt) would have on Wirral's wildlife in particular badgers. Badgers and their setts are protected by law under the Protection of Badgers Act 1992. Although common elsewhere the badger population on Wirral is small due primarily to lack of habitat, road fatalities and illegal persecution. In Wirral they are currently protected under Policy NC5, NC6 & NC7 of the council's Unitary Development Plan. Wirral's Green Belt contains several SSSIs and many Local Wildlife Sites. I estimate that two thirds of badger setts on Wirral lie within the Green Belt. While Green Belt is not a wildlife protection designation, it does afford extra protection to wildlife sites. The value of the Green Belt to wildlife must not be underestimated. It provides green, quiet, natural space away from humans and traffic. It provides valuable wildlife corridors and foraging areas. Badgers on the urban fringe depend on Greenfield sites for foraging. Development of the Green Belt could lead to destruction of large areas of foraging territory. It could cause badgers to travel further afield in search of food causing potential conflict with humans by relying on gardens and/or forcing them to cross more roads with a potential increase in road fatalities. Badger setts may well be protected by law and policies within the UDP but foraging area is equally important. A joined up countryside is essential for wildlife to thrive especially in urban and suburban areas such as exists on Wirral. Wildlife corridors are needed to link up the existing habitats. Currently the Green Belt, the central area (including the farmland corridor east of the M53) and the western and northern coastal strips, provides essential space for wildlife movement. I believe that the loss and subsequent development of the Green Belt would be detrimental to wildlife as it could lead to fragmentation of green sites making it difficult for wildlife movement. It is especially important to maintain links between badger populations. The loss of Green Belt land and subsequently wildlife corridors could lead to the isolation of social groups. When populations become isolated, there is a risk of genetical restriction reducing their ability to flourish. Therefore it is essential to protect existing wildlife corridors from development. The report made the following key points for establishing a strong and connected natural environment:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • That we better protect and manage our designated wildlife sites; • That we establish new Ecological Restoration Zones; and • That we better protect our non-designated wildlife sites <p>Currently all development is charged with achieving "net environmental gain" but if development is allowed in the Green Belt I fail to see how there can be any environmental gain. It is difficult to see how or where this will be provided as there is limited opportunity considering Wirral is a peninsula surrounded by water on three sides. All wildlife, badgers included, is stuck at the end of a cul-de-sac with limited space as it is. Although I write concerning the implications of development of the Green Belt on badgers I am concerned about the impact on all wildlife be it on designated sites or otherwise. It is essential to protect Wirral's existing wildlife. We have a responsibility to protect and manage it for the future. Where possible the environment needs protecting to support wildlife not the reverse. I oppose any development on any wildlife areas which are within the sites under review. I particularly oppose development on the following sites.</p> <p>SP013 West of Column Road, Caldy - I object to any development on parts of this land. Both Caldy Hill and Stapledon Woods are LWSs important for diverse, mature woodland, lowland heath and associated wildlife including badgers. Development would be unacceptable. These sites and surrounding areas are important for badgers. All foraging areas and wildlife corridors need protecting.</p> <p>SP016 West of Meols Drive - This is the site of the Royal Liverpool Golf course which is a LWS designated for its sand dune flora and fauna including badgers.</p> <p>Land east of M53 - There is limited wildlife habitat east of M53 therefore it is all the more important to keep the existing Green Belt land east of the M53 for wildlife to survive. It is also important to maintain this green corridor to allow for movement of wildlife. Sites include...</p> <p>SP030 North of Lever Causeway - There is an active badger sett (Burrell Road LWS) within Mountwood Conservation Area. The badgers from this sett are frequent visitors to many of the neighbouring gardens in Burrell Road, Mountwood Road and Stanley Avenue. There is also evidence of badger activity in the copse to the rear of "Millstone", Stanley Avenue. This land provides valuable foraging areas for the badgers. Although the two coverts are not LWSs they are still important for wildlife and together with the tree lined avenue and adjacent farmland provide valuable habitat and wildlife corridors. I believe that development of this land would affect wildlife and interrupt the movement of wildlife.</p> <p>SP037 - East of Brimstage Lane, Storeton - This site includes Umberstone covert an established woodland that has historically been host to an active badger sett.</p> <p>SP042 North of Poulton Hall Road; SP043 East of Poulton Road, Spital; SP044 West of Dibbinsdale Road; SP045 West of Raby Drive - SP042 North of Poulton Hall Road; SP043 East of Poulton Road, Spital; SP044 West of Dibbinsdale Road; SP045 West of Raby Drive - I object to the loss of these parcels of land, which include SSSIs and LWSs, to housing development due to their high importance wildlife. Together they form one of the largest biodiverse areas in Wirral. The sites include Thornton Wood, Intake Wood & Foxes Wood all part of Dibbinsdale SSSI and Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserves. They include ancient woodland which cannot be replaced and the River Dibbin is an important river/wildlife corridor. They are all known for historic and/or recent badger activity. Development of the SSSI is totally unacceptable and largely impractical given the nature of the terrain and the difficulty with access. I also object to any housing next to a SSSI, as this would undoubtedly lead to its deterioration. Cumulatively the development of this land would have a devastating effect on all wildlife including badgers.</p> <p>SP058 C, D, E East and west of Pipers Lane, Heswall - I am opposed to development of this land in principle. This site was home to active badger setts & destroyed under licence by an unsympathetic land owner. This demonstrates how the hopes of landowners for the removal of Green Belt status can influence their actions including the destruction of wildlife habitat. Badgers have a habit of returning to old sites and the badgers could have returned or may return to this site. Certainly badgers are in the vicinity and have been seen by local residents. Until the badger status on this site has been verified I would request that the Green Belt status remains.</p> <p>I am opposed to further development adjacent to Wirral Way. The Wirral Way is important wildlife habitat and wildlife corridor. It is already important for recreation. SP062 West of Barnston</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Village - I am opposed to any development in this area (south of Gill's Lane, Pensby) as it is important badger habitat. There is a large active sett in the river bank plus a subsidiary sett in a field hedgerow to the rear of Fender Way. Development of this site would considerably reduce the badgers' foraging area and increase the risk of human disturbance. It is part of Barnstondale LWS which is an important site for badgers providing excellent habitat, a wildlife corridor and supporting a large population of badgers.</p> <p>SHLAA0708 Land at The Akbar, Heswall - This site is immediately adjacent to SP058 where there is a history of badger activity. Until the badger status has been ascertained I would request that this site is not included. If badger activity is confirmed at SP058 then there would need to be a buffer zone which would include part of this site.</p> <p>SHLAA0916 & 3009 Land at Grange Hill Farm, West Kirby - This land is adjacent to Grange Hill LWS where there is an active badger sett. The site is already important for recreation and I would object to any further encroachment on the hill. In conclusion I object to the release of Greenfield and Green Belt land for housing and request it should stay as Greenfield/Green Belt land. Relaxation of Green Belt policies negates the important purpose of supporting urban regeneration. Therefore development should be focused in the existing urban areas with redevelopment of Brownfield sites. This is the most sustainable approach and the least damaging to wildlife. Every effort should be made to avoid building on Green Belt land especially where there is wildlife interest. Any development in a wildlife area would require an extensive buffer zone around it to prevent disturbance to the wildlife interest especially around river systems and sensitive areas. Wildlife needs space, minimum disturbance and it is vital to maintain links to other sites to enable wildlife movement. The impacts of any development must not lead to increased or future demands for building on Greenfield or Green Belt land. If Green Belt protection for the parcels of land under review is removed then the protection given to wildlife in the Local Plan policies should be increased. It must be made clear that development which adversely affects wildlife especially SSSIs or LWSs will not be allowed.</p> <p>In response to the above consultation I hereby provide my commentary on the 'Proposed Green Belt Sites for further investigation'. This comprises two documents as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This letter which sets out broad commentary on the importance of Green Belt principles purposes and policies and their continuing relevance to the preparation of the Local Plan. 2) Table 1- including an Impact Assessment for many of the land parcels for which I have some personal knowledge which are currently under further investigation as potential development sites. [Greenbelt Background and NPFF extract included; Rural England quoted] Land owners and developers continue to hold significant areas of land in the Wirral Green Belt on 'hope value' recognising that any future relaxation of Green Belt restrictions will lead to higher land values and profitability of housing development. Further there is plenty of evidence of targeted approaches currently being made to land owners in the Green Belt by some of the major house building companies seeking to enter into agreements to develop private land when Green Belt policies are relaxed highlighting that this may be imminent. These pressures are likely to skew the results of tests of viability of development which the planning authority uses to guide its policy development. A key role of the planning authority should be to uphold the Green Belt policies though this role appears to be compromised by political direction and conflicting planning guidance. In principle, green belt land should not now be under consideration for new housing development. Green Belt policies have hitherto ensured that there is a strong presumption against development and only applications which have met the rigorous tests of exceptional circumstances have received approval. Given that the current consultation assumes that an, as yet unspecified, area of Green Belt land will be made available for release to meet, as yet unspecified, housing development targets within the intended Local Plan period, it is important to focus now on the specific attributes of the land parcels under consideration. The following commentary refers to some of the parcels which are included in the schedule of Green Belt sites for further investigation (September 2018) of which I have some personal knowledge. In the attached table, an assessment is made of the likely negative impact of development against each Green Belt Purpose: For each land parcel, an overall negative impact score is obtained based on the degree to which the development of the land parcel would depart from the intended Green Belt purposes. I consider those land parcels with the larger negative scores should be at the least risk of being released for development. Please refer to the table for specific weighting and commentary for individual land parcels. Some of the issues identified are discussed in more detail below. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas: All of the parcels considered in the table would be lead to a moderate to high negative impact. Those which have the lower impact tend to be smaller sites which could be viewed as infill or 'rounding off' existing built up areas. However there are some significant concerns around the extent of some of the parcels which have been included. Sprawl could result from allowing a development zone across a wide sweep of land e.g. the area comprising SP061, SP062 and SP064E which along with other parcels SP019B and SP058 to SP061 inclusive would represent a major expansion of 'Greater Heswall'. 2. To prevent towns merging into one-another: For many of the land parcels under consideration the impact of allowing development would contravene the Green Belt principle of preventing the merger of towns. High negative impact is exemplified by SP060 which if developed would obliterate the rural land between Pensby and Irby. Similarly the sense of separation between Thingwall and Irby would disappear if SPO19B were to be developed. Both of these areas which are under 'further investigation' support Green Belt purpose 2. There would be significant loss of local amenity, urban squeeze and loss of ecological integrity along the upper Arrowe Brook corridor. The network of public rights of way which follows the Arrowe Brook and links the settlements of Irby and Pensby across rural fields, currently affords health and well- being benefits which would be eroded or compromised. Development in this area would put pressure on National Trust land at Harrock Wood and privately owned woodlands alongside the Arrowe Brook East of Glenwood Drive, Irby and development would encroach onto woodland at Limbo Lane and also along the south western boundary of Arrowe Country Park. Similarly parcels SPO61 and SP062 currently provide separation of Thingwall and Pensby from Barnston and Barnston from Heswall. The net effect of permitting housing development in any or all of these parcels would be to merge urban areas as part of a major expansion of 'Greater Heswall' which would be contrary to GB Purpose 2. 3. To safeguard the countryside from encroachment: The parcels under consideration show many examples where there would be significant encroachment into the countryside. This has moderate to high negative impact both through the direct effect of land take for development as well as impacts due to development alongside features of ecological interest or historical significance. An example of the latter is provided by the land parcels both around and within Storeton Village while many of the adjacent parcels would adversely affect Storeton Wood via Parcels SP030 to SP036.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns: This purpose is not particularly relevant to Wirral although development which threatens the setting of an historic village like Storeton could be deemed to come within the consideration of this Green Belt purpose. There are also features of historical interest which are recorded on the Sites and Monuments Record which need protection. Examples include a field system to the east of Irby Road, Irby within parcel SP060 and the site of an ancient well to the west of the Anchor Inn, Irby within parcel SP059E</p> <p>5. To assist urban regeneration: Development within the Green Belt does not benefit urban regeneration objectives; if land supply for housing is forthcoming from Green Belt this could totally undermine the Green Belt purpose and policy benefit of acting as a driver for urban regeneration. Wirral Council appointed consultants to assess the economic viability of new development in the Borough. In broad terms their work (2014 and updated in 2018) indicates that development viability improves significantly on sites west of the M53 motorway. This suggests that this Green Belt Purpose is not being met due to demand for high value homes in a rural setting. The willingness of Government and local government to force consideration of relaxing Green Belt boundaries will exacerbate this trend in development viability thereby undermining the key purpose of the Green Belt in assisting urban regeneration.</p> <p>Housing Needs: The availability of equitable social housing, affordable housing and the need to incentivise property owners to bring empty properties into the habitable market (c.f. penalising them) are important elements of an integrated approach to meet housing needs. The extent of viable brown field sites which Wirral Council has identified for housing is disappointing. It appears that Peel Holdings' Wirral Waters scheme could have been a more significant contributor to the overall housing needs had planning permission for some 13,500 homes been granted under different conditions and time limits.</p> <p>Development in the Green Belt is likely to benefit developers, landowners who are prepared to sacrifice agricultural land and a wealthier demographic. Local authority funding is increasingly dependent on council tax revenues. Building luxury homes both increases the potential revenue due to higher rateable values with council tax easier to collect from owner occupiers.</p> <p>Green Space and Recreational Capacity: Building in Green Belt locations may reduce the requirement to provide additional green space c.f. development in the urban area. It could also result in protected sites within the Green Belt being down-graded to Urban Greenspace for example Stapledon Wood at Caldy, (also a Local Wildlife Site) which is within the SP013 parcel. Development within the Green Belt will also place significant squeeze on the network of public rights of way and permissive paths, reducing the health and wellbeing benefits which residents enjoy on a daily basis e.g. within SP060 land to the south of Thingwall Road Irby where a network of rights of way crosses open fields between Pensby and Irby and follows the upper Arrowe Brook corridor including through Harrock Wood. Housing development anywhere in the borough is likely to increase recreational demands on open spaces and there will be increasing demands on designated sites notably SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and SLBIs.</p> <p>Ecological considerations: If land is released from Green Belt protection for housing, a significant concern will be the negative impact on ecological sites and networks: We should be working not only to prevent avoidable damage and further fragmentation of wildlife sites but to increase the integrity of our ecological networks throughout the countryside and in urban areas. Releasing Green Belt land for housing development sits uncomfortably with this aim. A 2010 report Making Space for Nature report made the case for wildlife sites to be Bigger, Better, More and Joined up. The 2016 State of Nature Report made plain the magnitude of the decline in UK's wildlife and the scale of the challenges to be overcome to turn this around. Living on Wirral, we are fortunate that we live alongside some of the most important sites for nature in the British Isles especially the Dee Estuary. Alongside this huge benefit comes the responsibility to provide for the effective long term conservation of these internationally important natural resources. Housing development anywhere in the borough is likely to increase recreational demands on open spaces. There will be increasing demands on designated sites notably SSSIs, SACs, SPAs and SLBIs. A key test of sustainability will be the impact assessment of new development on these protected sites and a strategy is required to mitigate these impacts. As stated above, many of the land parcels under consideration will, if developed, result in squeeze on existing natural watercourses, woodlands, ponds, hedgerows and other natural features which act as corridors and habitat for wildlife. Important wildlife corridors like the farmland east of the M53 around Storeton could be severely compromised by these proposals. There is a risk of some of Wirral's best woodland sites including Stapledon Wood, Storeton Wood and Harrock Wood being isolated from linking countryside. Reference is made in some of the consultation document notes to apparent mitigation measures e.g. 'Protect river corridors, Harrock Wood and public rights of way' (SP060) or 'Protect Stapledon Wood' (SP013). In practical terms these notes represent complacency as they give no indication of how this protection would be achieved. The likelihood is that these features would be compromised by development of the adjacent land. Making space for nature amongst Wirral's under pressure countryside presents particularly tough challenges and it will require much more effort on the part of planners, politicians, landowning interest and local communities. The continuing absence of an agreed Local Plan makes these challenges even greater as development and political pressures increase. Planning for sustainability of future land use is clearly not easy. If these proposals were properly considered against sustainability criteria, the release of land from the Green Belt would be shown not to be viable. I urge Wirral Council to reflect on the guidance in the National Planning Policy Framework 2018. The overarching aim of planning remains 'sustainable development'. A key duty is to provide for the conservation of the natural and historic environment. All development is charged with achieving 'net environmental gain' which should be 'measurable'. Please resist the pressure to release Green Belt land and work to maintain the benefits of Green Belt policy which have served this country well since 1955. I am writing to say that it has just come to my attention that there is badger activity in two sites in West Kirby. The sites are numbered as follows in the proposed Housing Allocations; SHLAA0716 - North of 90-92 Grange Road and SHLAA0718 - East of 92 Grange Road. I am unable to confirm badger activity before the 5.00pm deadline today but I will investigate as soon as possible. Until the badger status on these sites has been verified I would request that the sites are exempt from development proposals.</p>
DOR01177	<p>[SAME AS DOR01074] with the following additional comments: The fundamental character of Wirral is at risk. While having a relatively high population density for an administrative area that is not in a city Wirral doesn't feel like a conurbation. This is its most valuable asset it is a microcosm of Britain, with a feel of more than its urban landscape. This must be protected. Given that the areas goals can be met without the destruction of greenbelt I hope that this will be achieved. I would like to understand what the next steps are in the process.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01178	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01179	If the proposed houses are for British people born and bred in the UK, and they are first time buyers, then I am all for as many new houses being built as possible. If the houses are elaborate ones, built for property developers then I am dead against the idea. I want to give young people a chance to get their own houses, like in the 1960's. Keep the rich people down South (the sort who watch Blue Peter and Countryfile, where all the piggies have shampooed trotters. Also, give preference to people who work locally!
DOR01180	Wirral already has one of the highest levels of built up area in the n.w of england and therefore least able to support further building. The infrastructure surrounding sp062 is poor with hgv limited to pensby road only. The local schools and hospital are running at or above capacity and cannot support further population load.
DOR01181	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01182	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01183	[SAME AS DOR0770] Building so many houses will have a massive effect on the infastructure of our villages how will schools medical centres roads, which are already full and traffic a big issue in Heswall. Greenbelt should be just that greenbelt! We need green open spaces we need farmland so britain get start moving forward in sustaining ourselves with homegrown produce. We know of one hughe housing estate in little sutton which have stopped building because nobody buying – protect our greenbelt keep britain beautiful not a concrete urbanization!!!
DOR01184	Report based on the wrong statistics. Wirral population is ageing, therefore no need for large amounts of housing. There is no evidence of young people needing housing being drawn to Wirral or extra population arriving. No development of new businesses on the Wirral needing staff. There are more businesses closing down, especially Birkenhead. The need for housing is estimated. Brownfield sights could be located and used, maybe some incentive to be given by the Council to help builders clear these sites. Has empty properties been located and included in the report? There is no need to destroy Wirral's greenbelt for housing. It is a "gem" giving oxygen for health and space to have leisure and enjoy. The report should be redone using the correct information. We look for Wirral Council not allow this destruction of greenbelt.
DOR01185	Demolition of car park in Bromborough (Proposal) This will have a detrimental effect on shops in the village. If car park goes. Bromborough Village as we know it now will die. This car park is well used, what idiot decided to destroy it? Re. demolition of civic centre/Bromborough library (Proposal) Have the council lost their senses. These places are well used by various Clubs and the community at large. To sum up the council has no common sense to propose these proposals and Bromborough Village will die if they go ahead.
DOR01186	[SAME AS DOR0770] I believe that the following comments are so convincing that implementation of the Local Plan for housing in the Wirral and review of the Green Belt make these proposals completely impossible to accept.
DOR01187	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01188	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01189	Not happy at all. This road is already very busy and outside my house not wide enough for a car & lorry which in my opinion shouldn't be allowed (that is lorries) to pass one another. The common has been gifted to the people of heswall to enjoy by lord leverhume. There is a boulder with this inscribed. The traffic situation & health issue relatig to the fumes is unacceptable to the residents in whitfield lane. We would also loose our green outlook from our cottage if the agricultural land opposite us is built on. Very angry resident.
DOR01190	I am writing to express my deep concern and disappointment at the proposal to destroy Wirral's Green belt land. This is despite the fact that should the Green belt be released for development: 1. Built up areas would grow in an uncontrolled way. 2. Neighbouring communities, eg. Irby & Greasby would be more likely to merge. 3. The countryside would be spoilt. 4. The character of communities would be compromised. 5. You are refusing to put brownfield sites first. Thus making null & void what the Green belt was designed to do. People (except yourselves) are much more environmentally aware now than they were from 1950 – 80, so of course many thousands of people are against your "local plan". I am especially concerned about Green house farm, Greasby. At the moment, we need all the farmland we have due to the uncertain situation over Brexit, and the farm is prime farm land once this land is gone, it is gone forever. You may will by now have read, or become aware of, the report submitted to you by the Wirral Wildlife Society (the Wirral branch of the Cheshire Wildlife Society) Due to the fact that several protected species inhabit the copse, hedgerows and fields on the farm, the W.W.S. have objected to development on any part of the farm, & indeed on many 'parcels' of land owned by Leverhulme Estates. To allow development would mean a devastating loss of wildlife and habitat. The copse would, in effect, lose its protected status & would probably become a public right of way, to the detriment of the wildlife. At some point in the past, the planning Dept. thought it was a fantastic idea to have three schools within yards of each other (Hall Drive, Rigby Drive, Mill Lane) with two of the schools having no less than 4 school runs each day, and the roads being narrow, more congestion an traffic

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>would be unsustainable if houses were to be built on farm land 'East of Rigby Drive'. Access to this land is almost non-existent, and excess traffic would be a heavy burden for local residents. Only last summer, one mother collected a child from 'Our Lady of Pity' school was quoted as saying she would drive on the pavement in order to escape the congestion. We do not have the infrastructure to accommodate thousands of extra people, and in this climate it is extremely difficult to see where the council is going to find the money to fund it. The existing infrastructure is crumbling (many examples too numerous to mention) and is not getting the funding it needs, so how can the council support new infrastructure?</p> <p>The land 'East of Rigby Drive' is well known for poor drainage, and the Wirral Council tax payer would probably have to pay for assessments/liability studies to investigate drainage and traffic problems, which is unacceptable; anyone can see these problems for themselves. As you also know, Greenhouse Farm is an important archaeological site, and I expect you have the report submitted by Liverpool Museum and other interested parties. As the land in question is on a slope, existing houses would lose privacy, and house prices would fall. In conclusion, may thousands of people have voiced their objection to the "local plan". The statistics show clearly that no Green belt land needs to be sacrificed; Wirral does not need to be desecrated. Let's have some common sense and democracy in action – stop development on any Green Belt land. If development goes ahead, [the Council Leader] and the labour contingent of the Council will long be remembered as the party which destroyed the Wirral for future generations – for people and wildlife.</p> <p>Why bother to consult us if you are already determined to destroy green belt land? What a sham! Like many others, I am dismayed beyond belief that most of the Borough's Green Belt Land could be released for development.</p> <p>I am particularly concerned about Greenhouse Farm, Arrowe Road, Greasby, for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is grade 2 farm land, some of the best on Wirral. With the uncertainty over Brexit and imports/ exports we need our own farm land. 2. Greasby Copse is a site of Biological interest. The currently protected copse will be destroyed if houses are built along its edge, as people will wander through it. Will you relocate the many animals which use the field and hedgerows if they are ripped apart? 3. There are severe drainage issues associated with the land. 4. The farm is a site of archaeological interest. 5. No amount of 'sensitive' development will compensate for the destruction of the farm land. Houses built will not be social housing as the Government has stated they want. I wait with interest to see if democracy and common sense will prevail, and if political posturing will for once take a back seat. I suspect seeking our opinions on this matter are a total sham. If so, then it is the labour council, sacrificing votes in future elections, who will be blamed for the destruction of wildlife and communities for future generations. Will you destroy the Borough in which you yourselves live? <p>I attended the 'consultation' meeting at West Kirby concourse on Tues 18th Sept at 10 o'clock. However, this was a presentation, not a consultation by any stretch. There were no representatives to consult. Facts and figures have been shown to be incorrect. Why is Greenhouse Farm, Arrowe Road, Greasby included as a possible area for development?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is a site of biological importance. The fields are needed in order to sustain the species there. If the local biodiversity Plan is being thrown out, this is appalling. 2. There are severe drainage issues concerned with the land. 3. The site scores poorly on UDP policies GBT 2, 6, 7, 8 and 9 as an area for possible development. 4. There is no infrastructure to support the extra people if development should go ahead. 5. There is poor/extremely limited access to the site. There are three schools within yards of the farm, and the traffic during the three school runs is already a nightmare for local residents, with parking on pavements etc. 6. The site is an area of archaeological interest. SHALHH document only ready after consultation over. I will take note if green belt land is not released if it is on labour councillors' wards. <p>The Green Belt and our areas of natural beauty should be protected at all costs for the sake of the health/wellbeing in the future of residents and wildlife. The infrastructure we already have should be improved and maintained properly, e.g. existing roads. Statistics show there are enough brownfield sites for house building, and that no Green Belt land needs to be released at all. Creating "garden villages" would not disguise the fact that Green Belt/open space/wildlife habitats would have been destroyed. Greasby cannot take anymore new "infrastructure". We need to concentrate on the crumbling/poorly maintained infrastructure we already have, e.g. roads which have been poorly maintained and repaired, bin collections only once per fortnight, bus companies persuaded not to terminate certain routes, litter not being collected from roadsides, grass verges not being cut regularly, etc. Even our hospital has been slammed in recent months for poor administration. I find it very hard to believe that the Council will find the money to invest in "new" infrastructure, when they don't invest in the one we have. No Green Belt land should be released at all. This would entail the destruction of habitats and render the 5 points null and void - what is the point of them anyway? To say that green Belt land was released in the past is a very poor argument - how can building on such land protect the countryside from being spoiled? There has to be a point where we have to say no more or future generations will wake up to a concrete, organ sprawl with no green spaces or wildlife habitat. If Green Belt is released, the 5 points opposite are null and void. Only point 5 is applicable and should be considered, also point 4. The consultation for local plan has been rushed and the consultation period too short. We should be protecting our green spaces and farms from developers and this Labour Council. You will by now have received reports from many interested parties, including the Wirral Wildlife Trust (Cheshire Wildlife Trust). They are categorically opposed to development of several of the land parcels. The number of signatures against this appalling 'Local Plan' now runs into thousands. The statistics do not warrant any release of Green Belt land at all, anything else would not be democratic - do not release any Green Belt for development.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01191	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01192	[SAME AS DOR0770] A need for more accurate information on low cost housing need. Brown field site availability and development BEFORE allocating & releasing Green field sites. Traffic/ health services and schooling implications must be addressed.
DOR01193	I strongly oppose any building on green belt land 062. The proposal to build so many houses on the parcel of land 062 is flawed. I thought this country was trying to cut down on pollution and greenhouse gases. How does building so many more houses and their many more cars on the roads meet with this criteria? The infra structure is not suitable, if the houses are to be ¾ bedroom, where are the extra schools, doctors, bus services, shops and jobs within reasonable distance. Apart from all these reasons the land is valuable agricultural land. Please consult more widely on finding more suitable sites. Wirral is precious and should be protected, encourage more tourists. Most people below Watford gap have never heard of the Wirral. Stop being a slave to the government and stand up for Wirral, it is unique. Stop giving greedy developers the go ahead to build yet another commuter sprawl.
DOR01194	[SAME AS DOR0770] Frequently we are reminded that the global population is increasing dramatically. Farmers are being urged to grow food wherever possible. Between Pensby Road and Barnston Road is an area of rich fertile land. The farm is well maintained and highly productive. There is no justification for destroying agricultural land on this scale. This local plan proves lack of thought, knowledge and appreciation of the countryside.
DOR01195	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01196	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01197	[SAME AS DOR0770] I am very concerned about the local farms which would be forced to sell land if these plans went ahead.
DOR01198	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01199	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01200	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01201	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01202	[SAME AS DOR0770] The Green belt land 062 would be a disaster due to excess traffic. It's at max already. The schools are overloaded. Wildlife & bats is also an issue. Infrastructure will not cope with 1200 houses IMO
DOR01203	The narrow road leading from Barnston Road to the centre of Heswall, is a very busy rat run for commuters (I have even had problems leaving my bins out on the narrow pathway) The roads into and out of Heswall are already very congested – it is inconceivable how we could cope with her proposed extra housing! I would be very upset to have my property devalued and to lose this area of greenbelt. <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Aside from the fact that I would hate to see destruction of green belt land in terms of ecology (the very reason I chose to live here) the following points are extremely important. • I am a grandparent charged with delivering children to school each morning and collecting each afternoon. The parking around the school has become impossible for those needing to use a car. The school and local residents could not cope with further demands! • Over the past couple of years the extra cars along Milnes Road & Whitfield Road entail a great deal of driving noise & understanding as cars meander in and out (waving politely) in order to keep a flow. Heswall itself is dreadful at key junctions spreading out to Arrowe Park – these are daily hazards which would be exacerbated by extra housing on the scale proposed.
DOR01204	I am writing in regard to the Wirral Councils Local Plan. I am extremely concerned about the plan to build on Wirral's Green Belt, this will be an ir-reversible tragedy and must not be considered until the Brown field sites and empty properties are utilised. There are numerous objections to the allocation of Green Belt for development. I list a few:- <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Local Population growth figures do not substantiate the housing targets identified by the Council. 2. Lack of government funding for infrastructure. 3. Isolated nature of Green Field sites and access to facilities, ie service of regular Public transport, shops, etc. 4. Impact on core services Doctors, Hospitals, Schools. 5. Employment opportunities for new neighbourhoods. Wirral's Green Belt, presently comprises of 46% of land which if the proposed plan goes through will reduce to only 23%. People need Green spaces more than ever now to escape the stress of modern life. Finally.....Development on Green Belt sites must always.....always be as the very last resort.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01205	<p>Why sub-parcel SP010a (Greasby Copse) should not be released either wholly or in part from the green belt.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> According to local rumour, only the field at the south-west of site SP010A (bordered by The Close, Rigby Drive, Greasby Copse and Our Lady of Pity School) is being considered for release from the Green Belt. If this is true, the residents who would be affected should have been informed well before the Feedback deadline on 26 October 2018. There is no mention of a possible partial release of SP010A on the Council's website and documentation or in letters sent by the Council to residents on 3/9/2018. This field must not be sacrificed to 'save' the rest of the site. 'The area of very good quality land (Grade 2) is found on the slightly higher land in the western part of the site', 'the site is climatically Grade 1', 'Land of very good quality (Grade 2) occurs in the western part of the site' (ALC Report, June 1998). Good quality agricultural land is needed for food production now and in the uncertain future. The new Agriculture Bill makes this clear. Greenhouse Farm is a thriving concern, much appreciated by residents since its inception in the 1960s. None of its fields should be released from the Green Belt. Greasby Copse is a Core Biodiversity Area. A 'buffer zone' around it would do little to protect its wildlife, trees and plants from the effects of so many new households e.g. predatory pets, bored youths. Nearby is a Mesolithic site and traces of the Chester-Meols Roman Road which follows the hedgerow down to Barker Lane. Of all the Greenhouse Farm fields, the south-west field is nearest to the Copse. The site is on an incline and new houses would look down into the back gardens of existing properties on Rigby Drive, particularly those at the upper end. Because of their elevated position the new-build houses would be an eyesore obscuring the view of the beautiful Copse from Hall Drive, Barker Lane and all around. Wirral Council refused Planning Permission (APP/98/05749) for a phone mast (19 February 1999) citing 'disturbance and loss of important flora and fauna', 'visually obtrusive and out of character with the surrounding area'. Why would a housing estate now be acceptable? According to Wirral SHLAA 2017 the optimum walking distance from housing estates to a high frequency bus route is 400 metres or less. The nearest point of Site SP010A is over 800 metres from the nearest 437 bus stop. It has not been made clear if and where the site would be accessed from Rigby Drive. Development would put more pressure on local schools and doctors, and dentists, surgeries, would bring traffic congestion, noise and disturbance from building work plus loss of amenity and open space. More expensive infrastructure would be required. Green spaces are vital for residents' health and well-being. The surrounds of SP010A would no longer be so attractive and existing properties could lose value, causing great distress to hard-pressed elderly long-term residents and to families faced with negative equity or needing to home to take up employment elsewhere. <p>Greasby has already taken its fair share of development and is now a sprawl of housing estates around two parades of shops. What little is left of its rural aspect must be saved. KEEP SUB-PARCEL SP010A (Greasby Copse) IN ITS ENTIRETY IN THE GREEN BELT.</p>
DOR01206	<p>Why are you considering building on green belt land when all other areas have not been exhausted ie. Empty housing approx Three thousand six hundred empty properties and Brownfield sites SHOULD be used even if there are extra costs to builders?</p> <p>Peel Holdings have planning permission for approximately Thirteen Thousand houses which at the moment are only going to build sixteen hundred and yet Wirral council have given them a 20 year planning application, this cannot be allowed to continue especially when we have just found out Peel Holdings want to buy the Trafford centre for thirty Two Billion pounds. Make them build the houses promised or revoke their planning consent.</p> <p>Green belt should not be used until all other areas have been exhausted!!</p> <p>Where are all the jobs going to come from? Nearly everybody I know on our street who are working, commute off the Wirral including myself. You are talking about twenty six thousand adults if only two to a house excluding children. How does this help the environment when everyone will have to travel in cars? How is that going to help hit new emission targets etc?</p> <p>Proposed Green belts site SP062 of Barnston Village has Bats, Barn owls, Tawny owls Badgers and Hedgehog's, Foxes, Door mice, hawks, peregrines, sparrow hawk, buzzards and many more which all live off this land.</p> <p>New hedgerows have been planted in the last three years which must have had EU/UK Grants or subsidies they are going to be ripped out including all existing hedgerows which have been here for years and we have been told all the time that these hedges are needed for nature and the environment to survive. Approximately one hundred to two hundred mature trees are to be felled, how this can be allowed to happen? When again we are told by Michael Gove on Andrew Marr show we need more trees? It cannot be allowed to happen.</p> <p>We have just learnt from a former employee that there is a twenty two acre site at Clatterbridge hospital which has been offered to Wirral Council for housing which is not been considered, this plot would not impact the environment as it has existing buildings on the plot that are no longer used, why is it not been considered?</p> <p>Also most of the land is arable so why is this been considered for building land. (View of SP062) attached.</p>
DOR01207	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> The green belt should not be released for any development. It is vitally important to maintain a healthy environment for us and all wild life, plant & animal, and help in the action against climate change. All agricultural land, whether green belt or not, should not be developed as it is important for food production for us or trade. It also fulfils the same advantages as the green belt. There are sufficient brown field sites suitable for development, which could improve deprived areas too. The need for 12,000 houses is questionable since Wirral's population is relatively stable and the projected population increase does not require so many.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>5. The government also gives the directive – “Planning right homes in the right places” Green belt and agricultural land are not the right places.</p> <p>I attended the meeting on Sept 12th at Pensby Boys School. I found it very unsatisfactory, The speaker’s microphone was inadequate (it was not a hand held one) as was the very small screen for such a big hall, nothing could be seen or heard properly. The maps of Wirral showing the green belt were hard to interpret and too crowded to have a proper explanation.</p>
DOR01208	<p>We need green belt land, left as such. We interrelate with animals & birds & must provide green open spaces & trees. The law must meet the needs of nature & people to keep the balance. When walking we do see land owned by large companies & supermarkets, which remain “Derelict” for years, seems to be connected to money.</p> <p>Yes, we do need to build more houses, couldn’t it be regulated, that not so many large types are built. We need to ask if houses with several bathrooms & inbuilt cinemas, status symbols & the likes are really needed.</p> <p>I know, over the years, we have taken land from parks, farmland & green belt. This must stop & we must preserve what green belt we have left.</p>
DOR01209	<p>For the last 12 months we have had to live with Lovell’s development</p> <p>Which consisted of building mess, dust, noise, road closure, extra work traffic. (NELSON ROAD) has been left with a very uneven road surface because of all the heavy works traffic. We now see that building development is being considered on land near our property (SHLAA0763)</p> <p>The parking in NELSON ROAD is very tight as we have to compete with the Darby Arm’s (Patrons)</p> <p>NELSON ROAD was just not built for this amount of traffic and it is getting quite dangerous and that’s before this new proposal goes through.</p> <p>We are two 70 year old residents with a blue badge “due to our disabilities” and we have enough difficulties trying to find a parking space as it is.</p> <p>We hope you will take our comments into consideration</p>
DOR01210	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] We fully agree with all the points made in the enclosed comments sheets. We strongly believe that development of this area – strategic parcel 062 – is a mistake. House prices and sales figures in North Birkenhead/Tranmere fell dramatically after the financial crash in 2008 and they have remained almost static since, as they have done across most of Wirral. The proposal to build so many large homes in a desirable area in West Wirral suggest to us a cynical attempt to meet targets and raise cash for developers rather than a genuine attempt to address the issue of providing homes for those who are most in need. We believe that money would be better spent in developing and improving other less wealthy areas of Wirral to redress the balance and increase the desirability of living there. With investment in housing renovation, re-developing derelict sites, community and policing in these areas, they would become desirable locations for affordable living without the need to destroy rural belts.</p> <p>We need our green spaces for the health and wellbeing of all our residents. We believe that, should all this building on green belt land go ahead, all we will achieve is a growing influx of people who can afford 3-4 bedroom homes in the wealthier part of Wirral while the poor will become poorer because we are not investing in genuinely affordable homes.</p>
DOR01211	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] We do not wish to live in an area which has no green belt space. This is why we chose to live here in the first place. Thank you.</p>
DOR01212	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] I do not support the local plan.</p>
DOR01213	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] Unacceptable levels of noise, traffic if this proposal goes ahead. Too many houses in limited space, destruction of ‘green belt’ showing lack of understanding of environmental issues.</p>
DOR01214	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] I BELIEVE THAT THE FIGURE OF 1200 HOMES HAS BEEN REVISED. THIS SHOULD Response to Wirral Borough Council Local Plan Consultation October 2018</p>
DOR01215	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770] I do understand that homes need to be built but taking so much green belt when there are other options is not conducive to a populations mental health (positive) and having worked in mental health for many years I do understand it tremendous importance. Please consider carefully EVEN if the options cost more money!!!</p>
DOR01216	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770]</p>
DOR01217	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770]</p>
DOR01218	<p>[SAME AS DOR0770]</p>
DOR01219	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. These proposals and consultation commenced prior to the revised information coming from the Government stating that the council did not now need to provide 12,000 homes over 15 years. As a much reduced number of homes now need to be provided for, the council should SCRAP the existing Green Belt review and issue revised consultations based on the lower number of homes that are now required to be built. 2. With the lesser number of new houses now required, the council should firm up plans with Peel Holdings for Wirral Waters and take into account the number of new homes available to be built on brownfield sites, before reconsidering any plans to meet the shortfall from release of existing Green Belt. 3. I am strongly against the release of any Green Belt sites on the Wirral for additional housing or industrial development. Green Belt is an important nature of Wirral and should be protected. 4. The existing proposals for release of all the Green Belt sites currently listed is too great a sacrifice and particularly penalises the area on the East & South of Wirral (to the East of the M53 corridor) <p>If implemented, there would no longer be any Green Belt along the Wirral side of the Mersey.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01220	I strongly disagree with the proposal to build 534 new houses on Green Belt land, Rigby Drive & Arrowe Brook Lane. WIRRAL needs open spaces - GREEN BELT. Not only for farming but for the well-being of the population. The access from Rigby Drive is dangerous, passing two schools. The road narrows to a single track towards Our Lady of Pity primary school. Arrowe Brook Lane has many bends & is already busy, especially morning & evening. There are no footpaths making the route dangerous for pedestrians. There are 91 brown field sites in Birkenhead which would be far more suitable. Affordable for first-time buyers. The proposed building on the site of biological importance near Hancocks Wood is horrifying. This is an ancient copse. An area which was fundamental in dating our village of Greasby (Greavsberie) as having been settled for over 10,000 years. Farmland & open spaces are only beautiful if you take care of the history. If you don't its gone for ever. Since 1961 the Appleby family has kept a dairy herd, now numbering 200 cows. Also a flock of free-range hens. Wirral & England need farms to produce our food. More important than ever as "we" are about to leave The European Union. A number of sites have new homes. The Pines estate off Arrowe Park Rd, Upton. As well as the building on land by the approach to the M53 Moreton. This is enough. Who is hoping to make money out of this idea? The hospital, doctors surgeries, Schools will be over subscribed. Not to mention more traffic just adding to the chaos on our roads. Don't let this happen – PLEASE
DOR01221	[SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01222	<p>I am a resident of, Greasby and have some general concerns with regards to the area plan for Greasby my concerns locally are as follows.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are 3 schools locally and currently Shaw Lane is very busy at school times, parents' park regardless of any thought for residents also they drive very fast up and down the lane. It will become even more busy id addition housing is built. Also currently there are problems with water pressure and drains. Generally I feel these proposals will have a massive impact in the infrastructure of Greasby. The cost to the council will be enormous and I can only see and even bigger rise in council tax to accommodate the work required, new schools will have to be built, where? And what cost? 2. The local doctors are already over subscribed and under pressure. What about our local hospitals at Arrowe Park and Clatterbridge both struggling to meet their targets and needs of the greater Wirral community. 3. The roads will become busier and need more maintenance my lane alone is on accident waiting to happen. 4. Greasby has a wonderful natural habitat joining Irby to Greasby will destroy this and we will lose the wonderful animal and bird life that have made greasby their habitat. 5. Why destroy our "Green Belt" when there is more suitable land elsewhere. Greasby has already it fair share of housing. Who is this housing planned for anyway where are these people coming from that are desperate to live in Greasby. Please reconsider the plans!!
DOR01223	The Green Belt is sacrosanct. It is not just for us but future generations to enjoy, what about buying agricultural land then converting it into development land and selling it to developers and using the profit to buy more land. Govt targets may change over the next 15 years, if the Govt look over the building of more houses and tried to use the green belt they would lose votes in the next election. Better they lose votes than you.
DOR01224	It would be sacrilege to build on green belt land please, please do not. Anyway there are plenty houses. To build in Eastham, would be sacrilege. Or any area of natural beauty the Wirral is a lovely place and I can think of lots of things we need. A bus service to hospital, more police, a walk in centre, to name but a few. There is so much traffic on the roads even in my road it can take ages to cross the road outside my house. In the last 11 years I have moved 3 times it is easy there are plenty of houses even with a small budget.
DOR01225	<p>We need social places to meet and plenty of car parking to attend local meetings, function, visit friends and frequent shops. Local businesses need to be accessible and able to offer convenience for shoppers to visit. I teach keep fit at the Bromborough Civic Centre every week, and the local people take the time to stay local for coffee and shop. If this building was to vanish there would be a shortage of places to host this and of activity and if parking was lost too, there would be nowhere to park cars and small village would suffer. Green areas are needed to compliment living areas, plus the open space and park area is much needed in the summer months.</p> <p>Please understand this centre is really important with the library for its users and services. The elderly have a chance to mix and socialise in a building easy to park, walk to, get buses to and the taxi rank is so convenient. Everyone deserves the chance to speak up and say they need halls, rooms and WC's for everybody accessibility, and the library is still a useful building to have mums with children, babies and quiet times. Thank you for your time in reading my viewpoint.</p>
DOR01226	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) A 13th golf course and Luxury hotel would not be acceptable 2) Who pays for increases in road work, education, health 3) Value of existing properties would decrease 4) Swimming pool safety (case dealt with in past) 5) Pavement safety (3) – (cases in past) <p>Can council handle safety of new Wirral. Above need to be dealt with. So such points need to be considered.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01227	<p>Please view websites:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Better retirement housing 2) Leasehold knowledge partnership <p>Eastham mews a poor development which should not have been allowed. Sadly so much is wrong. Difficult to sell so stand empty I can't sublet (have to pay service charge/ council tax). Management Riverside home ownership is incompetent (in conservation area). I have lost 3 potential purchases for a variety of reasons. Some which I could disagree with. A true nightmare which could be compounded if Eastham House and the ancient woodlands are developed. Worrying times.</p>
DOR01228	<p>First of all this shambles is the creation of the ruling council in not doing their job, asleep? Having been born and lived on the Wirral and lived here over 90 years I am appalled at the thought of this delightful Wirral being destroyed even further. Over population is the prime reason for this situation and we all know who was responsible for that! Unless this erosion into the Green Belt is halted, somewhere down the line all our parks will end up in the concrete jungle. Mankind has destroyed the good lords gift to us by creating Brown Belt let us preserve this Green Belt and receive his blessing. God gave us a brain let us use it better than this. What maths genius arrived at a figure of 12,000 homes? What equation was used? The conclusion must be that not building that number means thousands of people living rough. What a load of rubbish!</p>
DOR01229	<p>First of all, the 13000 homes that peel holdings have promised to build by 2030 a) exceed the 1200 demanded by the Government b) 2030 would be in a shorter period. So what is the problem? The council must co-operate fully with peel holdings. They must see that all preliminary legalities are dealt with very speedily; the council must inform the Government of the plan. Secondly, why do we need all these houses and who is going to be put in them? I doubt it will be the homeless, found on the streets, of our council towns and cities. Thirdly, where are all these people going to find work? There simply is not any. Local people have been trying for years to find employment. If those being housed already have work in the area why do they need to move? To build on green belt land makes a mockery of having it in the first place. When it was introduced it was supposed to be untouchable for ever. That was the whole idea of having it. Perhaps the Government needs reminding of this. Why not use land occupied by long derelict eyesores? The site of the old B.P. garage, by the traffic lights, at the Burton turn off on the A540 springs to mind. Many shops have unused space, above them, which could be converted into living accommodation, some authorities have already done this. Not everybody is elderly, disabled or has small children. Room for bicycles etc. can be made downstairs. This has the advantage of improving the look of the area. Sometimes, when you look above perfectly decent shops and businesses, all you see is decaying filth. If all these prove insufficient we still have brown sites available. How do the Government calculate that there is not enough of it? People come to the Wirral because of how it is. If we make it into one large suburb nobody will want to come. There will be no communities to foster a community spirit in. As I understand if the proposed area here is land which the local farmer and his family form. What is he supposed to do? Join the already large number of jobless? He is unlikely to find work ever again. It is iniquitous that it should ever be considered. The politicians are always telling us that they listen to the people. Well the people are telling them loud and clear. "I am sure many members of the Government and opposition have enough land surrounding their properties. Let them build these houses there, or is it the greedy property developers, with £ signs oscillating in their eyes, buying land from equally greedy land owners. If the latter the government should tell them categorically no.</p>
DOR01230	<p>If 12,000 new dwellings are built in Wirral's green belt then it will no longer be Wirral and I am unclear whether I will wish to continue to live here in an area I have chosen for its big green areas. Such a vast number of dwellings in such a tiny area will utterly destroy the characteristics of the Wirral and what makes it a pleasure to live in. I am constantly sickened and stressed by the wall to wall concrete, brick and tarmac and the lack of trees that is already a problem in Wallasey. If there must be this colossal building project then it will have to be blocks of flats. I see no other option. But even then, we are talking about 250 blocks of flats.....where would they go? How could we hide them? This plan for 12,000 homes has no basis in reality. It cannot be achieved. You will have to fight to get 250 dwellings past planning, let alone 250 blocks of flats.</p>
DOR01231	<p>I support green belt boundary changes on the periphery of existing built-up areas where plots make no significant contribution to meeting green belt objections. I think in particular of the boundary around Roman Road in Prenton. The boundary here includes a former landfill site and a NHS building which has already been developed over the greenbelt boundary. Pulling the boundary back to the hedge line of the golf course would make more sense. If small areas on the edge of the existing built-up area are to be removed from the green belt then I would like to see a corresponding area included inside the green belt. I would like to see Bidston Village become a washed-over village in the greenbelt, in the same way Eastham Village is. Bidston Hill should also be included in the green belt to prevent Birkenhead from coalescing with Prenton entirely. I do not support alterations to the green belt boundary at villages already washed over by the greenbelt. I would like more meaningful public consultation about increasing development density within the existing built-up areas of Birkenhead and Wallasey, including minimum density development areas. The council needs to set minimum parking standards for origin destinations (including residential) and maximum parking standards for destination to reflect the most recent research which shows that restricting parking at origins does not have any effect upon the level of car ownership. The council needs to adopt the Governments Nationally Described Minimum Space Standards for residential layouts in order to prevent the consultation of 'bed in sheds' (e.g. the Clifton Road development of a stable last considered suitable for human habitation 150 years ago!) The Local Plan needs to make space for neighbourhood planning in a strategic and meaningful way so that neighbourhood plans and neighbourhood developments orders can support the strategic vision of the Local Plan. It is noteworthy that the Cheshire West and Chester Local Plan do exactly this. The development management policies in the existing UDP also need to be radically updated, especially the policy about back land development, which is supported by supplementing guidance which was produced for the previous plan and was not consulted on. It is ripe for legal challenge. Policies protecting conservation areas need to be strengthened. Our historic environment is unreplaceable and vital to a full understanding of the rich social history of the area. Article 4 Directions are needed for most conservation areas (Clifton Park and Hamilton Square in particular) to prevent the proliferation of u-PVC windows and doors.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01232	<p>Addressing the “Key Points”:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local Governments have had more than 10 years to provide these plans. After a decade of prevarication and ineptitude Wirral Council has produced a disaster and is now trying to put the responsibility for it on central Government. • None of the figures given are supported by any evidence. E.g. 12,000 homes over 15 years. • Similarly there are no facts given to show that there is insufficient brown field space. • Although the council does not own much of the land it does have planning committee. Let it stand up to developers. • I have no faith in it to produce “attractive developments” “which blend into their communities”. • There are neither statistics nor other information which accurately identify the real housing needs in the area. • Knowing that your Development Plan is unpopular and still going against the wishes of your electorate is undemocratic. Stand up for your elections. Stand up against parliament. • There is no mention of provision of affordable housing. • Wirral is a beautiful place: a combination of coast, town and countryside. Keep it that way.
DOR01233	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) We need more houses not flats, as flats not suitable for kids. 2) There are already too many flats on Wirral. 3) We need low cost houses for rent, not high priced houses to buy. 4) When building the infrastructure i.e. Roads must be updated etc. 5) Also affordable homes for people to buy, especially young families. 6) We still need a green belt, so only a % stay of a green belt area should be built on. 7) These extra homes mean a need for more leisure facilities not less, this should be part of the planning. 8) Parks to be updated as part of this process, more football pitches etc. <p>If we fail on this part we increase crime in the area, think about this please.</p>
DOR01234	<p>There must be lots of land around the borough that can be used before greenbelt. Run down areas could be rejuvenated by knocking down empty properties and building new ones. All the areas around corporation road, by docks it is all empty these areas could be made into nice areas to live.</p> <p>Where the schools, transport links etc. If all these houses are to be built. If they are social housing who tax pays – the long suffering council tax payers – that’s who.</p> <p>Councils are struggling to cope with issues at the moment with services being cut without added pressure having more households to deal with.</p>
DOR01235	I say ‘no’ to building on green belt land. I’m not happy with the tory Government or the labour controlled councils, who appear to have lied about Peel holdings.
DOR01236	<p>The Wirral is my birthplace and home. I’ve lived in Bromborough for 27 years and love our village. My daughter has just bought a house here as it’s a good place to raise a family. Our village is the vocal point of the community it’s a bustling hub where there are over 70 businesses. Everyone knows everyone. The civic centre and library are central to the community and are used near to maximum capacity. Morris homes are already building 217 houses in Acre Lane. To take away our civic centre and car park would totally destroy all of this!! No car park means shoppers would pass the village and use Retail Park. Events in the village would be poorly attended. I believe Bromborough pays a huge amount in business rates and we don’t receive much in the way of financial gain from the council. So it’s take take take from Bromborough why not use land that was compulsory purchased by council over 10yrs ago that has been left to grass (Livingstone Street in Birkenhead). Please leave Bromborough alone to flourish. It’s used by visitors and locals and provides not only shops but community which is sadly lacking these days and is much needed in today’s society. Please don’t destroy our village have a look at the bigger picture and let Bromborough serve the people who live here.</p>
DOR01237	<p>First hands off Green belt land, as we need it we need to breathe. Tree’s – plants give oxygen out for all of us. We should be environmentally friendly you build awful houses and flats it’s going to encourage [more] to let many people into the country ‘UK’ they have the next generation and so it goes on and on. Then you’ve got the ugliest Asda store in ‘town’ Birkenhead also [and] [plus] a store top of Oxtan Road, Birkenhead Aldi or Lidl! What a bad state of the arts, opposite you have building accommodations, flats where nobody lives, I believe there’s a planning problem. The Oxtan road used to be full of rows of houses, could have been redeveloped was brownfield – what happened there!</p> <p>Where I live I am in a bungalow you’ve now charged all residents more rent because you came up with an idea to increase rent because you put extra care plot about 3 years ago, yet we were are classed as phase 1 – and phase 2 are not classed as extra care, what the hell are you doing I will tell you now keep off the green belt land stop immigrants coming that are using other countries excuses when they’re not honest with themselves. Knock your own houses down and build three houses/flats on your plots. Use hidden brownfields and leave the greenbelt alone save our environment, stop people invading Wirral / keep UK free. Stop allowing more supermarkets – get our small shops back.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01238	<p>Re: - Proposed release of Greenhouse Farm (currently 'Green Belt') for development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Farm land is very valuable and we need to keep working farms for future generations, especially in view of Brexit! 2) The type of houses that will be built will not be 'affordable properties' for homeless people, as intended, and will not solve the housing problem! 3) We already have three schools in the area and the extra traffic would cause chaos with so many proposed homes being built. 4) The copse is a natural habitat for wildlife and should be preserved as it is – it would be destroyed with so much development. <p>Please consider very carefully because once our 'Green Belt' goes it will be gone forever!</p>
DOR01239	<p>Surely the existing problems for those living on Wirral now need to be put right before any more housing is built.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Existing problems on Wirral – lack of employment especially for school houses or early 20's. Difficulty and expense of travelling to Liverpool, Chester etc. for those who succeed in getting employment away from Wirral. 2) Pot holed roads causing expensive damage to cars. 3) Overcrowded Hospitals and long delays in getting treatment. 4) Lack of social care for vulnerable people. 5) Poor or non-existing bus services in many places. I have relatives who visit from London, people say the bus fares in London are cheaper than on Wirral. <p>How much Brownfield land is available on Wirral? How many homes could be built on existing Brownfield? Key points 2, 3, 4 – 12,000 homes over 15 years are 900 homes per year. How many each year will you provide on a) brownfield, b) council owned land, c) greenbelt? Why do 'local residents' have a 'need' for housing if they are already living in an attractive area? Why should new housing 'enhance Wirral'? I picked up this form in Greasby Library (luckily it is still open!) Why were these forms not sent to each householder? Who goes to the library? Are you hoping that few will reply, and therefore giving the Council full rein to do what you want? While saying that poor response means we are not interested, which is definitely not the case. Many, many on Wirral consider this council is hopeless. Prove us wrong, theres a challenge.</p>
DOR01240	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed home building on the Green Belt of the Wirral, are the 12,000 homes to be built over the next 15 years really needed? As we have been told the population on the Wirral is falling. Many roads will not be able to accommodate any large increase in the extra traffic all the homes will create, in my area alone Arrowe Park is always a snarl up, to and from the motorway so 500 houses in Gills Lane and 522 in Limbo Lane would increase the problem. Gills Lane onto Barnston Road which is supposed to be a Conservative Area is a junction with an accident waiting to happen, the other end by the traffic lights is always busy. With the development in Gills Lane and Whitefield Lane, Barnston Farms which at the moment produce food will be squeezed out of businesses. The Wirral is a narrow strip of land and the present roads leading from the Wirral could not cope. Hospitals, Doctors and Dental Surgeries are already under pressure, new schools will be required. All I can say is if this amount of housing is really necessary develop the Brown Sites first, of which there are many and as a last resort use the Green Belt as it can never be replaced.</p>
DOR01241	<p>We are writing to you to express our concern regarding the possibility of building on the Green Belt of Wirral. It is very surprising that the Government has told the council that 12,000 homes will be required by 2035. The population of Wirral has been mainly static for many years and there does not seem to be large increases in available jobs that would necessitate this number of homes. Some affordable homes are likely to be required but we think it is unlikely that builders will build many of these on green belt land. Brownfield sites should be considered before any Green Belt land is taken. Wirral Waters and the Brownfield sites should fulfil a large number of the quota of homes required.</p> <p>Barnston is a Conservation Area and building on these fields will change the character of the area. In parts Gills Lane is narrow and the junction with Barnston Road can be dangerous as there is no clear visibility. An increase in the number of vehicles using the road would only add to the problems. All the primary schools in the area are at full capacity and more homes would require more places to be found and the possibility of a new school being required, the cost possibly born by a council that is cash strapped. There would also be an increase demand on medical services in an area that is already very stretched. We feel it is doubtful that the infrastructure in the area would be able to cope with a large number of new homes. Wirral is a lovely place to live and visit. Taking away some of the Green Belt would have a detrimental effect on the Peninsula. It would mean large profits for a few but a great loss to the many.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01242	<p>Firstly there are around 60 to 90 brownfield sites in the Wirral also there are several hundred unoccupied houses in the Wirral.</p> <p>Whilst a large acreage of Green Belt exists in the Wirral, every inch of this will be required post – Brexit, as the Nation will need to feed itself and export in order to survive; otherwise pay high prices for imported produce and reliant on overseas supply-chains at all times. This will not help our economy re-balance of payments etc. Has anyone pointed this out to the blinkered people in Westminster? Wirral's Greenbelt also conceals much of our Nation's history. Examples are Eastham conservative Area, a likely battlefield site in the fields around Bromborough etc. Retention of the Green Belt also helps to conserve Nature and National habitat.</p> <p>The population of Wirral appears to be falling, if this is the case then the Government's figures are ridiculously optimistic and any housing demand can be satisfied by building in already existing urban areas. The Government insist that their current policies are in existence to preserve the Greenbelt, so why instigate this policy of building on it?</p> <p>Hoylake Golf Resort is a prime example of Greenbelt folly for several reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • £26 million of council tax payer's money to the developers, who have a very iffy past record. • Building on a flood plain. • Inadequate drainage. • Inadequate infrastructure such as roads, water supply, gas and electricity supply, public transport, and future strain on Council resources. • Will not generate the amount of employment forecast and much of the employment will be part-time and lowly paid. <p>The Wirral needs affordable housing for its young people, not the Governments definition of "affordable" but truly affordable housing. Housing policy needs to be aimed at this target rather than allowing developers to grab large chunks of the greenbelt and erect houses that most people cannot afford and place greater strains on local infrastructure and resources.</p>
DOR01243	<p>I agree that we need more houses. Whilst I do not want the green belt to be built on, I accept that this is the only way to build the required number. However, there is one aspect of planning permission that seems to get ignored and I think you should consider it (more) carefully when giving planning permission. This is the matter of parking.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Consider whether there is room for people to park their cars. If there isn't then people start parking on pavements – and they often do this even if there is sufficient parking space. You need to think about how to stop people parking on pavements in these new developments. I do not have the answer but I think it is an important issue 2. Builders must have a plan for where their staff will park their vehicles during the building phase. At present they just park where they want – usually on the pavement – causing problems for people in the existing houses. <p>This is a significant issue for people with wheelchair, prams, disabilities, children etc. and for pedestrians generally. The best time to tackle it is in the planning stage.</p>
DOR01244	To tell Peel Holdings to build the 20k+ units they said they would build.
DOR01245	I am completely opposed to any building or construction on any part of Wirral's green belt land. We were always promised that Wirral's green belt land would be preserved for future generations. It would be a disaster for Wirral tourism, because the open green spaces Wirral has to offer is one of the main attractions Wirral has to offer, nobody wants to visit a huge housing estate because that is what Wirral would become. Please see sense and block this insane plan.
DOR01246	<p>The removal of the South Annexe will be removing jobs from the area. There are very few parking areas in this part of Egremont. The removal of the car park and the building of houses will be reducing the parking areas. Rappart Road doesn't have enough parking spaces as it is. If there were more houses in the area imagine how little space there would be. If the South Annexe was removed there would be less workers parking in the area but the Town Hall workers and visitors always need parking spaces – you would be taking those away. Any meeting at the Town Hall would be denied parking spaces by the removal of the car park and the building of houses on it.</p> <p>The local shops which are still open in Brighton Street would be denied the South Annexe workers coming to use them and would possibly cause closure of these businesses. By the time the houses would be built we might have lost these shops! We lost our post office in Brighton Street. I get my stamps from A+A News now – it is closer than any post office. Further house would not raise the area; only reduce it in social standing. Something already done by shops closed in the area.</p> <p>No more housing in Egremont.</p>
DOR01247	In the July/August 2018 Edition of Wirral view, on page three, paragraph four of the article 'Wirral order to review levels of green belt land', it states that there is not enough land for 12,000 new homes and the Government says it is a requirement of the local plan that Wirral conducts a greenbelt review. This puzzles me as peel holdings were supposedly building in excess of 13,000 homes at Wirral Waters a brownfield site. If peel holdings are not building this number of homes, could Wirral Borough Council, with Government approval, compulsory purchase the land set aside for these homes by peel holdings, and build them instead. This would comply with the number of homes required by the local plan, and protect the green belt from development, whether that be housing or other projects such as golf resorts.
DOR01248	Too many drugs/alcohol dependent tenancies are running the area. Need more working families and young/older professionals in the area – keep our green spaces. Build below ground rather than above. Eco Friendly housing grants allow utilisation of extending planning permissions to town houses that have yards (yards are waste of space). Encourage rooftop extensions and gardens in replace of tiled roofs. Tranmere tunnels as well as all other tunnels are historic and valuable asset to tourism – create an underground city – utilise and make safe all tunnels. Protect coastline areas.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01249	This is a fruitless PR exercise – this council has a record of totally ignoring local public opinion! i.e. The Warrens, The Fire Station, The Golf Development and Parking Charges at the country parks. The council will go ahead with its own plans, regarding of all the opposition. Why does Wirral need 12,000 new homes – where is the evidence?
DOR01250	Wirral should oppose the Governments demands. The protection of the environment should be put first!
DOR01251	I would like to see and hope the process priorities the following: 1) Brown site usage (prioritise and don't release Green Belt) 2) Population density suiting infrastructure drains/schools/NHS provision / Roads /Transport Parking 3) Environmental impact / Water run off / Flooding 4) Emergency Response Cover 5) Affordability and Low cost provision
DOR01252	Look at housing that is currently unused and hope to refurbish for putting into a housing pool.
DOR01253	Your ancestor's fought for the green belt and you are destroying it bit by bit. You and the Government should be ashamed. The Wirral is over populated, underfunded, and over run by young thugs especially West Kirby.
DOR01254	I don't think you should use greenbelt land. Try to use vacant properties. What about the vacant dockland of Dock Rd.
DOR01255	It's good that brownfield sites in Rock Ferry and Birkenhead are going to have homes built on. There are too many unpleasant looking waste plots that give bad impressions – and wrong impressions – about the people who live there about. Some of the sites have some healthy trees growing which I trust will be considered to be left growing. Rock Ferry and Birkenhead need all the help these trees give – environmentally and ascetically.
DOR01256	I do not know what the local plan is. I know we need a great deal more affordable housing and not so many luxury houses being built for the wealthy few. When I see the plans I will be able to comment.
DOR01257	The developments planned for West Kirby need careful scrutiny – however nothing will ever be achieved in meeting targets if processes such as Ashton court – leave things turning into an eyesore and not a positive for the district or the council – as things stand.
DOR01258	We are an island!
DOR01259	I moved to Greasby as I liked the fact that it is semi-rural. Building on Greasby Copse is right behind my property which would devalue my house as well as spoiling greenbelt land and spoiling a Mesolithic site. It would also affect the wildlife that is there. There must be other suitable places to build.
DOR01260	As a resident in Bromborough I wish to retain Bromborough Village Library and Civic Centre. The Civic Centre is a vital community facility which has been let down by local council. The civic centre has two 'rooms' which are used by the community for community based activities and as such should be advertised clearly on the internet to encourage even greater use. All the activities and groups should be listed on the Wirral BC website with contract details so that all residents can see at a glance what is available. Also, booking of the rooms should be available on the internet to increase revenue and raise money to keep facility. It is also important to keep the car park which serves the library, civic centre, and other vital services e.g. Post Office, Bank, chemists, Shops, Solicitors, estate agents, dentists, doctors and physiotherapists etc.
DOR01261	I don't agree with building any houses on green belt land.
DOR01262	I think the whole plan is scandalous. Before even considering building on our wonderful green spaces – all brown field sites should be investigated. The council have already gone against public opinion and concern by building a fire station on green belt and a conservation area in Saughall Massie – learning two other fire stations redundant, why? Can they promise correct figures to show how many homeless people there are in Wirral? Why aren't the empty properties being taken into consideration? We can't afford to take all our beautiful green spaces. Wirral is a wonderful place to live and I feel that these plans will be an absolute disaster for us all. P.S Wirral Views is a total waste of money!
DOR01263	It is pleasing to read that [the Council Leader] does not accept the edict from London and is proposing to challenge it. As I see it the main housing problem is connected with the South East and to arbitrarily spread it across the country is ill thought through. A second observation concerns Peel Holdings. Having promised 13,000 houses presumably as part of the agreement, should be pressed to honour an obligation. In any expansion plan Brownfield sites should be resurrected first and the government should be passing a law that any privately owned Brownfield site must be developed. The potential of development around Birkenhead docks is enormous and a good developer could do wonders with it, competing with that other place across the river. What is the Albert Dock? A bit of virtually unused water surrounded by shops, some tatty. Water based theme park in the Birkenhead docks perhaps, or some sporting venue to match Manchester or Birmingham. An attractive housing area is not beyond the bounds of possibility and could be a very attractive place to live. Birkenhead has a proud history but alas is on a slippery slope. M&S gone and House of Fraser? If I may paraphrase a certain gentleman. LET'S MAKE BIRKENHEAD GREAT AGAIN!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01264	I am disgusted at the proposal for the exploitation of the current green belt. In the years will the 'leisure peninsula' be renamed the 'developers peninsula'? I envisage that any properties built on green belt will be aspirational rather than affordable homes – merely boosting the finances of developers and in all probability resulting in an inflationary effect on the values of the current housing stock – once again impacting adversely upon those whom the plan is, as I understand it, designed to benefit, those in head of affordable properties. Surely, before any such concessions are extended to the green belt, all brown field sites must be utilised – we see the benefit in New Ferry and Rock Ferry – and this should be the template. Finally, there remains the question of Wirral Waters! Peel has yet – to my knowledge, funded any developments themselves, after all these years, and continues to undertake presentations, but I would suggest most residents now consider them to be 'pie in the sky'. Given the failure to complete the scale of the Trafford Centre, a great deal of press coverage was given to the perceived financial position of Peel. The suggestion remains they are asset rich, cash poor and highly geared. The perception must be, that the view Wirral Waters, purely as a land bank, with to commitment to fund any developments, rather hoping that sale of parcels of land to third parties for developments will enhance the value of the residual area for future sides. I would ask that a formal deadline be issued for completion of properties, failing which the council issues a CPO, to be funded from profits and properties which could then be built!
DOR01265	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If you have given permission to feel holdings to build in excess of 12,000 new houses, you have already met the Government's requirements, whatever the legal niceties. • If Peel holdings which is a hardnosed commercial organisation only plans to build about 2,400 houses, over the 15 year period then that is their judgement on the potential demand. This is likely, to be much closer to reality than an inflated Government target, to cover their own deficiencies in the building new homes in the South East where the real demand is. • If this fanciful target is insisted on, then you should rescind the planning permissions given to Peel holdings and allocate that land to cover your targets.
DOR01266	The Wirral is unique in that it is a peninsula 8 miles by 11 miles to build on the green belt would reduce leisure and recreation for all who live here including the occupants of any new developments. The Wirral needs its town centre and surrounding residential areas to be invested in, with houses that the majority of people can afford either to buy or rent not outlandishly priced new developments on greenbelt land with commuting to work only possible by car. Current housing stock should be refurbished and upgraded including any properties currently empty. Peel holding should be held to account for reneging on the conditions that enabled them to purchase redundant dockland at a cheap price. Perhaps even compulsory purchase of all or some of the land should be considered as a preferable option to developing Greenbelt land and facilitating even more profits for housing speculators. What about New Ferry! 18 months since the explosion and still no building work in progress to replace what was a thriving shopping area. Surely this should be a prime 'brownfield' site and also a priority.
DOR01267	Every councillor and every Wirral resident must work together to challenge this – and prevent the destruction of the green peninsula. This is the result of failure by our councillors/council to do their jobs for Wirral residents. The 12,000 target is a ridiculous target- not justified/justifiable. 'Brownfield' alternatives could be found. I find it almost impossible to put into words my astonishment and deep disappointment that our Council has put us in this position. This proposal to take Greenbelt land for development of any kind is a monstrous attack on the physical, mental and spiritual health of the populace now, and for future generations. We are 'a green and pleasant, (and healthy) land because we have natural green environment. This 'proposal' is not set in stone. Our council(s) has let us down. It should be fought, and councillors have compounded their neglect to produce a plan, by giving away/ not resisting this 'edict' (which it isn't), this vast overestimate of housing 'requirement'. The value of Greenbelt is priceless to humans and wild life. Also, being a peninsula – a green peninsula makes Wirral a more valuable place to reside. It is a fool hardy travesty of pretence at local government to allow this to happen. Previous defence; 'consultations', have shown that the Wirral public are asked to engage with empty, futile processes. This latest, is a disgrace.
DOR01268	<p>I am very strongly against building on Greenbelt sites. Not only are there 6000 and empty houses in Wirral but also there are many brown field sites available.</p> <p>I am a member of ITPAS as a former resident of Irby and feel strongly that the fields around Irby and Thurstaston should be protected for historical, nature and tourism reasons.</p> <p>The council should be making more effort to regenerate and improve Birkenhead Town Centre and the Wirral Waters areas. At present everyone I know by-passes Birkenhead Centre and spend their money in Liverpool or Chester. As a matter of urgency this needs to be halted! Otherwise the area will spiral down as Liscard clearly has. I submitted a freedom of information request reference the number of empty houses and to date have not received a reply? Wirral is a desirable place to live and visit, please do not destroy our peninsula!!</p> <p>Overall good presentation. Was surprised about boundaries of areas i.e. that Pensby Irby and Thingwall are lumped as one.</p> <p>A planning application for 34 houses including affordable houses at towns end was refused and one reason was joining Irby and Pensby. I actually supported development of this untidy unsightly corner especially as it was for affordable houses. Please reconsider this site. Also the sites of Greenheys Nursery Thurstaston Rd and the Heather lands which would result in at least a total of 50 new homes without touching greenbelt. The Heatherlands site would be good for retirement apartments.</p>
DOR01269	<p>I have been resident on the Wirral for 15 years. Initially living 10 years in Liscard and now in Spital. I am dismayed at the Local Plan to build on green belt land for a number of reasons which are listed below.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • More than 10 years ago, residents were told, that Wirral waters would be destroyed for Housing. Cities such as Helsinki have made a fantastic job of redevelopment of dockland site into mixed community housing including housing for rent (protected renet), primary schools, secondary schools, housing for the elderly , private rented and owner occupied properties, doctors surgeries, art centre, park, playground and football pitch. • Peel holding has done nothing and now promises something within 30 years. This is a joke. Peel holding should be stripped off this vast assert, and a Finnish team should provide a masterplan that is worthy of wanting to live there. It's a total scandal that this vast wasteland from Birkenhead to Bidston has not been turned around. This site would be sufficient for 12,000 housing units of various specifications, 2 story to 8 story high mixed community settings. The area has even its own currently closed tunnel access. Wirral waters so far are a total scandal and urgently needs

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>sorting!!!!!! I would recommend a visit to Helsinki Dockland development rather than the ill-fated “Shanghai – Disaster”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are disastrous underused sites in Birkenhead itself, along Conway Street, near Hamilton Square and along Laird Street and Coronation Street. Housing there was demolished as part of some clearance scheme years ago, and absolutely nothing has been build there. Any council worth its merit should again tackle these areas; build mixed use housing, playparks and all other infrastructures. Close to Birkenhead North, again, the area has a grwea5t transport link. I just need some more high spec approach to housing. If Oxton works, why not try a second Oxton near there. • Rock Ferry and New Ferry are still totally run down and should be invested into with not only “stupid looking little houses” nobody wants, but with some decent high spec housing. Why not approach it by selling individual plots to keen self-build house builders, so a more mixed demographic comes in. The site of the old Rock Ferry School is still empty. New Ferry is still a bombsite and no go area, and it’s a scandal that nothing ambitious is done in this part of town. • Underused industrial sites in Bromborough should be converted into brownfield and the domestic use, as it is happening near the A41 at the other, with green corridors for cycling, children and dog walkers. • It is an absolute outrage to suggests, that ancient woodland (Dibbensdale) and surrounding ancient fields / oak trees should be considered for housing. This area houses stupendous amount of wildlife such as bats, foxes, falcons, waterfowl, butterflies, wood peckers, and a large range of song birds. It also provides recreation facilities (walking, jogging, gardening, and fishing) and is used by many elderly people who suffer social isolation as a meeting place and recreational facility. At a time, when the country and the NHS seek to address social isolation and high levels of inactivity with “social prescriptions”, the Dibbensdale and adjacent Brotherton Park provide both top many residents from Spital and Bromborough on a regular basis. The adjacent fields, would lead to the depletion of significant wildlife, and must be stopped at all costs. • Nearby Clatterbridge on the other hand, is totally underdeveloped site, and I have no doubt, since the infrastructure is already in place, 100+ high quality houses could be built within the perimeters of the Hospital grounds. <p>Like many of the people who respond, one of the attractions of Wirral is the ‘village like’ feel of many areas, but also the fact, that unlike Greater Manchester, it has not turned into a ‘pancake’ of endless housing with low quality and low levels of green spaces. Green spaces, especially woodlands, field, hedge land and [parks are the great asset of Wirral. Wirral has no concert hall, no arena, no contemporary art gallery, and no decent theatre (all that is nearby Liverpool), what it has instead is coastline, fields, forest, hedges and ‘villages’. It is absolutely essential that this character remains. It’s the single most important selling point beside good schools.</p> <p>So once again, sort out the mess around Wirral Waters! And Seacombe, and Birkenhead (the entire Conway road corridor). So much underused prime land.</p> <p>Say no to developing fields, destroying ancient woodland, wildlife, social spaces and fresh air produced by ancient and not so ancient trees.</p> <p>On another note, perhaps planning permissions to convert one family houses into intergenerational 2 family homes is another way of creating more high quality homes. I for one would not mind building on top of my bungalow for my son’s future family.</p>
DOR01270	<p>Regarding the current discussions for the appropriation of Greenbelt land for building: Remember the labour principle “for the many, not the few”!!! We are all aware that affordable housing is needed but there is ample land available for that apart from the Greenbelt. There are vast expanses of Wirral land in need of regeneration – crying out for people to settle there and bring new life to them. Why are you not able to build houses on these sites? Possibly with a school and a shop, a clinic and doctor to service the area. Create a community – that would make far more sense than expensive luxury housing – And if it doesn’t bring with it as profit – so be it! Aren’t people and their lives and wellbeing more important than profits? If so much money had not been wasted on the ‘investigations’ involved in the unwanted Hoylake Golf Course Project – perhaps that money could have been better used for the affordabl4 housing that is needed. Wirral has no need for another golf course and it has no need for luxury houses. Those able to afford luxury properties will find them – and if they can’t they will build them for themselves! It is not the person looking for the luxury housing that needs your help – it is those who need housing!!! A lot of greenbelt land is prone to flooding and to build anything where flooding is possible is a travesty. Many Wirral properties, my own included, already have gardens with drainage difficulties and it would be foolish to create more problems. It could be a disaster waiting to happen and the results could ultimately be very expensive for all concerned. The thought of you allowing houses to be built on farmland appals me. Farms are a necessity and are much needed. They have a purpose –and always will have. Because Wirral is fortunate to have green spaces – does not mean they are waiting to be developed and built on. I say again – there are other sites crying out for development on Wirral. Use them. So many of the proposed sites are unsuitable and would put considerable strain on current services for those areas. The schools, doctors, hospitals, police and fire services are already stretched to their limits. These proposals seem to emphasise that you are intent on ruining people’s standard of living and are not interested in the obvious implications just so long as you can build something! Nobody with any sense wants the Hoylake development to go ahead. Even people living at some distance are worried about the effects this could have on this land around them and have made their opinions clear. Yet still you refuse to listen top those people and continue to foolishly spend our money on this unsuitable project. We, the residents of Wirral, vote our Council in to look after us in whatever way is needed and we do not expect our money to be used and wasted in such a cavalier manner. Do the job you were voted in to do. Build affordable housing on suitable land and do not allow developers to pick and choose sites they would like to develop. Leave greenbelt land alone – once it is built on it is gone forever. Allow Wirral to keep the countryside that is there for all to enjoy because it is desirable for both local wildlife to flourish and for the people and children’s wellbeing.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01271	<p>There is a great need to refurbish of block of flats –e.g. grants to landlords and social housing. I’ve seen flats above closed shops where much work needs to be done. I live in Seacombe perhaps the worst for residential flats in Wallasey. Unfit for habitation. Should be condemned. Looking specifically at a matter I was involved in.</p> <p>The Mariners Home Egremont is due (I think!) to be refurbished in part of a contractual deal with the Wirral council. The chief Exec and his deputy, in particular, hold the file from 2017. Could a proving enquiry be made to the seafarers Association – who own it – to check program, before the bulldozers move in! Is it listed? The building could be transformed</p> <p>a) social flats b) elderly residential care homes c) Sheltered accommodation</p> <p>Just a few suggestions for you.</p> <p>There is a small (3 bedroom) terraced house- 27 Mainwaring Road Seacombe standing empty for years. It has been significantly refurbished, but at the front in very overgrown. Empty property. Can you sort it?</p>
DOR01272	<p>Building on brownfield sites is fine, where practical, and where people want to live, with local facilities already avoidable. It is not practical on land which has to be de-contaminated at great expense, unless funds are provided, I want the council to enable housebuilding with Greenbelt. Where necessary to help achieve annual building requirements e.g. within the agricultural buildings curtilage in Storeton (a recent proposal) or in similar circumstances in Thornton Hough. You must ignore the “not in my neighbourhood” bias of local residents.</p> <p>Wirral has dragged its feet on the keeping its up to date local plan over many years. I believe Wirral should use C.P.O. powers in certain circumstances to complete houses which are unfinished. Playing fields which are long as there will remain sufficient playing fields within the surrounding area.</p>
DOR01273	<p>I’ve lived in Greasby for 40 years a lot has changed; building another housing estate will ruin it completely over 500 houses, thats potentially 1000 children, its hard enough now with getting in the schools. You will need more schools, you can’t get a doctor’s appointment now, and you will need other doctors. The roads can’t cope now stand on Greasby road in the morning or evening we all know this has nothing to do with whats good for Greasby its all about money. You will put 20 houses on it that are affordable and call it affordable housing estate. “It not is it?” Theres loads of Brownbelt left, open your eyes “Bidston” unused houses “Thousands of them” No one in Greasby wants this, no one!!</p>
DOR01274	<p>Population in Wirral falling (See “W.B.C. compendium of statistics 2017”. Wirral homeless below average. Last available figures ... As reported in ‘L’Pool Echo “2nd Nov’ 15”; Frank Field M.P in parliamentary Questions was told 305 cases of homeless on Merseyside: 54 of those in Wirral, W.B.C. should be informing Westminster that housing need in Wirral is massively lower than their estimates. Sky News reported on 12th April 2018 that homeless charity “crisis” discovered 274,000 cases of homelessness in England across 186 local authorities = 1,473 homes per L.A. on average; reminder “homelessness in Wirral is lower than average” quote from P.2 of “WBC compendium of Statistics 2017” Of course not all L.A’s will have the same need, one size doesn’t fit all! Those L.A’s with less from morally obliged to take less from central Government so as to often more to those areas in genuine need. Wirral’s green spaces are the “lungs” of the area; not only improving physical but also mental health. They should be preserved for the generations to come; we do not have the right to perform the proposed barbarity and theft of their legacy. This is greed not need!!!</p>
DOR01275	PURE VANDALISM!
DOR01276	<p>As the owner of a property between Pensby and Irby. I object to the taking of the Green Belt Land between Pensby and Irby, and now that the Peel Group are going to Start building Property on the East Float and the Council to revive empty homes, I see no reason to take so much Green Belt Land. We don’t want Pensby and Irby to become one, and the loss of land for Horses and other wildlife.</p>
DOR01277	<p>Living between 2 proposed sites I am very concerned about the effect on roads, schools, doctors etc. I would feel better if the council considered other aspects of increasing our population eg. Parks, parking, whether schools can cope and are they taking into account the increased population of children/teens who struggle for somewhere to go as it is. A youth club, or sponsored activity centre. Also, surely the shortage of housing does not relate to the high end – out of first time buyer brackets on the proposed sites. People are fed up of builders making money under the guise of building “affordable housing”</p>
DOR01278	<p>I believe that the information of required housing is overstated. There are figures that indicate that there are between 4000/6000 empty homes on the Wirral. What action is the council taking to get landlords & developers to get these all back into occupancy??</p> <p>SHLAA 202A – BROMBOROUGH CIVIC CENTRE/LIBRARY</p> <p>There is a proposal that these two buildings are demolished to allow a mixed use development.</p> <p>It seems totally daft to remove two buildings that are always in use. The library has already had its opening days reduced which causes much concern to the residents in the area. These buildings are the hub of village life & the area, access to computers is curtailed – books etc for both adults and children especially for research for school work, not everyone has a computer at home.</p> <p>The civic hall is used for multi uses – clubs – children’s play groups – coffee mornings – bring & buy sales – classes for dancing – languages – availability for use photocopying services so I believe both should be kept otherwise village will die.</p> <p>SHLAA 2025 – ALLPORT LANE CARPARK – PROPOSAL</p> <p>The proposal to close the carpark to again build mixed use development seems to be at odds to a report “Bromborough Village District Centre Retail Action Plan” It states that by 2016 Bromborough Village will be thriving like never before. What has happened in two years to change this report?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Without parking visitors to the village would have nowhere to park their cars. People travel already from Eastham, Bebington, New ferry, Neston & Bromborough to do their banking. This is both business and private. If banks get less footfall, they will close. Businesses (71 in number) will also experience less custom which could force them to close. The council would lose business rates, four banks & post office would close – Banks always looking for opportunity to cut back. Users to Civic Centre also use carpark, without car parking, which is vital to the village – it will eventually die.</p> <p>SO PLEASE DO NOT CLOSE EITHER THE CAR PARK – CIVIC HALL – LIBRARY.</p> <p>THESE PROPOSAL'S WOULD NOT ENHANCE THE VILLAGE IT WILL KILL IT OFF.</p>
DOR01279	<p>We strongly object to the three sites towards the end of Pipers Lane, Heswall being considered for housing development because:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Pipers Lane is a very long, narrow winding lane without turning spaces, parking and is rural in character. It is lacking in footpaths and lighting causing danger to pedestrians, and is often blocked by commercial vehicles and parked cars. Pipers Lane is remote from public transport, shops and schools, making home owners reliant on their cars for most journeys. <p>Regarding sites SP058C, D, E.</p>
DOR01280	<p>I strongly object to the council's Green Belt proposals on the following grounds:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> The Wirral peninsula is a well-known, attractive tourist region. To reduce the greenfield areas as threatened would reduce the number of tourists and visitors and would reduce the W.B.C.'s income Wirral is a well-known healthy area, particularly the area to the west of the motorway. By losing a lot of open green fields this advantage would be threatened. Clearly the best way of reducing the national shortage of housing is to tackle the problem at its roots or source, i.e. in the first place reducing the tens of thousands of immigrants each and every year. The population density of the UK, i.e. the average no. of people per square mile, is one of the highest in Europe or even the world; let alone what it might be like in say 50 years' time. I've been reading in the local press about Peel Holdings proposals for the East and West Floats and looking at artist's impressions of sky scrapers, firm headquarters, office blocks and thousands of dwellings, looking at them over the past 10 years or so. It is now 2018 and nothing has happened! Why not? There are dozens of square miles of brownfield sites on Merseyside, particularly in Liverpool and Birkenhead. Little is ever heard about these areas being investigated or redeveloped. Another Lord Heseltine with his wide contacts is needed. Local Authorities seem to be easily hoodwinked by developers and building firms who claim that greenfield sites are cheaper to build on the brownfield sites. Their opinion is grossly short sighted and superficial. See 1. For e.g.
DOR01281	<p>Brownfield sites have the advantage of services being already in place. (Power supplies, drainage, roadways etc) They also have the advantage of having infrastructure like roads, shops etc locally. Developing sites in an already built-up area will re-generate local communities. Greenfield sites have to have, roads, lighting and services such as drainage supplied. The only reason for green field development is that developers can choose the areas where they will make the most profit.</p>
DOR01282	<p>I have attended a community consultation in West Kirby and studied the maps. It has been proven the housing needs are vastly over estimated so there is no need to build on the green belt. We should not build on pockets of land between housing. We need our green spaces for families and to encourage outdoor activities and to ensure our environment is not polluted. The Council need to use brown field sites only for new affordable housing and not purchase very expensive private land. Brown field sites need cleaning up as this will improve the whole of the Wirral's environment</p>
DOR01283	<p>As an 11 year old girl if the houses on SP058C, D & E were built that narrow road would be too busy for my mum to let me walk to the bus on my own especially in winter months when it is dark. This would limit my independence for now and many years to come.</p>
DOR01284	<p>I am writing to provide information about sites SP058C, D & E (land to the East and West of Pipers Lane, Heswall) in line with the request for public and stakeholders to - Confirm and refine the factual information about the assessment of each individual parcel, and - Identify any additional issues that may need to be considered if development was to be permitted.</p> <p>The 3 sites in question have been identified as suitable for a total of 93 dwellings. The sites are located at the very edge of the Heswall conurbation, a mile down a narrow lane. The lane has no footpaths for the majority of its length, as well as having very poor street lighting and not being wide enough for 2 cars to pass each other in parts. This makes the lane very dangerous for pedestrians, particularly local children and young people who are required to walk down the dangerously narrow parts of the lane, with very limited street lighting and no footpaths in order to reach the bus stops on Delavor Road to take their school buses to and from school.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> Compliance with Wirral Transport Strategy <p>Wirral has adopted a transport strategy which includes pledges on the environment including that: "Residents can use alternative travel modes to the private car to reduce carbon emissions and maintain standards of air quality". It is impossible to allow development on these sites, and comply with the Wirral Transport Strategy & sustainable development policy as any future residents would be compelled to use the private car given that the sites are 1 mile from the nearest bus stop which is only serviced by an hourly service that does not run in the evenings or on weekends. Alternative travel modes would not be available. It makes more sense to locate development adjacent to transport infrastructure.</p> Equalities impact assessment – discrimination against young people <p>Allowing development on these sites would discriminate against young people who are unable to drive by adding traffic and directly endangering our young people who are already required to</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>take their life in their hands on a twice daily basis to walk along the narrow and poorly lit parts of Pipers Lane in order to attend school.</p> <p>3. Biodiversity – threatening of protected species</p> <p>These sites are known locations of protected species (badger set) and very close to SSSIs & other biologically important sites. Local residents have reported sightings of badgers on Pipers Lane. Given the above information it is impossible to see how the current protections against development on these sites could be lifted and the Council remain compliant with its wider duties.</p>
DOR01285	The reason I moved here over thirty years ago was the beautiful abundant green areas, which host all sorts of wild life, Kestrels, Owls, Herons etc., building will destroy that. There has been a nett loss of people to the region as no new industry has come here. You have reduced the number needed to 500 per annum and with careful planning, the green belt can be retained. The only requirement is for retirement flats which are built on brown field sites. This will free up family houses for new owners. I hope this will plead my case and you will stick up for your electorate.
DOR01286	Have attended a few meetings regarding possible green belt sell-offs, and would be most disappointed if as a Labour Council you did not reject these proposals. It has been made apparent that new builds are not required, as there are sufficient brown lands and land already existing for Building Companies to make good. My interest is a personal as well as concern on behalf of the importance of green belt land being left for all to enjoy.
DOR01287	I'm opposed to building on any greenbelt land. There are plenty of brown field sites that should be used first. This would have the added benefit of building homes nearer to town centres thus reducing the need for more car use in order to reach services. The council should absolutely avoid developing so called "garden villages" because all these do is create more new roads and more new roads and more travelling due to the lack of local facilities. The greenbelt should be recognised as an important economic resource in itself, have a huge environmental and social value. Improving people's mental well-being is now a recognised responsibility of government and preserving green and open natural spaces play into this. The council should also look at forcing developers to increase the variety of the new builds via planning permission. Here in Heswall all new homes seem to be either five bed room detached with gardens or exclusive apartments. Where are the two bed affordable starter homes? There will surely be a knock on effect to the demographic of communities in the future, which cannot be a good thing.
DOR01288	<p>My view is that land currently designated Greenbelt should remain as such because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Current Greenbelt provides much needed green spaces between and amongst concentrated blocks of dense housing e.g. edge of Heswall expanding towards Barnston. 2. Taking away agricultural land for housing makes no sense. When population is increasing (naturally) and with Brexit on the horizon – we will need to be more self-sufficient in the future. 3. Areas of Greenbelt proposed for housing without huge further investment in facilities and utilities, will put severe strain on current provision in schools, health centres, water and sewage. 4. Locally not sure what we are all worrying over, as population of Wirral has supposed to have declined.
DOR01289	The consultation meeting that I attended (Hulme Hall) was an absolute disaster. The planning procedure has obviously been based on GVT statistics on brownfield availability and demographics that were totally unrealistic. The council's problems are of their own creation in that the plan should have been carried out by them several decades ago and not under threat of GVT officer involvement. The meeting broke up when it became obvious that half areas for "evaluation" would "not be suitable" and therefore should not have been proposed in the first place. The council have already auctioned the Wirral Greenbelt off to the highest bidding developers behind our backs.
DOR01290	This is as popular as the Poll Tax!!! Why are you so keen to kill the goose that laid the golden egg?? The appeal of the Wirral is its Greenbelt, its open spaces, its country parks. You should be encouraging more people to visit the Wirral. Sell its benefits. Not concrete over it. This would be political and economic vandalism. Farmland, post Brexit will be an important asset. Huge urban areas have to be fed. Wildlife has to be protected. Concrete over the Wirral and the area will die. Birkenhead needs to be regenerated. It is dying a slow death. Build the houses in North Birkenhead, where they are needed and at the Peel Ports facility. Build some hotels to piggy back on the success of Liverpool tourism boom. Set up a coach/bus tour of Wirral starting from Liverpool or Manchester. People are not aware of our hidden gems. There are many people in Liverpool that haven't a clue about the Wirral. I'm from Liverpool but live here on the Wirral because of its beauty and open spaces. I'm a lifelong Labour supporter, however I doubt for much longer.
DOR01291	<p>I wish to register my objections to building houses on Greenbelt land, in particular Greenheys Nursery, 41 Thurstaston Road, Irby and the fields at the rear of Irby Hall.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that Greenbelt land is kept as farmland. We are constantly being told to reduce carbon emissions. If all the Greenbelt disappears we will need to import more food so increasing carbon emissions and once we leave the EU. We will need to be even more self-sufficient in food production. • Increased population will further increase pressure on schools, healthcare and roads. Local schools are already full and doctors stretched and roads congested at peak times. • Destruction of wildlife habitat in the old Greenheys Nursery, Thurstaston Road would see a loss of owls, bats and other birds and wildlife. • Peel Group should be forced to keep their promise to build 13,000 houses on the brownfield sites they own or sell on the sites. Too many developers buy up land and don't develop it, waiting until it increases in value. Once plans are submitted time limits should be set for development. • Your proposals for building on Greenbelt land in the Irby area contravene the 5 Greenbelt tests and would severely compromise the character of the area. I trust that you will reconsider your proposals.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01292	I would like to register my objections to the building of homes on greenbelt land in the Irby area. We regular see items of T.V. or in the press telling us to produce more locally sourced food to reduce carbon emissions. So why are you planning to build on farmland at the rear of Irby Hall? We do not have sufficient infrastructure to support a large increase in the local population, for example, it is already difficult getting an appointment to see a doctor. Peel Group should be forced to keep their promise to build 13,000 homes, or sell off some of the land. They shouldn't have been allowed to buy so much land without a solid contract. Too many builders are buying up land but leaving them undeveloped for years. Is the Dee side of the Wirral destined to be one huge urban area swallowing up our lovely villages?
DOR01293	My view is that land proposed for re designation from greenbelt to use for housing should be left as greenbelt because: 1. Increasing population means more demand for agricultural products, particularly following Brexit when we may need to reduce agricultural imports. 2. Current greenbelt provides much needed green spaces between concentrated blocks of dense housing. 3. Large areas of housing on the greenbelt will further strain on utilities, services and roads. 4. The predicted need for housing is based on false premises.
DOR01294	NEWSFLASH 2025 - NEW TRAMWAY OPENS Connection Woodside, Seacombe and New Brighton Ferry Terminals via Hamilton Square, Birkenhead Park, Wirral Waters and Egremont Promenade – Where passengers enjoy a mobile grandstand view of the Mersey and Liverpool – probably Wirral's Greatest asset. Much praise has been heaped on the dramatic new Winter Garden Pavilion in Hamilton Square through which the trams pass.
DOR01295	1. Re development of car park in Bromborough Village (Proposal) This will have a detrimental effect on the shops in the village, as people will not have access to a car park in order to shop. This car park is well used and very often full. We do not need less parking spaces. Allport Lane (The Village) is already full with parking on both sides of the road. 2. Bromborough Civic Centre/Bromborough Library (Proposal – to be bulldozed, I can't believe this!!! It is important that both are retained for the following reasons. a. Access to library books for adults and children. b. Computer access. c. Toilets (The Bromborough Cross is a pick up/drop off for holidays/excursions. d. Talks given on a variety subjects, very often relating to local interest. e. Timetables (Bus & Train). f. Notices of Clubs/Societies/Forthcoming Events. g. Photocopying. h. Access to newspapers including "Wirral View". i. Coffee mornings run by volunteers. j. Play Groups. k. Various Classes, e.g. Yoga, Dancing, Reading Club. l. Elections (Government/Local). m. Attic Sales. The library and civic centre are vital in keeping the village alive!! (To be retained!!)
DOR01296	I strongly object to the portion of land known as Brackenwood Golf Course and Claremont Farm been taken out of greenbelt. This land is holding back the advancing intrusion of build up areas onto the last piece of countryside this side of the motorway. Keep it in will safeguard this precious remaining piece of countryside.
DOR01297	Greenheys Nursery, Irby. Rear of Irby Hall. Limbo Land. Thingwall Road, east of Horrocks Wood, Irby. Pressure of Schools. Health care? can't get appointments. Parking in Irby Village. Loss of agricultural land.
DOR01298	Farmland NOT suitable for housing back of property Pensby Road, Heswall. Horrocks Wood, Irby; Limbo Lane; Gills Lane.
DOR01299	We disagree, Wirral Council needs to consider re designation to any green belt land for development. Population growth for the future reduces any further housing needs? (The recently published ONS figures of which are wholly incorrect) The loss of biodiversity woodlands footpaths etc. The maximization of brown field sites must considered first option.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01300	<p>I feel very strongly indeed about the proposed depletion of Wirral's precious green-belt. Balance is everything in life, which includes the ratio of green-belt to urbanisation not only on the Wirral but everywhere.</p> <p>Despite the costs incorrect, it is of paramount importance to de-contaminate all land that requires it in my opinion (I note the grants mentioned for this). If it is not de-contaminated, the land concerned, I have no doubt, will be left as a useless carbuncle on a very precious peninsula. As we know, every last scrap of land needs to be made attractive to investors, before any green belt land is stolen for urbanisation.</p> <p>I fully endorse what has been said about using brown field sites first, it is essential. But, on the land has been made fit for purpose through de-contamination, then Peel holdings and other investors elsewhere will find future developments a much more attraction proposition and much of on housing problem will have been solved. The initial cost will eventually be re-coupled and the people of Wirral, I am sure, will endorse such a move and be left proud of our council's decisions.</p>
DOR01301	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why are we building more houses when there is clearly no need for them and will they just be houses that remain empty? • Surely you cannot put every County in the same category of houses required. There are not the jobs on the Wirral top bring in more people. • Who is going to be able to afford them? • If they are supposed to be affordable houses will they be very cheap and nasty spoiling the pleasant environment. • It would join up Pensby and Irby where at present there is a clear distinction. • The close is already full of cars parked and some almost double parked thus creating more through traffic. The bin Lorries already have problems getting through. • Already in the mornings there are queues of traffic this would obviously increase. • Extra schools, Hospitals, etc. would be required. • If in the peel report they say they have no infrastructure in place, if they pursue the plans they would have a depleted infrastructure owing to the increase in numbers of people in the areas they want to build.
DOR01302	<p>1) Wirral B.C urgently needs to contest the Governments "Office for National Statistics" population forecast and provide a credible alternative. Stop fighting central Government but co-operate.</p> <p>2) Consider more carefully infill sites. I have knowledge of the Woodchurch Estate and Thingwall Corner Estate both offer potential for infill. Consider for example the large strip of land adjacent to Woodchurch Rd. (E.g. from Arrowe Park traffic lights towards Asda). Other opportunities must exist throughout Wirral.</p> <p>3) Clarification to the tax payer of peels intended development of Birkenhead Docks should be given priority. In view of conflicting information given at the meeting I attended at "joint commune" from peel and Wirral should be produced for the public. Who is telling the truth?</p>
DOR01303	<p>Since the consultation meeting it has been reported that the figures stipulated for Wirral housing have been over estimated by the Government. It is essential that the elected members of our council now listen to the people, seriously look at the projected population growth or lack of it and push for a further reduced building target from the Government. What should be emphasised is that Wirral is already building homes, but I was informed at a meeting that these are not being used to reduce the Government target so Wirral is already losing open spaces before the Wirral Local Plan is implemented. Now the used brown field sites should be fully utilised. The housing projects need to be creative and attractive in the brownfield site areas. Look at how Liverpool has developed on – amazing Waterfront – Wirral should be doing the same. To use these areas and save the Greenbelt from developers who are itching to build on this land but they will not be affordable homes. Surely in the recent Agriculture Bill is about the country producing quality food and supporting farmers to achieve this and maintain their land. This is not the time for the council to turn its back on green belt the likelihood is that all this land will be needed post Brexit. We have a duty to protect this precious land for future generations. The fact that we are a Peninsula must be taken into consideration. The proposed plan now a result in the merging and densification of villages and township will risk undermining the character that residents highly value, which is part of the attraction for visitors to Wirral. The infrastructure to support such an increased population will have a further strain on the environment. The existing main road ways are already clogged up at rush hour times (being a Peninsula limits exist routes). How are we going to access the health services when already our hospitals are already under enormous pressure?</p>
DOR01304	<p>I think there is a need for more suitable housing in the Wirral. We especially need family houses and housing for the elderly. Some land should be taken out of the Greenbelt, the most suitable land would be land surrounded by housing.</p>
DOR01305	<p>Having attended the meeting at Pensby High School on Wednesday, 12th September I am increasingly worried about the Wirral Council's plans to build houses on the Wirral's Green Belt and their reasons for doing so which seem incredibly flawed. The number of new houses required, the projected increase in population increase here on the Wirral are unbelievable. Today's problem amongst the young and old alike are increasingly caused by stress and anxiety. It is a proven fact that fresh air, green spaces and beautiful landscapes are soothing to the soul, relaxing and refreshing. Please endeavour to keep our open spaces and try not to increase the urban sprawl. I appeal to common sense!</p>
DOR01306	<p>With the ever growing population, there will always be a demand for housing. People on the Wirral deserve decent housing in all areas, West, East, North and South. The planners at the consultation have explained the process and the plan very clearly. Whilst no one wants to see all the green spaces being built on, it is clear we need to build suitable houses somewhere. The best sites are the ones that are infill sites; the one's that already have houses around them. We need to start this process, sooner rather than later. Eco friendly houses that use less energy should be encouraged and supported.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01307	I am very concerned about the proposal for use in Whitfield Lane Heswall. The traffic there is already very fast and the school at the bottom of the road is (a crossroad) in danger of a child being injured. I hope you will reconsider; it is already a dangerous road.
DOR01308	I am a member of Bidston Village Conservation Committee and was pleased to see that the recent local plan proposals for the green belt close to village will remain unchanged. The separation of Bidston Village from Leasowe and Wallasey is critical for its identity to be protected. The Greenbelt at this point is anyway very narrow but its retention is fundamental to the protection of the character of that area. In respect of the other proposals throughout Wirral in order to show how national targets can be catered for in Wirral, I have particular view to express other than saying that the L.A. has to show it has treated national targets with respect. I do not believe that all these proposed new areas should be developed for new housing, but there should be intensive monitoring and updating over the 10 year period so as to avoid developers taking the 'easy' Greenfield option, rather than tackle the extensive brown field options fast and make sure that the potential of Wirral Waters is fully exploited. My view is that these letters areas will most logically cater for social housing which is the most important housing need in the borough.
DOR01309	We have attended two of your meetings about your plans for future housing on Wirral; at no time did you mention the bad water drainage in many of the areas you intend to build on. In Brian Ave, Irby the water drainage ditch no longer works, as the council no longer care for it and have allowed it to be filled in by some house holders, as a result the gardens flood every winter. The council will do nothing about it. The water should drain into the Arrowe Brook but this has flooded many times. If you allow any more buildings in the Thingwall Rd, Pensby, Irby area the drainage problem will be unmanageable. Harrock Wood and the meadow at the side belong to the National Trust of course. Not only will you need this to take the water away, but the trees will be needed to help with air pollution. Also if you intend to build many houses, solar panels should be installed to help the environment in all of the towns and villages of Wirral. Hoping notice is taken of Local Knowledge.
DOR01310	Helpful to hear of background to the consultation. Thought question re. Development of brown field sites very pertinent: i.e. is everything being done to encourage decontamination of these sites before the easy (and more profitable for the developers of course!!!) Option of developing Green Belt Land. Also, if 4,000 properties are already lying empty in Wirral – how do you justify the demand for all the entire development?? Where's the employment?? Working at the building already in Liverpool and Wirral, yet can see that Wirral is not for all looking like another city – urban sprawl? The Greenbelt was designed for health sanity – If we have to lose some of it, use as little as possible, delivering it attractively to include open areas.
DOR01311	The population projections for Wirral should be rigorously re-evaluated, before committing to the building on any sites. If there are only limited employment opportunities locally it is hard to understand where the projected increase in population and housing need in going to come from. Please consider the need for adequate housing for the increasing population of elderly residents. This could 'free up' family housing and enable the older residents to remain active and independent for longer. I would personally be sorry to see development of Storeton and Stapledon woods as these provide excellent local opportunities for residents to exercise (walk, run etc.) without having to use their cars. I would not be averse to small parcels of land in West Kirby (stables, towns etc.) as these would impact less of the heart of the community.
DOR01312	A large amount of detail was given about the geographical areas without any explanation of timelines for the actions described. Also, no explanation was given as to the methodology for choosing these sites; we should be told how such decisions were made. No attempt was made to discuss the bases of the whole Local Plan – the number of homes needed, where did the figure of 12,000 come from? What statistics and projections of population growth? This should have been explained. It is fundamental to the process. If this figure from National Government, does the council agree with it and why? If not, why have they not used the appeals process available? I was unable to question you about the basics assumption for the whole exercise – the number of houses actually needed – most frustration.
DOR01313	I strongly oppose development on Greenfield sites for the following reasons: 1. The council should not feel obliged to develop to some kind of blanket option, provided by Westminster, because the population of the Wirral is not due to rise by much. Any future development must reflect this. 2. With Brexit on the horizon, need for housing will likely be less, and need to provide food via farming should actually rise. 3. There are brownfield sites which should, in all cases, be explored first by collaboration between the council and Peel Holdings, as we were promised. 4. There should be a moratorium on development on all green-field; as yet undeveloped sites so that future generations can continue to enjoy our green spaces. I do not agree that green field sites should be viewed as more viable for building purposes.
DOR01314	1. How many empty houses are there on Wirral and what is the councils plan regarding continually uninhabitable houses. 2. Why, considering the number of people playing golf has decreased, do we need a further golf course, when we already have a well-known and suitable golf course that has had 2 open golf tournaments with great success?
DOR01315	Found very interesting, council explained very well and clear.
DOR01316	It's a shame that local people – particularly those at the front couldn't be grown up enough to a) not interrupt and b) allow us to hear the questions. Sadly the presenter gave the 2 most vociferous 'interrupters' the 1st and 2nd questions with the mic – not very equitable. Also sadly the presenter failed to answer a question regarding the breakdown of required units but referred her to go to a colleague at the back – shameful. He should have got the officer who would have known the answer, to answer the question!!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01317	Insufficient pressure is being put on Wirral Waters to commit to completing their planning application authorisation and building houses. Council is still “awaiting information from feed” – this has been in the pipe line for years and years. Also the chance of compulsory purchase of the land by the council is unlikely to succeed. In addition it is still not unable to build there so it is unlikely that the target expected by the council from Wirral Waters will actually be met in reality.
DOR01318	The council have been required by successive Governments to produce a 5 year plan. This council has failed to do so since 2000 and is now rushing a botched plan through. Irby, Thingwall, Pensby, Greasby will be merged to become one urban sprawl and as a consequence lose all identity. Whilst this is being done Birkenhead and New Ferry will continue to decline. If this was a school report it would state: Could do better.
DOR01319	1. Does the plan take into account the changing nature of the highest and need to regenerate city centres in the digital age 2. Are the detailed analytics on rejecting brown field options available? To demonstrate that these have been fully considered. Bearing in mind that such sites have been regenerated in other cities such as London – Battersea and Millwall. 3. Has the council used the same population growth numbers to plan for schools etc.?
DOR01320	Why are the council not doing a comparison study in relation to other peninsulas – which do not seem to have the same numbers of housing needs? A possible invite to Wirral from the Government Planning Minister to see our situation could be helpful – I am sure the Wirral Community would welcome this.
DOR01321	Regarding SHLAA 0716 and 0718 I do not feel 38 dwellings on this land are wise. Has schoolings been taken into account? 38 extra families would be a significant burden. Access would be an issue to the whole town. Extra traffic on Grange Road will be an issue (76 cars). The population of the Wirral is decreasing. Why follow irrelevant government targets? The excuse that Brownfield sites are too difficult to redevelop seems very weak. What developments are being done to the above sites? Please let me know.
DOR01322	Whilst we understand the need for more housing over the Wirral area. We are both very concerned at the proposed site opposite our house. We feel that by developing ‘affordable’ housing this will depreciate the value of our home. The road we live on ‘Milner Rd’, is already used as a ‘cut through’ from Pensby Road to Barnston Road will come increasingly busy. We are concerned that the local primary schools are already oversubscribed and our own medical centres struggling with the amount of patients each GP has on their register. Arrowe Park Hospital is already overwhelmed with the present population of the Wirral.
DOR01323	We have been bored into submission!! Dreadful consultation.
DOR01324	I want to thank Mr Hall for his clear, patient and detailed presentation and replies to questioners. My main reason for attending is to discover why the Council can’t compel feel to have hastened their housing at Wirral Waters. Whilst I now understand better some of the limitations (dwellings unsuitable for families) it still seems that a very large injection of funds (Homes England?) could resolve the problem of viability and, consequently reduce, for all time the sacrifice of Green Belt land.
DOR01325	Why are we the only country in the World that does not see the value of building multipurpose apartments for families with children in areas that also have industry/offices etc? Wirral Waters could easily be for all community groups – Look at Swiss and German models!
DOR01326	The Council decided in 2012 (according to the presentation) that Barnston, Thingwall, Pensby and Irby were our settlement area. This enables the planners to put in the Local Plan the infill of all the fields around these ancient settlements as viable for development of homes. Thus leading to an urban sprawl – a huge extension of Heswall and the loss of identity of Barnston, Thingwall, Pensby and Irby. The council should reverse that decision.
DOR01327	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Need to challenge national government figured and rationale it necessary in court. What population are being catered for? i.e. not affordable social housing. Post – Brexit conditions – will green land become more vital? What future plans are in place for agriculture? • Wirral is greenbelt. Tourism is important. Agriculture and open spaces matter – sustain and encourage population. Improve health and wellbeing thus reducing other costs e.g. medical. • What effect will population have on vital services and what provisions are being made for the future?
DOR01328	SP019 or SP019B – which one? Docs vary in reference to the two one is 100. 79 hectares one is 44. Review background report Sep 18 on website contradicts itself referring only to SP019 – misinformation – states 27% partially enclosed and if released will affect the separation between Irby and Greasby yet in other docs states the separated won’t be affected. Misleading to public during consultation period. Agricultural land classification for SP019 B is incorrect and out of date. You have used a map pre 1988. SP019 and 19B should be included in best and most useful agricultural land, I can prove this and will provide details of crops grown by farmers Easements re western link voltage cable included in this land. Please send me a copy of the information you hold regarding these easements and restructure covenants – as discussed. Also please advise me of evidence, obtained from Natural England for the current Post 1988 classification of SP019 and 19B. Both SP019 and 19B are areas of Biodiversity with Canadian migrating geese visiting year after year to feed. Natural habitat to bats, pheasants, ducks, hedgehogs, foxes, squirrels, rabbits. Public bridge ways and rights of way. Open views – encroachment on countryside. Consultation period is too short and very rushed – you aren’t giving people enough time to research info and not giving Peel enough time to provide evidence for the extra 6,000 houses they say they can build. Why is this being rushed? Not our fault the council have left it all too late. 6 weeks not enough time.
DOR01329	[SAME AS DOR00045]
DOR01330	I am completely opposed to any building on Greenbelt land, and already find Heswall town centre is becoming over crowded with flats. Also, just how many coffee shops does a small town need? It is becoming a joke over whoever is allowing this to happen. This council need to look elsewhere.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01331	I have lived in the Barnston area for 55 years and have continued to love and enjoy the open spaces, my concern is that they build on farm land on Barnston Road and close surroundings areas and will more likely drive people away. Also I have always understood that surrounding farm land is actually owned by Leverhulme estates and therefore would not be offered for building land. I would also like to add that any housing proposed in Wirral West would not be affordable to many. Also Heswall is also now over built.
DOR01332	I wish to register my objections to the release of all Green Belt land on Wirral and in particular Greenhouse farm Greasby. Why is there a need to build so many new houses? Walk down almost any road in the borough and you will see houses for sale. Who is going to buy these new houses? Wirral is a small self-contained area. There are only so many jobs in the area. Many employers, including the Council have reduced staffing levels. If people don't have jobs they can't afford new houses. On one site alone in Greasby there is a proposal to build 534 houses. This means a potential influx of 1000+ new residents. These people will need doctors – it's hard enough to get an appointment at local surgeries as it is. There could be several hundred children needing school spaces. It is doubtful if the local schools could absorb these new pupils. The council has previously declared in Policy OLE 18 that it would afford a high degree of protection to sites of ecological importance. There will be a strong presumption against any development on or close enough to affect adversely sites of special scientific interest, local nature reserves, and sites of biological or geological importance and other features or areas identified by the council as being suitable for protection on nature conservation grounds. Wherever possible the network of linear natural habitats and wildlife corridors will be protected and enhanced. Greasby Copse and Greenhouse Farm are definitely covered by this statement. The area is home to a wide variety of wildlife. Development would also mean the loss of prime agricultural land. Surely with Brexit we need to retain our farms. Development of this land would be in conflict with the principles of Green Belt control and must be avoided.
DOR01333	I would never believe a single comment from WBC because you are complete sham, intent only on doing your own thing regardless of the opinions of residents, voters and rate-players.
DOR01334	The Council can argue for a smaller target, 610 – 640pa. The latest household projections (base year 2016) for England are generally lower than previous ones (2014 base year) because they estimate lower rates of household formation and lower projected population into the future. The recent MHCLG Technical Consultation noted that its problem is with the latest household formation rates: lower than previous formation rates which were estimated from censuses back to 1971. MHCLG interprets the lower 2016 based household projections as an inability of people to form household because of issues of affordability and availability. This is not good science because the numbers are the latest, even if they do not fit in with the MHCLG's 300,000 "aspiration". The population projections are not affected. A solution might be to adjust some formation rates or use a hybrid of 2016 population and 2014 formation rates. Option 1 - applies the previous 2014 household formation rates to the 2016 based population projections. The result is an estimated 6,400 extra households in ten years or 640pa. Option 2 - applies the average household sizes from 2014 based projections to 2016 based population projections. The result is an estimated 6,070 extra households in ten years (607pa). Both options even with an affordability uplift, imply an annual rate of dwellings well below the Council's 803 figure. On the issue of affordability (from market signals), I consider there is little justification for an uplift. The 2016 and 2014 based projections imply Wirral's population and households are ageing. Older people tend to form households of one or two adults. The focus should be on smaller and older households. The Council has not demonstrated that it has planned fully for (i) bringing empty houses back into use and/or the current dwelling stock, (ii) fully securing development on brownfield sites, and (iii) accounting for the full potential of regeneration in the docklands and "Wirral Waters". These housing sources are a requirement of the NPPF before any alteration of greenbelt boundaries can take place. This includes the maximum use of brownfield sites underutilised land and the increase in units through raising the density of development. Wirral's head of planning has publically referred to 2,634 dwellings with planning permission, 2,400 dwellings possible on brownfield sites, 4,600 empty homes, and 6,450 dwellings/houses committed by Peel Holdings (see annex). Peel Holdings have confirmed they would build between 2,900 and 6,450 homes - depending on investment, change in the area and stakeholder commitment up to 2035. The full potential is then about 16,000 dwellings (1070 pa). Once these sources of dwelling numbers are properly developed over the 15 year life of the plan, (even at just three-quarters completion) there are no exceptional circumstances to alter greenbelt boundaries. The NPPF makes it clear that Greenbelt has a useful purpose and should only be altered by exceptional circumstances. The above latest calculations and the Council's failure to account for empty houses and brownfield sites do not constitute exceptional circumstances. Further the Council presentations quoted a need for an extra buffer of 20% (2,400 extra to the 12,000 figure). This is a misapplication of the mechanism of the buffer which is simply to bring forward the planned supply of dwellings (not an extra to the total – para 73 of the NPPF). Another issue is the Council's failure to take into account the current number of dwellings (habited and empty). It appears that Wirral has about 3,000 to 5,000 dwellings towards the assessment need (depends on how empty homes and excess dwellings over households are counted). If the Council pursued work on bringing empty homes back into use, gave positive support to developers of brownfield sites, and worked in a pragmatic and positive way with Peel Holdings, then along a 15 year plan, about 16,000 dwellings would be secured. Unless the Council does plan for these available sources, then it has not demonstrated it has examined fully all other reasonable options – in line with the NPPF (paras 136, 137).
DOR01335	I would like to make the following comments about the proposed Local Plan for Wirral in relation to the five tests for consulting on the Green Belt as per the NPPF guidelines:- Further building on the Green Belt will create large built up areas. As Wirral is a peninsula, it is surrounded by water to the north, east and west. The only direction we will be able to travel to access green areas outside the borough will be to the south. If all proposed areas are released, for development, the Green Belt will be reduced by an unacceptably large amount. This will increase the sprawl of large built up areas and affect the local environment and wildlife. I do not feel that all brownfield sites have considered. We have not been told which brownfield sites have been looked at and then dismissed as being unsuitable to build on (and why), so we are unable to see if the Local Plan has been thoroughly considered. Areas SP030 and SP033 are either side of Lever Causeway. They are large swathes of land which stretch from Mount Road to Storeton Village. Building on this scale is unacceptable and would affect the setting and special character of Storeton village. It would also affect the environment of the whole surrounding area and be a severe encroachment of the countryside. Lever Causeway is a beautiful tree lined road well known on the Wirral and used by many for walking, riding, cycling and jogging. It has historic significance as Lord Leverhulme designed this to join his manor in Thornton Hough to Thornton Road in Bebington.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01336	<p>Objections - I understand that it is simply not enough to object on basis that the greenfield sites proposed are areas where locally in Higher Bebington (and the other green belt areas under threat) are constantly used by residents for their enjoyment, health and well-being, both young and old alike? We must object under one of 'five tests' for consulting on green belt. Therefore I raise my objection against test number 5 - regeneration of urban derelict land:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In this case Wirral Waters project, that should have been well underway by now and would go a long way to meeting the housing stipulation by your department. • Why have Peel holdings been allowed to delay this project, despite free charge extensions by Wirral Planning and being allowed to use some Wirral Council office space rent free and suddenly reduce 12 000 promised homes to a mere 1000? - This needs looking into and responding. • Basic maths if Wirral needs 12000 new homes then Peel did initially promise this number - then job done! • Please provide greater clarity on where the 12000 required number comes from see attached stats - indeed is someone confusing dwellings and people - in fact Wirral population is and has been reducing year on year, so government demands from your department just don't add up - would be really appreciated if we can be shown the maths? • Simply why are you advocating green belt extermination when there are multiple brownfield sites across Wirral that would satisfy the requirements, which as above are questionable until shown your projection demographics that depict thus need. • Please can I request you look at this and don't just rubber stamp something and remove precious green belt land without asking the obvious, and searching questions as to what the alternatives are first - please get close to this before signing your name to it by agreeing to and allowing Wirral Councils Planning proposals without understanding them and questioning the ethos of Peel Holdings approach when having allocated government money to them based on original proposals ' • It struck me when I typed your email address that I hope you don't become aligned to your surname and be the one who agrees to a future 'broken shire' <p>There is a rumour that this whole thing is already a 'done deal' so the strength of the objections of Wirral residents and my time in emailing my family's heartfelt objection to you and others able to overturn this is futile - I sincerely hope not</p>
DOR01337	<p>I object in the strongest terms to this council's proposal to release large swathes of Green Belt land to developers. The council will have me believe that this is being forced by central Government. I dispute this based on the evidence that the council Strategic Housing Market Assessment, (2016) came up with approximately 12,000 houses required but yet this council took no action. Time and time again central Government insisted that Wirral Council produce a local plan and time and time again Wirral Council have done nothing. Sajid Javid wrote to the leader of the council stating that if a local plan was not produced central Government would produce one for Wirral - this is the stick that this council is now claiming to be beaten with. I believe that the current "consultations" are being rushed through.</p> <p>Independent Analysis of the Housing Targets shows that, using actual recent local population trends, the target should be between 220 - 350 houses per annum (or approx. 4,300 houses in total). I understand that background is in mathematical modelling, statistics and operational research. Section 44 of The Governments Document "Planning for the right homes in the right places", released in March 2018, states: "there may be compelling circumstances not to adopt the proposed approach. These will need to be properly justified, and will be subject to examination." I believe analysis and documents should be used as a basis to show that there are "compelling circumstances" not to adopt the Governments proposed method for calculating housing targets. I have to ask why the Council are not challenging the Governments targets, when Government guidance explicitly states that the targets can be challenged. Analysis shows that the land the Council propose to release from the Green Belt could actually support over 70,000 houses. At this rate of development the infrastructure simply could not and would not cope.</p> <p>Why are the Council claiming they are being forced by the Government to release Green Belt Land when, the truth is, that the Government are simply forcing them to produce a Local Plan like every other Local Authority? I understand that as part of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment in 2016, the Council received submissions from Developers wanting to build on 104 sites across the Wirral. I can only imagine that there are a large number of large house building companies, aggressively promoting the release of Green Belt land on the Wirral and also contacting landowners trying to buy up further land. What truth in the rumour that Morris Homes own the land behind Harrock Wood? If this is true then they bought only to land bank, and yet they are not being pilloried in the same way Peel Group are, but then this is only a rumour!! I believe that there is space for 18000 houses on Brownfield sites on the Wirral, more than enough to meet even the exaggerated targets. The Compulsory Purchase Orders for Brown field sites may be costly or take too long, but from my own experience I believe that this process usually takes around 18 months or so (a relatively small amount of time when the Local Plan is for 15 years) Wirral Waters has "housing zone status" which means it is eligible for Government grants to remediate and develop the land. Wirral Council has granted, I understand, Wirral Waters planning permission for 13000 houses. The Peel Group, who own the site, say that with the right public partnership they could build up to 6450 houses during the 15 year Local Plan period. It is worth noting that certain Councillors of this administration have pilloried Peel for land banking, and yet claim to be Strategic Partners with Peel.</p> <p>I have grave concerns about the development on Green Belt land of the so called Hoylake Golf Resort. Golf as a sport is in decline and I do not believe that this is a sensible development in an uncertain economic climate. Indeed one of the sites that has been targeted for release is Prenton Golf Club. If this land is released by a private members club surely this indicates that this sport is in decline Green Belt land comes with a premium price. Therefore, Green Belt development is usually for expensive executive homes and very few will be affordable housing. This then leads to increase Council Tax revenue which on one hand is good but not when the need for housing on the Wirral is of mixed costing and I do not believe that affordable housing will be accommodated IF our Green Belt is sacrificed. I also believe that developers can use alternatives to avoid the affordable housing percentages. From the meeting that I attended in Pensby, I appreciate that vacant properties cannot be included in the new housing figure. However it is surely feasible to use the "Compelling Circumstances" argument to show Government that this is a sensible and proactive</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>method of increasing housing stock. At the meeting in Pensby it was openly stated that there are between 2000 and 6000 empty properties on the Wirral. If Liverpool can release vacant run down properties for £1 then surely Wirral can do the same. If those properties are privately owned, then compulsory purchase them and return them to use, at a profit to the council. The council could employ its own trade people to undertake the work and create revenue. I would also point out that in certain areas, Barnston, Pensby, Thingwall the proposed release of Green Belt is contravention of the Green Belt guidelines. The Green Belt lands are our Green Lungs, mitigating against Climate Change. Green Belt development increases traffic and pollution and increases populations in areas without the infrastructure and services to cope. Take, for example Barnston, increase housing equals increased traffic on roads that cannot cope now. This is the first of many letters that will be sent to you on this subject and I will continue protesting against the release of Green Belt land for as long as it takes to convince this council it is wrong. If I, and the many others who stand against the destruction of Wirral, lose this argument then I will be selling up and leaving Wirral. If this council will not listen to the people who belong on the Wirral then I will not be staying to be betrayed. I get the sense that this council will not be happy until we will live in a concrete mess.</p>
DOR01338	<p>Firstly, why develop green belt when there are enough brownfield sites or empty properties to use. I believe there is space for 18000 houses on brownfield sites plus 3000 empty houses on the Wirral. Green belt land is precious it is the lungs not only of Wirral but the world as a whole and with the destruction of rain forests soon clean breathable air will be a thing of the past. Sorry I digress. Green fields, parks etc provide areas of beauty bringing peace to the mind and exercise to the body. Once gone they can never come back. Brownfield sites are easier to develop with amenities close by in most cases. Gas, electricity, sewer's and public transport, roads are in place capable of carrying the traffic needed to develop these areas which are ideal as affordable housing for young couples, families who want to start on the home ownership ladder, or for people who wish to downsize. Your plans to develop green belt land is for greed only, to build executive homes suitable for high earners multi car households, not for the common good of the lower classes, the low earners, the manual workers those who need public transport and affordable homes. People on the Wirral talk about the incompetent way the council run the borough, the back handers, dishonesty and corruption are allegedly rife, I didn't know about these things until now when the debacle over the rape of our Greenbelt has come top of the agenda and the incompetence and rumours of corruption has bubbled over. Every one of you should be brought to task over this and your misguided reasons explained in full, as quite honestly I can think of no good reason why the council insist on taking this stand to build on precious greenbelt. Some of you may think it is wrong to snatch our greenbelt, some of you may agree that housing built on fields of green is purely for high faluting houses for the rich, some of you may think someone is taking a mighty back hander off greedy developers, are you being bullied or intimidated into going along with these proposals, is the council being held to some sort of ransom by powerful developers? I don't know how the council works but I know you have it wrong over this matter and your incompetence over the last few years by not looking into it properly has led to this 'volcano waiting to erupt situation'. You have only one chance to get this right, please make the correct decision and leave the greenbelt green and beautiful as it is now.</p> <p>Wirral is a gem, fields, beaches and history are attractions that many parts of the UK don't have they are all together on a neat Peninsular yet in your folly you wish to reduce it to a continuous housing estate the beaches and history will remain but the green fields will be gone. Known as the Paradise Peninsular but for how much longer. I am Birkonian born and bred although I have spent periods away living and working, this is my home and I love Wirral and I can assure you it is one of the most beautiful places in the UK, please don't ruin it as you are proposing to do.</p>
DOR01339	<p>I have just seen the plans for development on the car park in New Ferry. I am astounded that anyone would think this would help regenerate the town!</p> <p>It would be absolutely disastrous to build on the car park in New Ferry! This will never encourage shoppers to the high street but then again with so many derelict and run down shops there's not much to entice anyone in any event! This really needs to be thought through! Refurbish and repair the existing derelict shops. This might not be the cheapest option but would benefit the community far more in the long run. Offer decent businesses reduced start out rates. Get decent businesses in, nice clothes shops, decent book shops, boutique style home stores some nice cafe bars (no more charity shops, pound shops or book makers!) With the offer of free parking we might actually get some business back into the town centre.</p> <p>Shoppers would want to visit New Ferry if we had decent shops on offer, something a little different from those at the Croft plus with the benefit of free parking. Once the shops are refurbished, do up the apartments above for additional housing. This plan really is going to kill off New Ferry! How else do you propose to keep our high street alive?</p> <p>Please reconsider this plan.</p>
DOR01340	<p>When we moved to the area we made sure all the checks and searches were done to make sure nothing could be built on the field behind, as that was the reason we bought the property. I was told it was Green belt land so felt relieved knowing that houses wouldn't be able to be built on Green belt land. It would not only be views that would be affected by a house built on the green belt land but also the wildlife. It is wrong to build on green belt land just because it is more profitable and less difficult than building on brownfield. It is also wrong for the council to look to do this to increase their revenue. The governments "New Homes Bonus" is encouraging councils to increase the amount of planning permission, but this shouldn't be at the detriment of green belt land. I strongly oppose any building on our green belt land. Pollution and wild life protection are both factors to be taken into consideration and the fact that you will drive people out of areas instead of attracting them to the area with supposed affordable housing.</p> <p>There are no exceptional circumstances for the council to look at green belt land, when they haven't yet answered requests for builds on brownfield.</p> <p>It's sad to think that people are considering allowing building on green belt land for their own gain and not for the good of the community.</p>
DOR01341	<p>I have just received a letter re: Wirral Local Plan-Development Options Review with proposals near my property under site reference SP0 53. Firstly I do not understand these proposals; what does EXISTING INFILL VILLAGE mean, and secondly how can a Council not know the correct name for a Road in its jurisdiction. I have lived in Eastham for over 70 years, in the same house, in the same road ST DAVID ROAD not, St David's Road. Please make sure when you send out information that this said information is correct. Can you also please explain to me if there are any intentions to change any part of St David Road?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01342	I am writing to inform you that I strongly oppose the current proposals to build on Wirral's Green Belt. Please build on brown belt land (there is plenty of it) or mandate Peel Holdings to build on the land they own. The Wirral is a beautiful place, don't ruin it.
DOR01343	<p>I am very concerned about the amount of house being built on the green belt.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Do we really need all these houses? What is going to happen to food, milk etc, if all farm land is used for houses? 2. Our roads are not built for extra traffic, which more houses and an increase in families, i.e. 2 cars per family will bring. 3. Arrow park hospital can not cope now, when an 87year old man is told he will have to wait between 1 and 4 hours for an ambulance, how long our we going to wait when we have more people living on the Wirral? 4. Schools, G Ps dentists are all going to be in short supply. <p>Take a look at Midlothian Scotland, who are building, the roads are grid locked, people are late into work, ambulances cannot get through. School playgrounds are being filled with portacabins so space is limited for children to play. It is extremely difficult to find a G.P.</p>
DOR01344	I am emailing you to ask you to add my name to the opposition of the local plan. I have lived on the Wirral all my life and am very disappointed that such plans have been proposed. I regularly walk, run, cycle around these areas, and feel any development would be detrimental to the landscape. I have emailed both local and central government with reasons for my opposition hopefully we can persuade them to leave our beautiful peninsula green!
	<p>I should like to register my opposition to the proposed changes to the local plan, which could result in green belt land near my home being developed for large-scale housing. I strongly oppose this for these reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I regularly walk, run and cycle in the areas which could be affected and really enjoy the feeling of escaping from the 'urban sprawl' and being in the countryside. The rural area in my home contributes greatly to my health and wellbeing, this would be lost if the land was developed for housing. 2. It is outrageous that green belt land is being considered when there are so many brown field sites on the Wirral, including the area owned by Peel Holdings. Peel holdings should be forced to develop their land, and all other brown field sites should be used, before rural green belt land is considered. 3. Developing the green belt land near my home could reduce the value of my property. 4. Large scale housing will increase the strain on local services and further increase traffic and pollution in my area. 5. Wirral is already about 50% urban, there are many counties in the UK which are almost entirely rural, these should have to shoulder the burden of additional housing before the precious remaining areas of countryside within our peninsular are built upon. Why should Wirral become completely built-upon and overcrowded while places like Cumbria, Cornwall or Lincolnshire remain mostly rural? 6. The housing problem in the UK is partly the result of irresponsible immigration policy by central government, which has seen the population increase by several million in the past decades, against the wishes of the majority of British voters. This has put great strain on services in many areas, it now seems another impact of this incompetent strategy could be that my quality of life is diminished by unwanted housing developments in my area. 7. The figure of 12000 homes seems completely arbitrary and does not reflect local housing needs. 8. If the proposed developments were to go ahead it could be that they would not even solve the problem, as the homes built on green belt land would probably be too expensive for many of those facing housing problems to afford. <p>In conclusion I wish to state categorically that I am strongly opposed to the proposals and hope that the council can reconsider the matter, and find solutions involving brown field sites, as well as challenging the entire flawed government target of '12000 homes regardless of local need.'</p>
DOR01345	I have been told that there are plans to develop green belt land in Wirral. Obviously that is very disappointing. From a personal point of view, we live in a Road that backs onto green belt land. I understood that it belongs to Leverhulme Estates. When we bought the property we live in we were told that Lord Leverhulme left the land in his will on the understanding it would not be built on. I'm not sure if that is true, but appreciate any information you can give me as to the likelihood that this land could now be used for building. We are obviously concerned for the whole of Wirral losing any green belt land as that is what makes the Wirral attractive but from a selfish point of view were wondering if the fields at the rear of our bungalow could be built on.
DOR01346	I wish to register my objections to the great Wirral land grab that is about to be released on the people of Wirral by the sale of much of our green belt land. I am led to understand that most the new developments planned will not help any of the people waiting to get on the property ladder, but will very much help the building companies who are waiting in the wings to buy the land. Wirral has always been a wonderful place to live but if the sale of the green belt land goes ahead it will become a sprawl of large built up areas losing its historic character. We will lose wildlife, history and in it's their place will have overcrowding schools and chaos on the roads. Please help save our green belt.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01347	<p>I refer to Wirral Borough Council's plans to build houses on green belt land adjoining Claremont Farm. I am vehemently against this proposal. This is a real quality of life issue that will negatively impact on the wellbeing of all local residents. It will also significantly affect local infrastructure, placing an increased burden on already stretched services such as schools, medical care etc, and increase traffic and pollution. After a day's work in the office I regularly walk around these fields with my dog, a great way to unwind. A simple pleasure, but these things matter! In an attempt to do my bit to combat climate change I planted trees in the mature hedgerows in these fields. I hope my efforts are not to be wasted. This particular parcel of land hosts some valuable wildlife, many species of birds including the very scarce lesser spotted woodpecker and butterflies, including purple hairstreak, and orchids, protected by the Wildlife and Countryside Act 1981. Green belt land is hugely important and should be safeguarded for existing and future generations. It is vital to local identity and personally I not do not want to live in an area, that becomes a large housing estate. Another proposal to release land for development at nearby Dibbinsdale beggars belief. If this land needs to be defended against development then frankly the future for the environment looks bleak indeed.</p> <p>Local politicians are in an ideal position to influence policy and must resist government's proposals to cover huge swathes of countryside in concrete and look to use brown field sites instead. Is there to be an inexorable and inevitable tide of urban sprawl, destroying the unique character of Wirral?</p>
DOR01348	<p>We wish to express our concern about the amount of Green Belt land being considered for release from Green Belt status across Wirral Peninsula. The Green Belt is of great importance to the whole community, and the possibility of Wirral changing beyond recognition will have a massive impact on our local environment ranging from the preservation of wildlife, flora and fauna to traffic congestion and pollution affecting our health and wellbeing. In February 2018 the Leader of Wirral Council, Councillor "I am not prepared to allow our Green Belt land to be built on. I am resolute about that commitment. It is the Jewel in Wirral's Crown and greatly valued by our residents" In July 2018, writing in the Wirral Globe, [the Council Leader] suddenly changed his view and stated that "some level of Green Belt release is inevitable". The following week a "leaked" document showed the extent of Green Belt land being considered for release across Wirral. Nearly 50 sites are being considered in Wirral Council areas.</p> <p>Wirral Council has failed to produce a Local Plan since the last Plan was adopted in 2000 and the Council has not met milestones published in the Local Development Schemes over a period of 13 years. The Council has a target of building 12000 new homes by 2035. There is space for 18000 homes on Brownfield sites on the Wirral. Wirral Waters alone, already has planning permission for 13000 homes - more than enough to meet our target - but currently only has plans to build 2700 homes over the next 15 years.</p> <p>There are also 6000 empty properties on the Wirral, it is outrageous that the Council is considering releasing invaluable Green Belt Land while these properties lie empty.</p>
DOR01349	<p>NLP data presented to the council. I have been reading through the report today. I made the following observations.</p> <p>Scenario A, is over optimistic by +380 people at 2018 compared to actually known population data. It should not be used for future projection beyond 2018 because of the following.</p> <p>The council is the largest employer on Wirral 38%. This position could change due to government cuts, the result of which is likely to make redundancies inevitable. If the council were to make cuts of 10%, this would be equivalent to increasing unemployment on the Wirral by 3.8%. An almost doubling of the current rate. This will take many years to reverse and have a major impact on Wirral housing projections.</p> <p>NPL acknowledges the likely problems but does not include them in the analysis. Other problems of note.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The change in National household formation rates 2012 have also not be included, but are put aside for those published in 2015, as there is no hard evidence for either being used both should have been included for comparative purposes to give a fuller picture. 2. It is not clear that when considering the ageing populations requirement for smaller houses, that allowance is made for the increased housing released to the market as a consequence of this. 3. No account is taken for people working longer due to pension age increases or people working past pension age due to financial necessity.
DOR01350	<p>Any development on Green Belt land within Wirral would be regrettable. I don't feel in a position to comment about any other area of Wirral, but have lived in Barnston for most of the last 76 years so am in a position to comment about any proposed development covering the Pensby/Barnston area. With relation to traffic pressures, the junction of Barnston Road with Storeton Lane has been the subject of lengthy traffic jams in the morning and evening rush hours for many years. Storeton Lane close to the junction is very narrow allowing only one vehicle through at a time vehicles wishing to exit Storeton Lane are also faced with very restricted sight lines. Barnston Road is also very restricted at the bend between 'Beech Farm' & 'Beechcroft', the property opposite, as traffic rounds the corner it is faced with vehicles entering or leaving 'The Fox & Hounds' before entering the narrow defile of Barnston dip. As long ago as the 1960's plans were drawn up for a bye-pass to address these problems (I have a copy of these plans, should anybody wish to see them). The bypass would have placed the junction 250 yards or so down Storeton Lane before crossing Barnston Dale on a Bridge to eventually form a junction with Gills Lane. As recently as 2005 the retailer 'Aldi' had proposals which would have seen as many as 70 H.G.V.'s daily using Barnston Road, these proposals led to a ban on articulated vehicles using this stretch of Barnston Road due to the perceived danger of such heavy vehicles using the road through 'Barnston Dip', the problem of congestion however still remains. My other concern is with the sewer systems for the area. A sewer was constructed in the early 1960's which runs parallel to The '!=ender or Prenton Brook, this passes through three 'Sites of Biological Importance', Barnston Dale (Site 30), Murrayfield Hospital (Site 31) & Lower Heath Wood (Site 73), the construction of this sewer allowed the development of Pensby as it now is. There have been a number of problems with this sewer over the years, resulting in raw sewage finding its way into Barnston Dale SBI. More recently, (2014), a number of sinkholes, (approx 12) up to 3 feet wide and as deep following the line of the sewer through Barnston Dale were a matter of concern for the then tenant farmer, these were brought to the attention of United Utilities but only acted upon following the intervention of Esther McVey M.P. I believe the sewer to be at or near capacity both it and the traffic issues should be resolved before anything other than very small scale development is contemplated within the area.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01351	I urge you to protect Wirral's Green Belt. Brownfield sites should be developed first. The council can ask for exemption from the government's estimated housing demand and argue for approximately 300 new homes to be built per year instead of the government assessment of 800. Look in detail at the analysis produced by [another respondent]. Affordable homes are needed not luxury developments. Please protect our environment for future generations to enjoy.
DOR01352	<p>I am writing to oppose the development of greenbelt land across the Wirral. My family have been residents in Irby since 1920. My mother was born here and that is where my family home now is. I have great concerns about the local greenbelt land being developed, detrimental to both my family and thousands of other families across Wirral. We have worked hard to ensure that our family can enjoy the wonderful surroundings, views, woodland and open farmland that Wirral offers. We chose to work hard and go without holidays and other luxuries in order to pay a premium for our home due to the benefits of the greenbelt land in our local area. We chose Irby due to the surrounding green spaces, for the attractive environment for our children to grow up in and for the health benefits that these green spaces provide. I do not want to live in an area of urban sprawl which has unfortunately happened in many other places in the UK. I do not want the loss of farming and wildlife which would happen if areas in Wirral are developed, especially in Irby. The loss of protection of woodland with Houses built so closely would be detrimental to residents of such lovely areas, also so rich in heritage. We chose Irby due to the limited amount of traffic, for health benefits and the safety of our children. We are concerned that developing land around Irby will inevitably increase the amount of traffic on the roads, especially Mill Hill Rd. Irby does not have close commuting links to trains, and has a limited bus service and so inevitably more homes would create more traffic which would in turn cause health and safety issues. We are already weary of allowing our children to cross or walk along our road on their own due to traffic and development of our greenbelt would make this an even greater hazard. We enjoy using the park on Mill Hill Rd and walking along to the library while the children ride their scooters, or walking to school but I fear this will no longer be safe or healthy with increased congestion on our road. Increased commuting travel results in increased fuel consumption and carbon footprints. Am I wrong to believe that this goes against government policy and is an issue that the public in general is against? I feel that the council are trying to develop greenbelt as an easy option. There are many brownfield sites across Wirral which would benefit from development and feel that this has been underestimated, ignored or dismissed as an option for housing in Wirral. The council have underestimated the identification of and potential of brownfield sites. I understand that there is space for 18,000 homes on these sites. Maybe the council should place restrictions on developers of what can be built on these sites to ensure efficient use of land and to ensure affordable housing is priority. To dismiss the redevelopment of derelict or run down houses and buildings will lead to urban sprawl and undesirable areas. If these are redeveloped it would show better use of council funds and would be more agreeable to Wirral residents. In turn, if decent housing is available in these run down areas, residents are more likely to improve standards of living resulting in increasingly positive contributions to society. I understand that there are around 4000 empty properties in Wirral. Further development is not needed in Wirral due to lack of demand for this many proposed houses on the peninsular. Birth and death rates on the Wirral are near enough the same and do not call for more housing in fact the population of Wirral is decreasing. Development needs of Wirral have been significantly overstated through mistakes, a lack of rigour and imagination and an adoption of unrealistic, unsound and aspirational assumptions on growth. I do not feel that 'affordable' housing constitutes 'exceptional circumstances' for building on greenbelt due to lack of demand. The greenbelt areas that are proposed for development would not lend themselves to affordable housing and feel that developers would be lining their pockets by predominantly selling these houses at a premium, while devaluing houses of existing residents due to destroying greenbelt and creating an excess of homes. As an elected body, the council should be making sure that anything built should therefore be affordable as stated and should be making decisions in the best interests of residents and the local area, not in the best interests of the developers.</p> <p>The greenbelt on Wirral has high environmental value. We have rich variety of wildlife and plant life in Wirral and feel that this has not been considered sufficiently. Developing greenbelt in Irby especially would result in houses close to our woodland, threatening the habitats or endangered birds, animals and insects that currently live in the greenbelt areas. These species help with the natural processes on greenbelt land that help eliminate some pollution. Children in green areas suffer less from chest complaints due to pollution than children in built up areas; I do not want this for my children, grandchildren or other children further down the line.</p> <p>Many brownfield sites on Wirral, especially Wirral Waters owned by Peel Holdings (which, I understand, has the capacity to deliver more homes and other developments than stated) have promised sufficient housing for expansion of residential areas on Wirral, albeit outside of government timescales, but realistically, what do a few more years matter? Deadlines have been set by people behind desks in government offices and must sensibly consider flexibility in this depending on the difference in localities, surely? I urge you to put this forward and challenge government targets if this is an issue. Considerations must be made regarding health services and education on the Wirral. I already struggle to get an appointment at our local health centre and I know that resources at Arrowe Park hospital are already stretched to the limit, so this many extra houses on local greenbelt would also create a greater strain on these resources. The same goes for our schools; funding is falling and class sizes are already rising, how is this to be addressed if we have so many more residents? In addition, more residents will require more jobs and I have heard very little about how this is going to be addressed. My family and I are certainly not rich, but have worked hard for what we have. We have attempted to build equity in our homes to ensure security for ourselves and our children in the form of funds for our old age, pensions and whatever may be left as inheritance. If our homes devalue due to lower desirability of the area in which we live, ourselves and our children lose out. Our children will not have the funds required to purchase property themselves and will add to the issue of affording homes. I know that the majority of people living around our greenbelt have paid a premium for housing in these areas and continue to pay a higher level of council tax as houses are more desirable. If our greenbelt is destroyed I know that I would campaign for a reduction in rates for our houses as they become less desirable due to the deluge of new houses with less green spaces. I am afraid that this would also result in many people moving out of the area which would be a great shame. Would there be compensation available for the devaluation of properties? This is not greed of high earners we have compromised on our outgoings to make payments on our house for years, as I know that many other families in the area have done. If, after all other options considered and it is decided that there are truly special circumstances and greenbelt needs to be built on, why encourage urban sprawl by only considering sites next to existing houses? Could new villages be created (including schools, shops, health centres etc,) whilst</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	ensuring that openness, views, 'green corridors' and distinct communities remain? Consideration could be made to proximity to train and motorway links to ensure minimum disruption due to traffic. We believe that this option should have been included as part of the local plan and has been a major flaw in the development process from the start. If we do not campaign against the building of greenbelt now, preserving the 'special circumstances' of which it would be developed, then when will the development of greenbelt stop? Wirral is unique; the greenbelt serves in preserving the character and historical significance in the local area and its destruction would be devastating.
DOR01353	As a resident of Spital/Bromborough area this is of great concern to me and my family. Spital Road, which in particular affects me is already stretched to capacity regarding traffic. Our local farm, Claremont Farm also appears to be under threat.
DOR01354	<p>How has the Council under your leadership has arrived at the state we appear to be in and being 'forced' to release Green Belt by the Government to meet inaccurate estimates created by your own Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA) or should it read SHAM!!! It appears the Council has failed since 2000 to produce a Local Plan. This is a legal requirement and due to the Councils ineptitude the Government are now threatening to send in their own inspectors to assess the situation.</p> <p>Hence the Councils hasty ill thought out consultation plans to save face and try and remain in control, which is not in the interest of Wirral residents. The ONS (Office of National Statistics) figures require challenging as they result from the 'botched' figures supplied by you own SHMA. Independent figures result in much more modest and realistic requirement of 220 - 350 homes per annum (max 4200 over 15 years) but do not appear to have been taken into account or considered. Whilst Wirral Waters already has planning permission for 13000 homes we have the realistic potential with Peel Group who own the site to comfortably develop over 6000 homes with the right public backing within the next 15 years, adequately meeting the independent figure of 4200. With the possible development of Brown Field sites (18000) homes and utilising the empty houses on the Wirral (approx 4000) this will adequately cover the inaccurate SHMA figure of 15.000 homes in 15 years. As there are government grants available to remediate and develop land under 'housing zone status' which Wirral Waters comes under. Why is the Council not being proactive? Absolutely no need to interfere with the Green Belt. We have challenged you regarding the ill-conceived Hoylake Resort Golf development which hopefully will be now abandoned by you acknowledging the concerns of local residents and their local MP Margaret Greenwood. Enough money has been squandered on this "ego trip", 1 million pounds plus a possible 17 million pounds on infrastructure and a loan to a very dodgy developer of 26 million pounds. What is the Council thinking about? We now challenge you and your Council members to adopt the right policies with regard to housing on the Wirral abandon thoughts of ruining the Wirral and destroying Green Belt which once built on will be lost to future generations.</p>
DOR01355	<p>I am contacting you to vehemently oppose Wirral Borough Council's 'Local Plan' proposal to build over 12,000 new homes (over a 15 year period) the majority of which would be built on released Green Belt Land throughout Wirral but significant majority within the South Wirral area. This is in response to Central Government's national house building targets. Firstly I would challenge the fact that Central Government Ministry of Housing deem it necessary to build such large numbers of housing on the Wirral peninsula. This does not reflect the demographics of Wirral residents, nor on the historical and future patterns of population growth. Using the Governments own official statistics (www.ons.gov.uk) Wirral's population is less today than in 1981 and the proposed population growth is only an additional 10,898 people by 2036!!! This increased figure (population total 332,136) will still not exceed the historical population figure in 1981 (pop total 338,954)...SO WHY do we need to build 12,000 ++houses?????? Wirral is a unique peninsula which has approx 46% green belt land and is surrounded by coastline and has open green areas. Our Greenbelt includes woodlands and nature reserves, areas of natural beauty, agricultural land and areas of historical significance. All of which have been identified as part of Wirral's proposed Local Plan to release for housing development. Wirral Councils proposed Local Plan to release Greenbelt Land for development will increase the sprawl of large built up areas especially within South Wirral area; creating neighbouring towns merging towards one another. This proposal is a gross encroachment on the countryside. It will detrimentally affect Wirral's historical setting and its special character. By not ensuring urban regeneration of derelict Brownfield land such as 'Wirral Waters' the council are failing to ensure the protection of precious Greenbelt Land on the Wirral Peninsula. This is a ludicrous situation that Wirral councillors are saying that there is no option but to use precious Green Belt land within their Local Plan because there is not enough Brownfield sites to meet this housing demand when there are developers such as Peel Enterprises who bought brownfield site - Wirral Waters from Wirral Council approximately 10 years ago with full glossy presentations and proposals to build 12,000 houses and business and community projects, with full support from Wirral Borough Council (who 2 years ago extended their planning permission at no extra cost to facilitate this development)..... To-date to their SHAME Peel have not built a single house!!! This is despite their acknowledgement about the importance of Wirral Waters development in providing the majority this Governments housing target ... they to-date only plan to build approximately 2,400 homes over next 15 years. How can this be?? When in 2017 Wirral Waters was designated a Housing Zone by Central Government making it the ONLY project in UK to benefit from Housing Zone and Enterprise Zone status,...thus demonstrating the priority status Central Government was giving to this project. Any finances available from local AND central Government should be aimed towards facilitating the Wirral Waters Development (12,000 houses) and should form the central part of Wirral Council Local Plan!!!! Not only would it satisfy your need for your housing targets but utilising this development - as it should be!!! Would have the least amount of decimating and detrimental impact on the Wirral peninsula Green Belt areas and therefore Wirral residents alike as the Green Belt would remain mainly untouched. To build the proposed number of new homes within Wirral peninsula is going to require major multi million pound investment in local infrastructure and services. (Roads, access, main services, increased size motorway, public transport, new schools, GP's and shops and business) Where does Central Government expect this funding to come from ??? Furthermore What detrimental impact would this have on the environment for all Wirral residents??</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01356	Our planet is at breaking point and human activity is to blame, with over development of the natural world and extraction of its resources being a primary cause. To build upon any remaining green spaces that contribute to the production of clean air and safe habitat for a variety of species, is to demonstrate a level of denial, disregard and irresponsibility given the knowledge of how crucial it is to preserve all green spaces at this fragile time in history. To develop green spaces, it not only destroys something essential to combating the serious concern of climate change, but also contributes to increasing the rate at which climate change is already happening. When there are already numerous empty homes sitting throughout the Wirral, when there are still ample Brownfield sites available for development, how can anyone possibly think it is a good idea to develop any part of the Green Belt? Even an abundance of money cannot be a good enough reason for such irresponsible actions. There simply is no good logic to this plan. I raise my young children to understand the importance of protecting the environment. I teach them about the trees making oxygen for us to breath, about the important role of all plants, of soil, of earth worms, and of the impact of all those things being destroyed. If you rip up the Green Belt for development, you are not only negatively impacting the future of my children, but of all children who will have to bear the consequences of the decisions made by people in your positions.
DOR01357	[SAME AS DOR01355]
DOR01358	<p>I would like to express my objection to the proposal for the release of green belt land on the Wirral for housing development for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Housing targets set by government are questionable and should be challenged in view of local population trends which suggest the actual housing needs of the Wirral are much lower. The council should challenge the government on this. 2. There is no need to develop green belt with the amount of brownfield sites that could be developed. These should be exhausted before releasing green belt land. The land at Wirral Waters owned by Peel Holdings has planning permission for thousands of homes which would go along way to meeting targets 3. Type of housing need - green belt land is typically in areas where executive homes would be built. These are not the homes required to meet our future housing needs 4. Green belt is essential to maintain the unique character of the Wirral. Historic towns would merge together if green belt sites were to be developed. We have lost enough green belt over the years and it would be travesty if more were to be lost. <p>I urge you to fight this proposal to release green belt land for the development of houses.</p>
DOR01359	[SAME AS DOR01355]
DOR01360	[SAME AS DOR01355]
DOR01361	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I accept that the Local Plan should be based on needs assessed locally but I think that the National Planning Policy Framework should take precedence. Green Belt is a valuable commodity for our heritage and should be used only after all of the Brownfield sites and vacant homes including suitable other have been used. It is regrettable that the Local Plan has been awaiting completion since 2004. If you had done your work when required, we might not now be in the situation into which you have placed yourselves. 2. Wirral MBC failed to participate in the national consultation conducted by the Ministry of Housing in September 2018. Your quiescent acceptance of the Government's data and conclusions condemns the Labour Group for its incompetence, laziness or dumb acceptance. By not participating, you have lost the possibility of arguing for a reduction in housing numbers and have lost all authority. 3. The result of Councils assessment of housing need undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield & Partners further diminishes your arguing for a reduction in the figures. If your reasoning is weak, which I suppose it to be since you have been unable to reason with a simple person such as myself, then there is no chance of the Labour Group securing a reduction. The Labour Group has accepted that more houses are needed than the Government suggests and you failed to give voice to your opinions when asked. 4. The letter from Peel Waters Development Director to Council Leader's is disappointing but one with which I entirely agree. The Labour Group has been providing misleading information that it is unable to deny to me a simple voting Council Tax-payer. 5. I totally support the Conservative Group's statement that it will not support a Local Plan that fails to reflect the TRUE housing needs in the Borough fails to meet the urgent need to regenerate and direct investment into the urban areas diminishes our Green Belt. I am delighted to see that they are supported by Green, Independent and Liberal Democrat councillors. I cannot support any Labour Councillor or candidate who fails to adopt the same approach. <p>The Council should take account of the new Agriculture Bill. Farming, must protect the look of the countryside, the health of the soil, the biodiversity of hedges and streams, of what should be farmed, how it is farmed, how intensively it is farmed and the balance between production and imports in which UK is only 60% self-sufficient. You intend reaping the rewards of land value rather than productivity, which you will destroy, and are ignorant of environmental value, which you will destroy, all in the same way and for the same reasons as did the rich land-owners and land-grabbers of past times.</p>
DOR01362	Wirral is a beautiful place which brings visitors to the area if it is a sprawling housing estate with no clear boundaries there will be no reason to visit. Also, the impact on nature and wildlife will be massive. There isn't that much green belt compared to other parts of the country we need to respect and protect it for future generations and wildlife. The impact on local schools and roads can only be negative. There are other sites that already have buildings on that could be developed.
DOR01363	You say the Government has told you to this, but considering the Tory government has drastically cut the money available for you to spend on our services, I don't see why you should do what they tell you, if you don't think this plan is the right thing for Wirral residents then don't roll over and do what the Tories tell you to do. Considering what's happening politically at the moment they might not even be in power much longer and all these plans could change. It is a serious irreversible decision to build on greenbelt and once built on it is gone forever. I don't have any trust in politicians

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	to stand up for the Wirral residents and environment, please try to prove me wrong.
DOR01364	There's not enough infrastructure to support additional housing in most areas, there are so many traffic bottlenecks on most through routes across and down the Wirral it only takes a suicidal jumper to block our main highway causing mayhem to all other road networks. If we created more senior residential estates this would provide more properties on the market
DOR01365	I think the areas regarding the new build council estates, are some of the only places left with lovely green scenery on the Wirral, this will be ruined with hundreds of houses. Also being small villages there is no room in local schools for new children to the area as the schools are full as they are. The neighbourhood is quiet, this will disrupt this.
DOR01366	There is a notice on the gate to build houses on our green belt nature reserve, SP043 East of Poulton Road Spital,
DOR01367	The Wirral peninsula, is one if the country's most beautiful landmarks and therefore should be given the upmost consideration by both the authorities and local residents. Whilst everyone is aware of government targets and the pressure on local councils to make land available for development, destruction of green space and local communities should not be done lightly or needlessly.
DOR01368	I would like to know when the relevant improvement to infrastructure will take place prior to commencement of any building homes on a large scale. Have the appropriate surveys been carried out to see if gas, electric, water and sewage been considered. Has each footprint for houses, driveways, footpaths and roads been calculated to see how this volume of surface water is to be dealt? As previous planning requirements stipulate the laying of non-permeable surfaces must be covered by soakaways. Are local aquifers going to be compromised in the way they feed brooks, streams ponds and pits. Land currently acting as a buffer zone between housing and sensitive areas likes the National Trust land in Irby how will wildlife be effected and protected. Schools doctors dentist nursery spaces? Roads and transport, Heswall Telegraph road in the village has frequently long delays. Access to Arrowe Park Hospital is already an issue for ambulances at times. Presumably the houses will have green credentials with charge points for electric cars again will the electric demand compromise supplies. Cover from police, fire and ambulance, is this to be expanded? Recycling and refuse collections what is the plan here. Parking locally will more space be made available or will new improved public transport be put in place. Regarding the poor state of local road surfaces and pavements is there a proper program to cover this instead of the current trend to cover failing roads with temporary sprayed tar and crushed stone which doesn't last. Improved policing of roads which are treated as rat runs and racetracks.
DOR01369	I have lived on the Wirral all my life and have also travelled the world, the Wirral has always been a great place to return to, with its balance of green open spaces, urban combination, and transport links. This local proposed housing development plan threatens this fine balance. The reduction of green belt that this plan proposes will result in further urban expansion greatly reducing the remaining green belt. The Wirral is in a unique position being surrounded on three sides by water thus limiting the extent of land available for urban expansion; this should be the driver to prioritise the use of brown field sites. I strongly feel that all brown field sites and Wirral has plenty i.e. Birkenhead/Birkenhead docks, New Ferry, Bidston etc should be employed as an absolute priority before any consideration is given to any green belt development (what a great opportunity to redevelop these towns). We have to remember that we all need a life/home/work balance and our current green belt offers such for many Wirral people and visitors alike from walking, cycling, exercising, sports, clean air, children playing/exploring etc. The Wirral probably only has a few remaining distinct villages i.e. Thornton Hough, Storeton, Barnston, Thurston. Not impacted by urban sprawl as many villages on the Wirral can give testimony to i.e. Pensby, Upton, Irby, Greasby, Heswall etc where there is no distinct differential other than road signs indicating former village names. I would strongly argue that the undertaking of this proposed plan will degrade our marketing and promotional claim that Wirral "as the leisure peninsula" which may result in the decrease in visitor numbers, it will certainly have a detrimental effect on our environment and to the local inhabitants.
DOR01370	M53 traffic as well as Wallasey traffic has become more and more unbearable. I think new houses will only lead to a worse situation. Rather than build more cement it would anyway better to convert already existing areas in flats if more flats are needed. Totally disagree with the plan.
DOR01371	Traffic in centre of Heswall already too congested. Lots of recent development has been adding to this problem, which also brings increased pollution. A very limited Train line connection means this will only increase. Housing unlikely to be affordable or desirable to younger buyers due to distance of local amenities and public transport connections. Plenty of brown sites to build on, remaining green belt gives Wirral an identity that separates it from sprawling suburbia.
DOR01372	There are plenty of old empty houses on the Wirral that can be used for this! New builds looks ugly and ruin the landscape. Building works destroy wild habitats and kill animals and insects which in turn will cause environmental issues. One of the reasons I love living on the Wirral is the easy access to greenery and nature without having to drive. Destroying the green belt means that low income families or families without a car will have to travel further to get close to nature, which isn't always possible.
DOR01373	There are issues due to firms such as Peel holding onto land causing a shortage.
DOR01374	Brown belt land should be built on first. There is plenty of brown belt land, look at the docks in Birkenhead, all the land around Birkenhead North station where housing was knocked down. All the empty properties in Birkenhead, Wallasey & surrounding areas. Once our greenbelt is gone, it's gone! Leave it alone, so up the run down, neglected buildings & land that is just going to waste & leave our green belt land as nature intends it to be!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01375	I believe that before any greenbelt land is considered, all brownfield sites should be utilised and used up. The need to utilise brownfield sites should be prioritised above appeasing or bowing to pressure from developers who wish to buy greenbelt land for a bigger profit. Brownfield sites can offer more houses/flats to be built per square metre compared to greenbelt sites therefore they will be more beneficial to meeting the housing targets. Greenbelt land should not be sold lightly as it will have huge implications for the area, the identity of villages, the scenery, tourism, to mention the impact on the value of existing property near to those sites.
DOR01376	It would be a disaster for the area, existing infrastructure is already shambolic.
DOR01377	Too much green belt has already been taken from Greasby in the past. All the small village communities will do merge into one if you continue with the proposals which I thought wasn't allowed. There are so many Brown field sites that can be used to make housing cheaper for first time buyers. When looking at green belt land that has now been built on in Moreton there is no real affordable housing. You might be able to buy a piece of a house if you have a low income but not a whole house which is ridiculous.
DOR01378	Absolutely appalled about the proposed plans to build on green belt. I moved to Wirral for the countryside and bought my house because of the beautiful views and wildlife. This could potentially be lost if the building plans go ahead. The bats that fly round my garden at night and other protected wildlife don't seem to have any consideration anymore. Wirral will be totally spoilt. Having grown up in a highly populated town in the Midlands I may as well have stayed there!
DOR01379	I am totally opposed to the use of green belt land for house building or any building on green belt in Wirral. Wirral is a special place because of its green spaces. Houses should be built on Brown field sites or disused housing should be refurbished. I will vote against any party which supports building houses on green belt. WBC should use brownfield sites or force Peel to build the houses they have promised to build.
DOR01380	The area in Spital east is beautiful countryside with quite a concentration of housing already, here on the 2 sides of the estate and with enough traffic already to cope with. I am deeply opposed to any changes to this greenbelt area.
DOR01381	I think there is plenty brownfield site that can be considered before eating up the greenbelt. The local amenities will be overstretched with the proposed development.
DOR01382	I agree affordable housing is needed but build on brown sites only. Save our valuable countryside and woodlands for our children's future.
DOR01383	The number of houses proposed is totally unrelated to the number of residents Wirral can reasonably sustain. Employment health and education infrastructures are not in place to support this increase either. Why is this relatively small and contained geographical area being targeted in this way? Using the empty existing properties should be first. There are many; and landlords with such properties or with planning permissions in place but unused should be fined. Wirral Waters is a huge example which could solve much of the current crisis. Green belt is Wirral. It must be protected at all costs for environmental reasons, but also because of tourism and the rights of current residents. We must protect our beautiful area with everything we have!
DOR01384	Brownfields sites need to be used. This is not about affordable housing using green belt. Wirral is a beautiful place to live we cannot afford to lose greenbelt land for our wildlife, or our future generations. Wirral will end up like a penal colony if this is passed and people will no longer find it a desirable place to live.
DOR01385	Firstly I'd like to say I appreciate the council's position with regards building new homes in the borough and meeting targets. But I'd like to say the proposal for development east of Poulton road i.e. Spital field and surrounding area is nothing short of outrageous. This area is part of a unique and very special green belt area which includes ancient history, rare wildlife, its own eco system not to mention its popularity for ramblers, dog walkers and the like. I know it is said that Brotherton Park and the local nature reserve are both protected, but to my knowledge both these sites are east of the river Dibbin, leaving all the land West of the Dibbin open to development which would destroy all the above mentioned special qualities of having such a place at our disposal to the local community.
DOR01386	Please don't build. My children love playing in the fields. I love the peace and quiet that it provides and gives me a sense of calm and relaxation in a busy and sometimes stressful life.
DOR01387	I am writing to express my views, as a Wirral resident, AGAINST the proposal to build new housing on Wirral Green Belt land. I understand the need for meeting a housing target set by Central Government as part of its National Housing Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this should not be at the expense of precious Greenbelt Land. Every effort should be done to regenerate brownfield sites such as Wirral Waters and the re-occupation of existing houses offering a total well in excess of the 12,000 homes required by 2035.
DOR01388	No housing in greenbelt. Its unspoilt nature will be destroyed, and it invites crime into the area when we have already had 3 West Wirral police stations closed. We do not need to add social housing to increase crime to an already stretched safe area.
DOR01389	I think Wirral is beautiful because it has so many green areas when they are gone they are gone for ever the council should be looking at brown field sites, and areas that could be done up so people want to live in them.
DOR01390	No part of Wirral's Green Belt should be released. There are adequate brown field sites to be developed first. The Council needs to be encouraging regeneration on these brown field sites not entertaining the release of green belt land. Wirral is not an area that suffers from high housing demand and therefore the release of green belt is not necessary.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01391	<p>I disagree with the Government & Wirral Council plans to build 12k new homes on Wirral Green Belt sites and particularly site earmarked SP 062. The reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I do not believe that the figure of 12k new houses is correct. Wirral is a relatively small borough and I don't believe that this amount of new houses is warranted, nor sustainable for services / infrastructure. 2. The effect of building 1.8k houses on SP 062 land would amalgamate 3 distinctively different areas; i.e. Pensby, Heswall & Barnston. 3. The proposed 3 to 4 bedroom buildings within SP 062 would be highly unlikely to be affordable to new 'first time' buyers. 4. The loss of the Green Belt land will have a detrimental effect on wildlife, local farming and current & future generations of local residents. In my own garden (which is opposite the land proposed) I have seen common lizard, woodpecker, nuthatch, bats to name but a few. 5. Rather than Wirral Council ploughing millions of pounds into planning a golf course in Hoylake, perhaps this land could be used to provide new housing instead??? <p>In addition: [SAME AS DOR0770]</p>
DOR01392	Great we should build on more green belt area.
DOR01393	I strongly object to building on the existing woodland areas. It will be devastating to the wildlife and did not think such areas both including and excluding conservation and national trust land could be developed?
DOR01394	<p>I am totally opposed to building on greenbelt. Greenbelt areas have served Wirral well since their inception despite approval of massive building encroachment of the hospital at Arrowe Park and the fire station at Saughall Massie. The Council must protect the remainder of our green belt and greenfield areas and be seen to be doing so with a total refusal to build on green belt.</p> <p>Government housing targets are "pie-in-the-sky" and need to be challenged. Even some members of the present Government are questioning the sheer scale of their numbers. There are plenty of brownfield sites in Wirral which would benefit from re-development and some existing parts of the Borough have already seen proposals to demolish and build (Birkenhead). I would like the Council to prioritise the brownfield sites already identified in Wirral as there is more than sufficient land for even the inflated Government housing figures. I hope that all Councillors will vote against the proposals to build on green belt.</p>
DOR01395	Green areas should not be developed they are for the enjoyment of everyone and should not be used for profit. There are numerous buildings and areas that could be re developed and renovated for housing. Don't take the easy road take the right one, think outside the box , cheap energy efficient housing , look to the examples of other countries .
DOR01396	Government figures need to be challenged rather than Council simply saying we have to build on greenbelt because of the government. There appears to be plenty of brownfield sites available, so use them. Building executive houses on the greenbelt doesn't help those on lower incomes. To me it isn't tribal politics. I won't vote for anyone supporting building on the greenbelt. What has happened to Wirral Waters? Talking to friends (of all political persuasion), no-one is happy with the Council's attitude towards the greenbelt.
DOR01397	<p>I have been looking through the Government criteria for assessing land availability which states as follows: Housing and economic land availability assessment guides councils in identifying appropriate land to meet development needs.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To be considered deliverable, sites should be available now, offer a suitable location for development now, and be achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on the site within 5 years and in particular that development of the site is viable. Sites with planning permission should be considered deliverable until permission expires, unless there is clear evidence that schemes will not be implemented within five years, for example they will not be viable, there is no longer a demand for the type of units or sites have long term phasing plans. 2. To be considered developable, sites should be in a suitable location for housing development and there should be a reasonable prospect that the site is available and could be viably developed at the point envisaged. <p>In the FAQs part of the Local Plan Wirral Waters has been ruled out because: Wirral Waters - The calculations include 1,100 additional homes currently expected to be brought forward at Wirral Waters, although these have not yet obtained detailed planning permission. The remainder of the outline planning permission for 13,000 homes is over a 22 year period and would not meet the Government's test for inclusion in the five year housing land supply. Why can't the council provide planning permission over a shorter timescale and insist this plan from Peel to build homes is accelerated to enable this land to pass the test?</p>
DOR01398	To threaten the Green belt infrastructure of the Wirral is nothing short of scandalous. The beauty of this area is so special and for the Government to press gang this must be stop. There are many areas of brown field site areas just rotting needing a major upgrade such as Wirral Waters and around the docks area. Peel have to long been saying what they are proposing to do then reneging. If it was property required for something Purchase orders would be put on them why not the same for these desolate parts of the Wirral.
DOR01399	Apart from the very obvious fact that this will destroy the essence of what makes the Wirral Peninsular a great place to live. It's painfully clear that no thought has been given to the impact on the local infrastructure if these idiotic planes ever come to fruition. Wirral Council needs to be very careful, you're already hated by many of the people living to the south of the M53, this plan will simply make this worse.
DOR01400	I hear this problem about finding places to build houses....but I'm staggered there's no movement for years on projects like Wirral waters and New Ferry regeneration....why aren't sites like this being used and invested in?...all we see in New Ferry is stalled projects and empty spaces...The dell is prime example of super plans that were submitted, half started and nothing has happened for 2 years yet we live with a boarded up road that hides a building site that been inactive for 2 years...The corner of Rock Lane Wests junction with new Chester Road has been the same derelict waste ground and eye sore for 5 years. You don't have to look too far to see lots of development opportunities in New Ferry, it leads me to think the council has given up on the area, and finds it simpler

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	or more cost effective to sell of big bits of land to developers who can take the easy option of building houses on open countryside...one very miffed New Ferry resident.
DOR01401	Keep off the green belt, once it has gone you never get it back. The local roads are already choked with traffic and the schools and health centres are full. The Wirral's population is actually falling so no need to build more houses, just revamp the areas that used to have houses, stop Peel Holdings hanging on to land and force them to develop it for housing if you are determined to do this. We're all these people going to work there are no local jobs and so people are leaving, when we leave the EU then we are going to need all the farms we have so leave the land to them. This is a flawed plan at every level but I doubt you will listen to the people who pay your wages, why would you? Yes, Brown land and keep your hands off the green belt please.
DOR01402	There are sufficient abandoned and dilapidated buildings (and potential development sites) in the borough with established infrastructure routes that could easily be developed in lieu of building on green belt land. Presumably its the attraction of building in 'more desirable' locations (and hence higher selling prices) is what is at the root cause of this issue. All about the money....
DOR01403	<p>I can appreciate the pressure the local council is under to prepare a local plan that offers a realistic future for the development of Wirral. I am opposing the Local Plan on the grounds that it is based on out of date information, and as the revised information is now available, there is no justifiable reason why that current information is not being used to put forward a revised plan that protects Wirral's green spaces for future generations.</p> <p>Justification:</p> <p>Objection 1 - The Council has put forward a plan showing a need for 800 new dwellings a year, 12000 over the planned 15 year period. The revised figures from the ONS local authority household forecasts show a revised housing requirement of 395 houses per annum, 5925 over the 15 year period and significantly less than those suggested in the Local Plan. This new figure also assumes high levels of economic migration which, given the uncertainty of future employment prospects and the data from the ONS annual survey of hours and earnings placing Birkenhead as one of the ten towns paying the lowest wages, seems unrealistically optimistic. During the public consultation meetings the planning officer had a link to a government page that advised that the figures were going to be revised downward on a slide entitled 'How much housing do we need?' showing that the council has been aware of the need to revise the figures but has not attempted to do so. 'The government is aware that lower than previously forecast population projections have an impact on the outputs associated with the method. Specifically it is noted that the revised projections are likely to result in the minimum need numbers generated by the method being subject to a significant reduction, once the relevant household projection figures are released in September 2018.' www.gov.uk/guidance. Currently the plan is showing 4900 acres of Green Belt land being parcelled and considered as suitable for release for development. If you apply the new figures proportionately then only 43 acres of Green Belt would be required to deliver the required growth.</p> <p>Whilst it would be preferable to protect all of our Green Belt from development, the revised figure might be justified if all Brownfield sites and empty buildings had been accounted for correctly and utilised and there was still a shortfall against the new figures.</p> <p>Objection 2 - I am opposing the Local Plan where it relates to the release of Green Belt land for development with particular reference to land in Bebington, East of the M53. The identification of the M53 as a strategic boundary effectively slices Wirral into two halves. A built up half and a wealthy half, adding to the already identified health and wealth divide between Heswall and the coastal West and the rest of the Wirral. Currently Bebington consists of 55% built upon area and 45% Green Belt, if the plans to release everything East of the M53 go ahead, Bebington will be 100% built upon. It would make greater sense to use Storeton Ridge as the strategic boundary where the B5151 runs alongside Storeton Woods and where the land starts to drop away from its highest point. This would be a natural boundary and would be in keeping with the already identified Green Belt boundaries. When The Localism Act 2011 was introduced it was described as an opportunity 'to allow local authorities to set a vision in consultation with local people about what their area should look like in the future'. The idea that the local residents of Bebington would see the loss of 100% of their Green Belt as a vision for their future is deplorable.</p> <p>Furthermore, it goes against the overarching objectives set out in the The National Planning Policy Framework with regard to local plans meeting their obligations for sustainable development:</p> <p>Social objective - Development plans should support communities' health, social and cultural well-being</p> <p>Environmental objective - Development plans should be protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p>With reference to specific parcels of land I would like to add the following objections:</p> <p>SP030 North of Lever Causeway, Storeton Prenton Golf Course; Prenton RUFC; Lever Causeway; Cow Hey Covert; and Marsh Hey Covert Prenton; Bebington</p> <p>SP030 is an area of mainly agricultural land offering good quality agricultural soil. It includes the historic 'Levers Causeway' which is of local significance, relating to the late Lord Leverhulme who planted tree lined Lever Causeway and linked it to other tree-lined causeways across his estate that still exist today (within the Green Belt) and that are a unique feature and landmark of this area. Levers Causeway is a 'breathing space' for Bebington and provides a recreational path running the one mile length of the causeway which is valued by horse riders, walkers, joggers and cyclists. It is also home to various species of wildlife.</p> <p>Under Green Belt Objectives SP030 meets the following purposes:</p> <p>Purpose 1 – To Check the unrestricted Sprawl of large built up areas</p> <p>Purpose 2 – Preventing Bebington from merging with Prenton</p> <p>Purpose 3 – Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>SP031/32/34 Little Storeton, Storeton Village and West of Landican Lane, Storeton. Storeton Village is an historic settlement mentioned in the Domesday Book of 1085. It also houses Storeton Hall</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>which was built in 1372 for the Master Forester of Wirral. The village is of historic significance and should be protected for future generations. Developing in and around Storeton fails to address the NPPF objective relating to protecting and enhancing our natural, built and historic environment.</p> <p>SP033 / 35 North of Marsh Lane, Storeton and North of Rest Hill This land, particularly at its boundary with the B5151, represent a natural border between housing and countryside. From this vantage point one can see across Wirral to the Welsh Hills. It gives the impression of uninterrupted green space as far as the eye can see, with just the houses and historic Storeton to break up a picture postcard scene. The importance of this aspect for the health and wellbeing of those that pass it daily either by car, cycle or on foot cannot be underestimated. Passers-by emerge from a built up area to a view of the possibilities that lie in the countryside and beyond.</p> <p>With regard to Green Belt it meets:</p> <p>Purpose 1 – To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>Purpose 3 – Safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>SP036/37/41 North of Red Hill Road, East of Brimstage Lane, West of Brimstage Lane, Storeton These areas fall away from Storeton Ridge towards the M53. The built-up land rises to the B5151 at Storeton Ridge and then falls away as countryside and woodland on the opposite side of the road. This area is land farmed from the farm buildings in Storeton village and is part of the unique history of that settlement / hamlet.</p> <p>Footpaths that criss cross these fields link Bebington with Storeton and Brimstage and provide an outlet from the urban areas to the rural villages of Brimstage and Thornton Hough.</p> <p>The possible option here would be to split parcel SP037, where the land falls away in the opposite direction, and develop a parcel from Clatterbridge roundabout to the south/south west side of the existing public footpath (south of the ponds and the lane), where no existing footpaths or housing would be affected.</p> <p>I trust you will give my comments your full consideration.</p>
DOR01404	You shouldn't even be thinking about using green belt land to build new homes.
DOR01405	New housing should be affordable.
DOR01406	<p>The council should be challenging the government's projections for the number of new homes needed in Wirral - the council's own estimates show far fewer new homes are needed. The council should be working with Peel Holdings to develop and build homes on the Wirral Waters site instead of considering releasing greenbelt land. Homes built on greenbelt land will not be affordable homes and I suspect the council wants to see these areas developed so that it can maximise Council Tax revenues from expensive new properties. I am completely opposed to ANY development on ANY greenbelt land. With specific reference to parcel SP010A (SHLAA 879) in Greasby fronting onto Arrowe Road, I note there is no reference in the Summary documents of the known flooding issues in Arrowe Road/Rigby Drive. I attended a meeting at Greasby library on 07/09/2016 which was attended by two council officers, Highway Assets Wirral Council as well as representatives from the Highways Agency and United Utilities. Residents were told that the flooding issues were caused by the drainage system which was built in the 1930s and 1950s is unable to cope with the volume of water in heavy downpours. There is also an issue with water running off the farmland which is now being proposed to be built on. At the meeting we were told that even micro developments such as the trend for people to pave over their drives was contributing towards the flooding. So if the drainage system is unable to cope now, how much worse is the flooding likely to get if the open farmland is concreted over and replaced by 200-300 houses? And given that the Council is well aware of this issue, why is there no mention of it in the summary documents prepared to date?</p>
DOR01407	Green belt should not be built on at all. There are plenty of brownfield sites that should be used and not just left as blights on the landscape. Magenta Living has demolished numerous high rise blocks and some of these sites are not being developed. Also houses are being demolished on the Crossways Estate and this is also a site which needs to be redeveloped. Social Housing Providers should be encouraged to develop affordable housing on all the sites they have in their ownership. I will not vote for any Councillors who support development on Green Belt land.
DOR01408	We need to protect our green belt and surrounding countryside, once it's gone and built on this land is gone ... end of. We need to protect our habitual wildlife and fauna, land, plants, trees, and wildlife is so important....we do not need more bricks and mortar.
DOR01409	I appreciate that there may be need for more housing over the coming years but building on green belt sites is short-sighted and promises to be disastrous for the Wirral overall. One of the reasons Wirral is a good place to live is that we have access to lots of pockets (some of them small but important) of woodland, heath, and meadow (as well as the shore line). Any building will put more strain on council resources, increase traffic, demand for water supplies etc, but the effect on the quality of lives of those who live in Wirral and on our indigenous flora and fauna will be irrevocably, and potentially disastrously, damaging. Please seriously rethink these plans.
DOR01410	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Does Wirral still need 12,000 new homes, or does this calculation need to be revised, based upon current data? 2. Does Wirral have unoccupied housing stock which could be refurbished as an alternative to building new homes? 3. If new homes are to be built, what is the best way of ensuring that local firms and people benefit from all the work available through these contracts? 4. What is the best way of ensuring that all the housing is affordable to meet the needs mentioned in the Government Targets above – not just a token percentage - AND stays affordable throughout the lifetime of the properties?
DOR01411	I do not wish the green belt to be built on Wirral is a beautiful place to live don't spoil it.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01412	I object in the strongest possible terms the proposals to release green belt land in the Wirral South area and other green belt land around Wirral for development of housing estates etc. It is essential that the council carry out a robust review of the housing needs of Wirral and develop first and foremost the brown field sites; invest in the less desirable areas that are in need of quality housing and an injection of investment and therefore addressing the health and wealth divide of the peninsula. The intention to develop on green belt, I feel, is driven by profit. This beautiful landscape is more likely to attract higher house prices and higher council tax payments than poorer areas of the Wirral. Developing in green belt will also only serve to further entrench the health and wealth divide of the borough. Leave our green belt alone. I do not wish for my children to grow up in a congested and over-urbanised area. Our green belt is what makes Wirral a great place to live. Developing on green belt is the easy way to please corrupt and greedy politicians and developers. Be different and strive to utilise brown sites before anything else. Stand up for our precious woodlands, habitats, farmlands and countryside.
DOR01413	The local plan, which identifies green belt as suitable for homes, has been conducted in a lazy, effortless way, by just outlining large areas of land. In addition to the land held by Peel Holdings, there are so many brownfield sites much more suited to a distribution of additional housing.
DOR01414	No problems with house building, but NOT on green belt land.
DOR01415	Wirral does not need any more executive homes, but affordable homes for ordinary people. That said where is the employment for them? Where are they living now? Empty properties should have CPO's and that would bridge a large gap. Green belt should be kept as long as possible in our beautiful peninsula. Brownfield sites should be used first with CPO's being used even if owned by a large company (is our council frightened of them?) i.e. Peel at Wirral Waters. Presumably they are sitting on the land waiting for it to increase in value. They should be made to build their promised homes.
DOR01416	I'm disgusted and disappointed that the council aren't looking at brownfield options and the state of the current housing stock. Greenbelt land must be protected.
DOR01417	There are a number of brown sites not being fully utilised. Also town centres should be condensed and the ribbon development converted into houses.
DOR01418	My family have lived in Irby for over 100 years. Whilst I recognise the reasons behind production of a local plan (i.e. because national government require it), there are SO many other areas of the peninsula that need redevelopment and would benefit so much from investment and the development of new housing. There is a considerable amount of brownfield land which could be developed. People in these areas are desperate to have their communities in Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry revived, yet developing in Irby and on other greenbelt land would destroy our well established communities. This is not NIMBYism this is a genuine concern for our village and the people that live here. Increasing population density puts pressure on services, schools, hospitals etc.in the area. We would lose our small village community. Crime is known to rise as population densities increase. Furthermore, part of the outlined area for possible development adjacent to Limbo Lane on Thingwall Road is in flood zone 2 and 3. Increasing tarmacked areas would lead to an increase in runoff and lead to potentially greater flood risks, contravening policy planning statement 25. The biodiversity and ecology of the area would also suffer.
DOR01419	I strongly oppose any recreation or sports areas being sacrificed. There are many more areas that could be built on.
DOR01420	I'd like you to prioritise brown field sites as there are significant brownfield sites available to meet even the over inflated targets. I will be watching and won't vote for any councillor who approves building on greenbelt.
DOR01421	I think that being forced by the government to make these targets is ludicrous, how can someone say in an office in London make a decision on a Borough they have more than likely never visited before. There are tons of old buildings, rows of closed shops with empty flats above and so much wasteland around the whole of the Wirral to develop. I cannot understand why we are being forced to build on green belt, the useless money spent on buildings like the hive that so easily could have been used to develop local youth clubs, then using the land where that unused monstrosity is built for large housing plots. Birkenhead docks could be developed with flats and housing big enough to cut the housing demand right down, the problem is there are massively underdeveloped areas that would benefit more from regeneration and building new and improved housing, before selling off vital oxygen producing countryside. Why are we agreeing to this when the housing will go to London escapees, the truth is not only the local council but also the government is hell bent on ravaging something so beautiful, to make way for quota filling housing that isn't required. If an area is full then surely housing wouldn't be advertised on the likes of zoopla and rightmove for rent and sale, I bet if anyone was to look at all these sites they could easily find close to the amount of 'required' properties. Green belt shouldn't be allowed to be relaxed for the good of the people of this country, the roads of all the local towns are fit to bursting with cars and the lack of parking spaces available surely show that the area is already suitably developed. It is a massive loss to the eco system of the Wirral to lose this greenbelt land, unnecessary and unwanted by the people who make up the Wirral population. One day we will have a local representative who has the gumption to stand up and fight against these kinds of plans but I fear at that point it will be too late and the damage will be irreparable.
DOR01422	Object to building by Dibbendsdale woods.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01423	I object to the proposal to use greenbelt in its entirety. The Wirral is an open green space by its very nature, a Peninsula with immense biodiversity that must be protected. What it isn't, is an industrial hub or developed business district with plenty of jobs. The Wirral migrates its workforce via the congested M53 to where there are jobs, everyday, as local residents know too well. What possible justification can there be to increase the number of new builds on greenbelt when there are thousands of empty properties on the Wirral, and an abundance of Brownfield available. Local infrastructure is not sufficient, especially in the areas proposed. Spital crossroads is congested due to the Croft retail park and local schools are full. What is WBC going to do about this?
DOR01424	Green belt land should NOT be considered for building on. We need our open spaces especially when there is so much existing property which could be renovated or levelled. Not enough is being done to consider this as the obvious option. Instead of building property on The Rake why not take some of the grounds of the golf courses, which after all are only used by the privileged few. What a waste of space and there seems to be an unprecedented surplus of these just on the Wirral. There's few enough open spaces and trees.
DOR01425	Building on Green Belt will not provide the required affordable housing. Wildlife needs our green areas to survive-we are already destroying our planet worldwide by removing it. People need green areas to walk for exercise, health and well-being-too many of us are overweight and stressed. We have not got the required infrastructure of roads/schools/medical centres to accommodate extra housing. There are hundreds of empty properties across Wirral which just require renovation to be habitable. Why are there no plans to build on the old Pensby Boys' School which is already council owned - an exit onto Telegraph Road via a roundabout would slow traffic down on that road too. Boundaries for our individual villages need to be retained.
DOR01426	Please clarify two points made in your invitation to public consultation. 1. How many homes, and how much land, are involved in failures by builders to start approved projects? 2. What is the current percentage of Wirral Green Belt land?
DOR01427	Green belt needs to be preserved for future generations. Housing requirements should be targeted at brownfield and redevelopment sites and infrastructure requirements taken into account as the road and rail network for the borough already struggles during commuting periods.
DOR01428	Could you add some sense to those statements please?
DOR01429	There are lots of parcels of land currently available in towns and dock areas before any suggestion of using greenbelt land. If Peel Holdings are not building as planned then apply to Central Government to have the land taken back under compulsory purchase.
DOR01430	To have a plan this needs to be informed by evidenced, current data. I fail to understand how a council can purport to produce specific proposals, consider planning applications and undertake meaningful consultation, all at the same time. There is no mention of the types of tenure needed in Wirral, social rented, shared ownership, market rent. Again this would need to be informed by current data and demographic projections. A major concern is that land will be sold to the highest bidder (private developer) to build homes for sale which will in turn be sold to buy to let landlords. I have not read of any proposals to consider the impact on infrastructure e.g. school places, primary and secondary care services, transport, roads, employment opportunities. This is not a consultation on 'a plan' it is rather seeking, and hopefully listening, to views which will inform the development of 'a plan' alongside an evidenced based strategic HOUSING NEEDS assessment containing health, education, employment and relevant infrastructure finance, activity and risk evidence. The 'golden thread' should run: 1. Strategic housing needs assessment. 2. Formulation of proposals 3. Meaningful, recorded/evidenced consultation. 4. Draft plan, evidencing outputs of above to be shared with residents to demonstrate transparency. 5. Published plan for council consideration. I am concerned also at what appears to be the ideal decent haste, with which the council are undertaking this exercise. We have not had a strategic housing plan for about 14 years, the government pressure for Wirral is for the production of such a plan, which is evidenced, stress tested, and reflects the housing and community needs of Wirral for the next 10-15 years.
DOR01431	Proposals in the Local Plan will ruin the green belt and valuable arable farming land and disadvantage present and future generations living within the confines of our Wirral Peninsula.
DOR01432	The scale of the need for new housing must be carefully and accurately determined based on good quality data. Based on this data the plan should be developed which uses existing land in currently developed areas, including brownfield sites. Regeneration of existing areas prevents a complete running down of those areas, leading to growing social problems, and increased costs of managing them. Green belt land should not be used until it is proven that there are no other alternatives. Until that is correctly established I am absolutely against any further intrusion into the green belt. Councillors if all parties should be approaching this issue together to ensure the best long term outcome for Wirral, not for any short term political gain. Be big about this and do the right thing please.
DOR01433	Build affordable housing and use brown field sites.
DOR01434	I feel building on greenbelt land should be an absolute last resort. It is well known that the Wirral has plenty of brownfield sites that could be used for new homes which would improve existing built up areas. By spending money on new houses in areas that need investment, it will help the Wirral's economy in the long run while helping to preserve precious green belt land. Greenbelt land is so important in a small area like the Wirral as it provides a buffer between towns and villages so they keep their own identity and stops the area turning into a conurbation.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01435	<p>a. The Councils delay in producing a Local Plan has meant there is now a rush to satisfy unrealistic targets and to release Green Belt unnecessarily.</p> <p>b. The Council should be challenging the unrealistic targets. The target figures stem from the Councils own inflated population and economic growth projections</p> <p>c. The Council should be compelling Developers to build on Brownfield sites using powers such as Compulsory Purchase Orders.</p> <p>d. There are more than enough Brownfield sites to meet the targets without releasing Green Belt. (Especially if the targets are reduced to a more realistic level)</p> <p>e. The Council should be compelling Peel Holdings to build the 13500 homes at Wirral Waters for which it has planning permission since 2012.</p> <p>f. Wirral Waters has Housing Zone Status which means that it is eligible for £millions of government grants.</p> <p>g. Why are the Council prepared to borrow £26 million (at a reduced rate) to lend to a Developer to build luxury houses for a Golf Resort on Green Belt in Hoylake, but will not borrow money to develop housing on Brownfield sites?</p> <p>h. We need affordable housing not executive housing on green belt.</p> <p>i. Rather than using all their power and resources to develop offices and retail in Birkenhead they should be building homes and communities in deprived areas.</p> <p>j. The Council should be following a "Brownfield first" policy and not release any Green belt land until all the Brownfield has been exhausted and the 6000 empty properties on the Wirral have been brought back in to use.</p>
DOR01436	No building on green belt, ever.
DOR01437	Sell off unused land. Old disused parks i.e. Citrene park Seacombe. Demesne street greens. Rock park (delta rd east). Warren Golf, half of brakenwood golf making it a 9 hole. Arrowe park playing fields (football pitches).
DOR01438	Why is there a clear bias towards green belt consideration around Clatterbridge, Bromborough and Eastham? These are areas already built up with existing housing estates. Why is the West of Wirral seemingly exempt from this process?
DOR01439	Horrrific idea my home backs on to stunning fields in Irby, it's why we bought our home 12 years ago. If this plan goes ahead you will destroy Irby village, it's a quiet lovely traditional area with small schools and a couple of shops, people have lived here for many many years because of the green belt views. They support the wildlife, the horse riders, the walkers over the fields, build in Birkenhead by the docks, not here!!! You will destroy people's lives.
DOR01440	There are lots of derelict housing and old people's homes in Egerton Park and Rock Park, plus lots of unsuitable houses in Birkenhead which could be knocked down and redeveloped. I would look at projects like this before I looked at developing green belt, I am not sure if the government are aware we need spaces like that to protect the environment, and to provide oxygen which we need to breath. Furthermore I do not believe we need 12000 homes on Wirral.
DOR01441	Initial thoughts are that the plans as they stand will drastically impact Wirral's green belt. Wirral is not, nor ever has been a highly industrialised peninsula. A high percentage is farmland and rural areas enjoyed by residents and visitors alike. Whilst agreeing that young people need low cost housing, I do not agree that it should be at the cost of decimating our green belt areas. Denser populations at the Wallasey and Birkenhead area of the Wirral may well be in need of low cost housing but these need to be nearer their place of work, mainly in those areas around Wallasey and Birkenhead and where access to Liverpool is important. Please do not spoil our peninsula by de-greening it.
DOR01442	There are enough brownfield sites to build on! Please, please leave our green spaces green. To promote health and mental well-being and especially to protect our beautiful natural word we need to work in harmony, to supply housing but still make the Wirral a place people want to come to visit and boost our local economy. DO NOT RUIN our beautiful surroundings, please.
DOR01443	I object to building on Greenbelt. Its value to health and wellbeing is completely underestimated. I am appalled at the lack of understanding how important it is.
DOR01444	Is the Wirral really going to need the number of houses the government are saying need to be built? Council needs to get tough on Peel holdings before any more green belt is built on. On the subject of green belt, from the plan, it looks like council has given up on keeping any green belt east of the M53. Looks like it is all going to be concreted over so that it is one big urban area, while retaining most of the green belt to the west of the M53. It is the east of Wirral that needs the green belt to protect from further urban sprawl (and who want to live right next to a motorway anyway?)
DOR01445	As a family we moved to Irby because of the very close access to rural areas- places to walk with in a short distance from home. Irby is a Village and again this is what brought us to the area to have the local village feel and local amenities within walking distance. We feel strongly that the proposed plans, which are going to take up a significant amount of rural land, are excessive. The walk that we do from the bottom of south drive / dawlish will no longer be possible. There will be a significant rise in number of vehicles in the area where we have already expressed concerns to the local neighbourhood watch about due to volume and speed of traffic. Getting out of south drive as a drive or pedestrian can often be difficult and at times seem dangerous- a further increase in this is going to raise these risks. I would not be able to allow my children to walk to school alone when the appropriate time comes. The proposed plans are going to cause congestion's, the risk that people will avoid the local shops are parking is never available / the area is too congested. There are many potential areas on the Wirral where redevelopment would be much more appropriate and far less controversial and would use far less areas of natural beauty. So many aspects of the natural habitat for many animals / birds will be affected. We as a family are strongly opposed to these developments.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01446	I think the plans for development of the green belt land in Spital is much too comprehensive and will have a devastating effect on the Poulton Royd and particularly Poulton Lancelyn housing estates. The infrastructure of Spital is not made to withstand this amount of new homes. The school is not big enough to accommodate new children with parking issues at school times already a major issue. The Dibbinsdale Nature reserve and Brotherton Park will be adversely affected. With access now being limited. And this will also affect the health of families in the area who use these beautiful places for relaxation and for exercise. Please think again. Granted people have to live somewhere but this amount of new homes will be devastating for the area.
DOR01447	I urge you to develop Birkenhead documents area, what is the hold up? We enjoy our green belt please do not develop on it there is enough space in Birkenhead to develop.
DOR01448	I am really hoping that Wirral council can see the sense enough to NOT release any of our beautiful greenbelt land for housing development. Our village (Greasby) is as big as it should be now as it is virtually impossible to get a doctors apt. or school place as it is, without removing our lovely countryside and shoe horning in a ridiculous amount of housing making those problems worse. One of the main reasons myself and my husband moved here from Chester 15 years ago, was having fields surrounding us instead of an exhaust polluted city for our 3 young children to grow up in. There are lots of sites around Wirral that would be far better suited to this development than removing our precious Green belt. It has been protected for all this time for a reason surely!! Please, please don't build on the Green belt land.
DOR01449	Why the need to use greenfield when there are more than adequate brownfield sites, they need decontaminating.
DOR01450	I think that Irby has been unfairly over targeted for the use of greenbelt land! The village will lose its identity as it will merge with Thingwall. There are other spaces that can be used and the council should look at Brown sites!!
DOR01451	I do not believe that Wirral is as short of houses as is claimed. The recent figures seem to suggest that the population is dropping. There are plenty of brown field sites which should be used BEFORE any of our precious green belt is destroyed and I include the council leader's much desired golf course in Hoylake.
DOR01452	SP043 is recognized for its biodiversity. It should not form part of this review.
DOR01453	If the Council had not delayed preparing the Plan until they were compelled to produce one by the Secretary of State then we would not be in this mess and rush to develop Green Belt land. The Council should be challenging the government's unrealistic housing targets, and they should be based on real population growths, not inflated projections for economic growth. The Council should be using all its powers to compel developers to build on brownfield sites, such as Wirral Waters. There are more than enough houses on brownfield sites to satisfy our needs (especially if the targets were reduced to a realistic level). Stop putting all your efforts into building offices and retail spaces in Birkenhead and start building homes and communities. If you build homes then the businesses will follow. We need affordable housing not executive homes on the Green Belt. The Green belt is our most precious resource and should be saved at all costs!
DOR01454	Green belt land should not be considered, when Peel Holdings are sitting on enough land to satisfy the requirements. Start a Compulsory Purchase Order on them and sell the land to builders who will start building straight away.
DOR01455	Respectfully, our green belt land is a resource we cannot use to build houses. I moved to Saughall Massie because of the greenery. I also believe that the needs of local people are being ignored and have been for some time. It is clear that the plan for Saughall Massie Road through to West Kirby and the surrounding area has been on the plans for a long time, starting with the road changes, now the fire station, and not forgetting the golf club. The locals who live here do not want this.
DOR01456	New housing on the Wirral should not mean that areas will lose green belt land to build on. The local plan needs re-evaluating. We should use brown land to build new housing on. The houses will be more affordable as the land would be cheaper to purchase, than greenbelt land. It's more affordable homes that are needed, and once built Wirral would still have open green spaces for families to enjoy in their leisure time.
DOR01457	The Wirral is a beautiful area and the green belt should be protected. We're in a unique position with being a peninsula and we should limit housing so the prices of current homes are protected. Why not turn the green belt into nature reserves, protect what we have rather than encourage destruction. Why not build more homes on the Birkenhead and Wallasey docks, which are in desperate need of renovation. Furthermore, rather than building more homes on the green belt, these homes would not located next to rail ways therefore increasing the motorway traffic.
DOR01458	I think that brown sites should be utilised first as a priority. I also believe that Wirral should do something SPECIAL and make all the new homes as ENVIRONMENTALLY FRIENDLY as can be. They should have SOLAR PANELS as standard built in, WINDTURBINES if possible and other ENERGY SAVING systems. I believe this should be made a stipulation of the planners. Let's make Wirral GREAT.
DOR01459	I think the area where the champion spark plug factory used to be (and other factories) down the hill from Arrowe Brook, are a big mess. Great area for new housing.
DOR01460	Completely against the plans! Leave the green belts alone, and stop being greedy! Nobody needs these ugly cheap new builds. Neither does the natural wild life that you are putting at risk!!!
DOR01461	Very concerned that the loss of green built will forever change Wirral charm. We have so much brown site that must be developed before we make a change to green belt that cannot be revoked. Developers are not interested in building quality housing on these sites it's just ramming as much housing in that's poor quality. We risk losing sssi wildlife sites and important farmland. The council are being incredibly short sighted and haven't even considered reviewing changes to existing housing stock to make it suitable.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01462	I am opposed to the release of greenbelt for development. The brownfield sites in the Wirral should be used and invested in, and in return will help grow those areas and enable them to grow and prosper. Wirral is famous for its tourism and open spaces and if these are built upon the area will negatively suffer. The local infrastructure will not be able to cope. The schools are already full. The areas are home to farmland, which in turn provides income for the Borough and employment. The figures being dictated to us are generated from London and Westminster, and are not the same up North as they are down South. Can there be evidence of the requirement for the 12,000 homes 'required'? - It is understood that this extent is not the need and rather not a shortage of housing to that extent in the Borough. Brownfield sites must be prioritised and investments pushed for these areas. Existing infrastructure is already in place for brownfield sites - there is none for greenbelt. To build on greenbelt will massively impact local drainage problems in the Borough, and will increase and worsen flooding. We must prevent development sprawl and retain the individuality and history that the Wirral is famous for in its towns, villages, parks, farmland, beaches and open space. It will affect local wildlife, fauna and vistas. People need countryside as much as housing and it's something that needs protecting in lieu of the health and well-being benefits.
DOR01463	I strongly reject the idea of building upon Wirral Green belt land. This would be a huge mistake, whittling away at what makes Wirral an attractive place to visit. There are many brown land areas which could be developed. I remember reading thousands of housing could be put on these brown field sites. I wouldn't be against the council funding these brown field developments if it meant developers were more inclined to build there (it's notorious that developers are put off by the costs). Also theres that huge waterfront development where they will put lots of commercial building we don't need! Plenty of space there to put AFFORDABLE housing. Please listen to these thousands of people that don't want greenbelt land developed.
DOR01464	I am strongly against building of ANY kind on green belt land. More effort should be made into making uninhabitable places habitable, building on brown field sites and using land that is part of the waterfront development. Build genuinely affordable homes. Review if the number of homes planned to be built is actually needed. You see lots of new builds stand empty for a while. Make sure you have more houses for sale rather than let. Part of the problem is the lack of available homes for sale, more and more I see houses to let. I will have even less trust in this council if they go against the voice of the many thousands of people on the Wirral. Listen to us.
DOR01465	I think it is hideous that green belt areas are even being considered for development when we have plenty of brown belt sites in the borough, and actually what is really needed is affordable not luxury housing. This is evidently an opportunity for developers and their councillor cronies to line their pockets at the expense of what makes our borough such an amazing place to live and bring up my children. Once green belt land is gone we can never get it back. We have a responsibility to our children as well as the various species that live on our green belt to fight tooth and nail to save it.
DOR01466	I am horrified at the plan to use irreplaceable green belt land for building. If the 6,000 unoccupied properties are refurbished there are sufficient brownfield sites available to provide the 12,000 homes specified without recourse to using our precious countryside.
DOR01467	I live in Irby, Wirral and like thousands of other Wirral residents have been devastated and outraged at the Council's recent proposals to release Green Belt land for development. Several potential sites in the Irby and the surrounding areas have been identified for review and if approved, would reduce this area to a vast housing estate. Huge pressure would be put on an inadequate infrastructure, increasing traffic, pollution, destroying the character and charm of the individual villages as well as the wildlife with which we share our lives. We have chosen to live here because of the quality of life it brings and we are now faced with the real threat (based on very questionable housing and economic forecasts) that our precious Green Belt will be lost forever. There are a number of issues which I feel should be challenged. Firstly, looking at the parcels of land in the Irby area in particular, we are not convinced that they should form part of any review in the first place. If one looks at the five Green Belt tests, at least two of the proposed sites (South of Thingwall Road and West of Glenwood Drive) fulfil the Green Belt test, particularly with regards to the merging of neighbouring settlements. Secondly, I, like many others, am puzzled by the Governments' estimate that the tiny Wirral peninsula needs 12000 houses over the next 15 years, especially as they have been quoted as saying that the Council's task should be simple as Wirral "is not an area of high housing pressure". I have read, and listened to many opinions regarding Wirral's housing need and the projection of future economic growth. The general consensus is that both have been vastly overestimated and display a staggering lack of recognition of both local knowledge and historic trends. Is there some remarkable economic boom about to hit the Wirral when all the evidence seems to suggest the opposite? I therefore believe that it is vital to question the accuracy and validity of this figure. The Council are simply blaming the Government for this estimate but are not challenging it! If a more realistic estimate of our future housing needs was considered many believe it would virtually remove the need to consider releasing Green Belt land for development. Surely, development is most desperately needed in the run down and declining areas of Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry. The Council should be putting more effort into forcing Peel Holdings to fulfil their promises for the Wirral Waters development rather than wasting time and money in the costly Hoylake Golf Resort! The fact that Wirral Council has been so tardy in producing the Local Plan, and is now being threatened with Government intervention only bodes ill for the future of our Green Belt. They are under pressure and I have no faith whatsoever in the Council's ability. It was clear from a recent local meeting held in Pensby this week that Wirral residents are not just prepared to sit back and accept this assault on our Green Belt.
DOR01468	The land at Civic Way, Bebington, where the town hall stood should be used for houses only. To be used for anything else would be criminal at this time.
DOR01469	Our Green space is very precious. It supports wildlife, improves air quality and helps to give some areas of peace and quiet from the onslaught of traffic, light pollution and noise. We need spaces to feel free so that and away from all the hustle and bustle of life. It can be vital for people with mental health issues to have a quiet space to go to, and for people to be able to exercise and keep fit. The infrastructure is not there to support all these extra houses. The roads cannot cope with any more traffic. Our air pollution is compromised and we do not have the schools or medical facilities to cope with large numbers of extra people. Waiting times at hospitals and for doctors appointments are already the worst they have ever been.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01470	Wirral is already overcrowded, roads are too busy and congested at many times of day, and have become dangerous especially if you want to turn right across a road. Wirral needs to breath we are not a suburb of Liverpool, we need green space and to protect our already congested road system. We are in danger of sprawling one area into another.
DOR01471	Having just purchased a Bungalow in Greasby. We are appalled that land behind our property which dates back to early settlement, and for cows to graze and proved much needed milk for the community, is being considered to develop houses on this land. Obviously being new to the area, land searches did not bring up any of this when purchasing our home. And the main reason for the said purchase was the outlook to our property. Having lived in the house only 5 months, we have also seen considerable parking issues over our drive with influx of parents driving into our cul-de-sac and drop and collect twice daily. They double park and use both sides of the road and cause considerable congestion for the residents living here. There is limited access to and to introduce an access for further houses would in our opinion be detrimental to our lives, our health and wellbeing. I have found the parking an issue. And the local council should take into consideration, an already busy road due to two local schools that the Rigby Drive residents have to manage on a daily basis. As for The Copse which has been there since early settlement in this country is detrimental to wildlife and cattle that supplies milk to the local community.
DOR01472	Far too many houses. Lack of schooling. Too densely populated. Lack of space.
DOR01473	Housing targets unreasonable. Build on brownfield first. Reclaim unoccupied housing. Fail to see how greenbelt loss proposed in Wirral west will provide appropriate housing need. Are speculative profiteering building interests being pandered to without regard to planning for increased demand on local services? What biodiversity information has been used in the review? Wirral west proposals would mean unacceptable levels of unnecessary protected species loss. Are Caldy fields west of column road important to water quality in aquifer and unsuitable for building due to drainage impact?
DOR01474	There are so many brownfield sites to be renovated and rebuilt. Why you need to build on green spaces when there are so many other places is beyond me. No doubt you will get more money for contracts on green spaces and with compulsory purchase can get the land cheap. If the spaces around Irby get built on my family are moving out of the Wirral.
DOR01475	Why do we need additional housing when, the population growth is stagnant?
DOR01476	It is absolutely ludicrous to be considering developing on our precious green belt without using the available brown field sites first. It appears that Developers profits come first rather than Residents opinions!
DOR01477	We should refuse to build on any green belt. Only brownfield sites should be used. If this is done initially then let us see what the government will try to do. By the time the brownfield sites are used the situation will have changed, certainly the government will have.
DOR01478	I feel that it is shocking that Wirral Council are considering opening up Green Belt land for development, when there are Brownfield areas that are not been prioritised to be used first.
DOR01479	I am dismayed to note that Peel Holdings are not being urged to build more of the homes they have planning permission for at Wirral Waters. This would certainly relieve the pressure to encroach onto Green Belt land in order to meet government targets. It would also provide housing where it will be needed, if the Wirral Waters development generates as many jobs as predicted. I am also concerned, following revelations about its connection with a private lettings agency, that Magenta Living, formerly Wirral Housing Department is not operating wholly for the best interest of those who live in or are seeking affordable social housing. This is a betrayal of the trust asked of everyone in Wirral when the Housing Department was privatised as a "socially responsible", "not-for-profit organisation". I smell whiffs of corruption in the air.
DOR01480	I think Wirral, like the rest of the country does need more housing. The best way to achieve this would to try and built eco-friendly housing, firstly building in infill sites as a priority. There is obviously a limit to how many houses can be built in a relatively small country.
DOR01481	We moved to Irby because it is a quiet village with plenty of green belt surrounding it. If we had of wanted more houses surrounding us we would have stayed in Prenton. By building more houses around Irby it will be ruining access to the lovely area that we have now. We do not agree with the plan to build on green belt land around Irby! Banning dogs from parks and new builds, what happened to enjoying life and living in an area you have chosen because of the availability of parks and fields. Also what will the effect be on house prices?
DOR01482	Regeneration of the Borough should be the only option on the table. Supporting existing Communities and businesses through regeneration is the only sensible way forward. Releasing greenbelt and building houses in the likes of Allport Precinct area will not help regenerate areas like New Ferry and Birkenhead. The consultation is purely putting money and profit before communities like New Ferry and Birkenhead who are in desperate need or rebuilding.
DOR01483	Don't build on green belt! My family are out every weekend enjoying our local walks. Concentrate on brown field sites. We are already so overbuilt compared to what we once were.
DOR01484	Wirral council is not a council to be trusted. I do not believe that this proposal is necessary. Once again it is an attack on West Wirral, whilst claiming it is not their fault. Supposedly it is always being forced on them by somebody else. We need a new council!
DOR01485	I agree more and better housing solutions need to be found. However, the plan for housing in the Poulton/Spital location (SP043) is completely inappropriate and I believe bordering upon dangerous (when you consider the increase in traffic that will be generated).
DOR01486	I don't agree with it in the slightest, not that I believe the council cares what their electorate think. There are a number of brown field sites that could easily be developed.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01487	<p>I have two main issues with the plan.</p> <p>The first is losing the thing that makes Wirral special both to live and visit. Small towns and villages separated by green fields, woods and countryside. Suggesting turning farm land, areas within conservation areas and areas next to National Trust land into disjointed housing plans is quite simply wrong. We cannot allow a beautiful area of England be turned into urban sprawl purely for the benefit of greedy and already rich land owners.</p> <p>The second is the fact that if Wirral really needs this number of houses they cannot be simply dotted around the peninsula. The new householders will need jobs, schools, health centres, shops etc etc. Scattering them around the Wirral will simply put more pressure on the services already there. A coherent plan to redevelop brown field sites along the Mersey, might allow the targets to be met but will also allow development of all the services the new houses need (generating employment for the new residents) and will also add to, rather than detracting from, the area. A well thought out development allowing views across to a World Heritage Site with easy commutes across to the city will attract people and work to the area and will almost certainly allow much needed investment to modernise and improve the centre of Birkenhead. There are many reasons I do not support the plan but these two are the most important.</p>
DOR01488	<p>I am opposed to so easily building/developing the Wirral's Much loved and desired green belt land; however as an architect I am aware of the housing shortage. I feel that we should give more consideration to the land supply and demand, and instead consider much available brownfield parcels of land to develop first. Various plots of brownfield land can be used to secure good sized developments on the Wirral which might mean less green belt land is required. The Wirral is known for its history of farming, agriculture and fields. It would be a shame to lose this! Its history of being subservient to the city over the water is something that should be considered.</p>
DOR01489	<p>I fully understand that there is a shortage of housing, however I feel more needs to be considered to place the houses in the correct area, and make sure the infrastructure is ready first. Including better road networks and doctors surgeries. Also I would prefer to see the brownfield land used before green belt.</p>
DOR01490	<p>There are a number of brown field sites that should be developed before considering green belt locations.</p>
DOR01491	<p>There should be a presumption that planning permission for residential property should be granted unless on a site of genuine environmental or historical value.</p>
DOR01492	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. One of the key elements underlying the concept of "Green Belt" is to maintain gaps in the urban sprawl. Some of the protected areas under review contravene this basic principle. 2. The government's own approach, which appears to drive your thinking and attempts to dodge responsibility for the impending urbanisation, is to be challenged anyway. You could definitely kick this particular can further down the road. 3. New housing is required, but many of the areas at which you appear to be looking, won't have any meaningful impact on your particular housing problem, as the shortage is in a price bracket that the areas under review will exceed.
DOR01493	<p>Bromborough and Eastham have seen over 1000 new homes built in the last 10 years, not one new School. The amount of industrial units also built has changed Bromborough also forever. The infrastructure is creaking with the new residents already and existing residents have their standard of living compromised. The majority of the land identified on your Greenbelt review is within Wirral South again, as a resident of the area I am greatly concerned for our standard of living. You have included WORKING farm land i.e. Hargreaves farm, as well as Claremont farm, with a growing population good farm land will be very important to feed us all. Why are you looking at so much Greenbelt? We don't have the services in place to attend these properties, for God's sake don't release this much Greenbelt. Developers will build a few here a few there, as you know we have Brownfield land available also therefore the area you have identified does not need to be as large. One of Wirral's attractions is being semi-rural and the leisure peninsula, keep it that way! Scale back your plans on the release of Greenbelt and certainly DO NOT include ANY working farmland. I really can't work out also the 800 houses per year? These figures don't add up.</p>
DOR01494	<p>Sadly this consultation exercise has begun, with many residents and amenity groups already annoyed by the premise that it will be necessary to release green belt land in order to build new homes. In my view prior to releasing green belt the Council should undertake a full audit of land it owns, with the option of releasing some of the less valuable sites. For example, Parkland, Bidston Court Gardens, Playing fields, Kings Lane Allotments, Harris part of site, Golf Course, Wallasey Beach Mini Golf. I have listed these sites because they have limited recreational value but there may well be others with even less value and only a full audit will identify them.</p>
DOR01495	<p>We are on an Island and we are known as the leisure peninsula. Build on brown fields only and keep the green areas for the tourism.</p>
DOR01496	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The population growth forecast for Wirral does not require building on greenbelt - The economic prospects for Wirral are not as optimistic as the Council would have us believe and e.g. takes no account of Brexit effect - The amount of greenbelt indicated as required is greatly in excess of the housing need as forecast - Largescale reclassification of land with the prospect of subsequent development will have a blighting effect, because people and companies will not have any certainty as to what might happen - The infrastructure required to support the number of houses is not a feasible development viz. GPs, Hospitals, Police, Fire, Ambulance, Roads, Schools, Social Services, Libraries
DOR01497	<p>House building should be restricted to brown field sites. Green field sites should be protected.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01498	The proposed plan to explore all building sites, including green belt is ill-conceived and not required when you have remained inactive on putting the onus back on Peel Holdings to develop their housing that they have had plans for years to build. In one fell swoop you could solve the issue imposed upon us. Any further green belt building is merely going to open the flood gates to future development making it easier the next time. The motorway exit and local infrastructure in the Bebington area is not capable of sustaining large numbers of homes, primary schools are oversubscribed, traffic routes struggle at peak times already and our local hospital will not be able to manage the increased demand. It would be wiser to increase tenancy in the plethora of unoccupied flats and derelict shops we have, rebuild the new ferry centre with more homes to replace the space created by that terrible explosion. The Wirral has a potential 13000 homes "locked" away by Peels inactivity as they sit on property and try to make it more valuable by waiting. Your arbitrary use of the M53 corridor as a boundary for green belt development is misguided and means that in future there can be no argument about developing on the other side of the M53. From a public perspective this decision is likely to cast you in a very poor light.
DOR01499	I disagree we need more housing on the Wirral. There is no need to invite more people to the borough. If more houses are to be built then brown areas and NOT green belt should be developed. The river streets where knocked down in Birkenhead yet the council believes we need to build on green belt? I won't be voting for anyone who is for building on green belt. Quite the opposite, I will fervently campaign against anyone who supports destroying the green parts of the Wirral.
DOR01500	I understand the need for housing development. I also understand the need for affordable and social housing. What I do not understand is how the council can propose to remove greenfield sites in contravention of the guidelines for greenfield sites. In the areas that I have looked at there is a failing of the tests in all cases. Additionally I do not comprehend how this council can advocate removing ANY farmland and replacing it with housing. My family were forced by the council to move from the where they had lived for many years, so that housing could be built and I am not allowing this to go unchallenged in 2018. I am concerned, more so after attending an open meeting in my ward yesterday that the council has made contact with landowners and suggested to them that they may wish to sell their land to developers. If, as was quoted yesterday, one developer has already purchased land speculatively then it is apparent that there will be more. I wish that I had the confidence in this council to say NO. Please do not blame Government for this mess. This is a problem of this council making and they are going to be hard pressed to get out of it. I will be also submitting my more detailed comments to council and to James Brokenshire directly during the formal consultation. The council has failed in its duties and has failed consistently to produce a local plan on time and in full. We, the residents of the Wirral have been failed. The threat to de classify greenbelt land is fuelling a frenzy by developers hungry to despoil OUR peninsula. I use the phrase declassify because the land is not the councils to release. I have written formally to the councillors for this ward lodging my formal objection. Only one has had the courtesy to reply. I can only see one outcome from this rape of the land my family cared for and that is high council tax band housing. There are few jobs for low medium earners so only those who commute and I am one of them, could possibly afford these new houses. If this fiasco is allowed to go ahead I will potentially look to live from the Wirral. I am ashamed of this council and all it has come to stand for.
DOR01501	I think it's a disgrace that the council should be considering using any aspect of the green belt. There are plenty of unused areas around the Birkenhead North that is not being used and other pocket around the Wirral that could be used to build! No you're quickly destroying the whole of the Wirral and soon I will be ashamed to admit that Wirral is my home. The council is systematically destroying the Wirral.
DOR01502	I am very strongly opposed to the removal of land from the Green Belt in Wirral and the proposal to build on that land. The main reasons are:- <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It will have a significant impact on biodiversity • Removal of green spaces will turn Wirral into one large conurbation and destroy the character of Wirral • The local infrastructure, including road, schools, medical centres, land drainage, could not cope • The type of houses developers would want to build on green field sites in most of Wirral would not be affordable housing, so would not address the reason for this push for housing • There are brown field sites lying undeveloped in many parts of Wirral East • Finally, where is the demand and where are the jobs for so many new residents? To go ahead with these plans will destroy the environment and character of Wirral and make it a much less attractive place to live and work, making it difficult to attract the people to come and live in these new houses.
DOR01503	I fully support the review of the Green Belt as a resident I recognise that it is necessary to provide for the long term needs of residents in the borough. I also recognise that there is insufficient brownfield land. I consider that all of the sites proposed in the Greasby, Upton, Moreton and Hoylake area are suitable in principle for housing development. My two areas of concern are infrastructure and design. The Local Plan will need to be specific on what infrastructure each site will be required to deliver. Improvements to the local highways infrastructure will be very welcome. I would support signalised the roundabouts in Moreton cross and by Sainsbury's on the Upton bypass, as additional housing will out additional pressure on these junctions that already struggle at peak times. In relation to design, I would like strong and robust policies on design and landscaping for all new schemes.
DOR01504	Oppose release of green belt, especially around Spital area where congestion is already a significant problem.
DOR01505	I am writing as I completely disagree with the proposal to sell Green Belt. Greasby is a beautiful village as it is now with all of its rural areas. It will be completely ruined building more houses on it. The impact it will have on the area and amount of traffic it will cause will be extremely heightened. The houses will not be affordable. You are going to ruin the green land and the rural feel that many residents of Greasby chose to live here for.
DOR01506	The area of land highlighted near Spital appears to include the Dibbinsdale / Brotherton Park area. This is a well-used recreational area and wildlife conservation area. It would be a disgrace to lose this. I cannot see how it would make good housing land given the terrain. This huge influx of population will need somewhere to walk and enjoy with their families.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01507	No building on Green Belt, until all brownfield sites have been developed including Wirral waters. If the site is not developed, force the sale to builders who will develop it. Don't let Builders cherry pick desirable sites while viable sites in less desirable areas are ignored, gentrification will only happen if our council stands firm and forces companies to use the land available.
DOR01508	I think it is outrageous that the one reason people want to live in Greasby is for its location to beautiful green belt land. We will destroy our wildlife habitat too. I live in Rigby drive and watch bats, owls, foxes and an array of birds including sparrow hawk, jays, woodpeckers and buzzard enjoying the fields adjacent to our home. This will end.
DOR01509	No!! Just no!! There is enough vacant land that is not green belt which you can consider! There is also too much pressure on Schools, GP's & local hospital for more housing! Why Wirral? Why not North Wales??? Wirral is built up enough.
DOR01510	<p>We need affordable social housing to rent for families and the growing elderly population</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • a timebomb ignored politically for so long • small houses with a little outside space • the towns need regenerating • Birkenhead , Liscard , Wallasey and so in and the houses should be built here on brownfield land as there is so much of it there empty tarmaced areas and spaces where houses used to be and empty business units • Borough Road is an example of what NOT to build • big soulless flats and apartments all piled on top of each other that no one really wants to live in • people want to be individual and have a little bit of nice space to call their own which helps with their mental health and well-being
DOR01511	<p>The figure of 12000 homes over the next 15 years needs to be challenged. There simply isn't that level of need. It is a false belief that releasing Green Belt land will tackle the housing crisis, as the crisis is one of affordability, not simply land availability. CPRE research showed that since 2009 only 16% of houses built on Green Belt outside of local plans were classed as affordable, and nearly three-quarters of the housing proposed on land to be released from the Green Belt will be un-affordable for most people living in the local area. More effective measures should be taken first such as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Much firmer action on developers who are failing to build what communities need. The use of viability assessments by developers to undercut their affordable housing requirements must be stopped. • Incentives and enforcement on slow build out rates. To ensure developers' existing commitments are met before further land is released. • The untapped possibilities of brownfield sites could be invested in. <p>Suitable Brownfield land has the potential to deliver over a million homes and brownfield sites are proven to be developed on average six months faster than other sites. Why not build there first? At the heart of these solutions is a firm and enforced commitment to putting community interests at the centre of government policy, protecting the countryside in the process.</p>
DOR01512	There is no need to even think about taking up any of our green belt, I hear that in February, Council Leader wrote to the Minister saying that planning permission was in place for 16,000 homes on previously developed land and there is room for 13,000 homes on land owned by Peel at Wirral Waters, therefore green belt need not come into reckoning, as the above figures more than covers the 800 homes needed per year.
DOR01513	Leave the woodland and green areas alone it's already an urban graveyard full of scum bags and bad crime rates we do not need more housing.
DOR01514	If you think that WBC are going to take any notice, think again.
DOR01515	There are plenty of brownfield sites lying vacant. Why can't these be used? This council is intent on destroying Wirral. Is there a hidden agenda? Money is wasted on vanity projects and resident's protests are ignored. The problem is that the council is so entrenched they can do as they please.
DOR01516	The land already provided to developers should be used for housing rather than any green belt land. This is being imposed by central government and is a land grab for developers that is not needed or wanted by the local community.
DOR01517	Green belt is precious and a legacy for future generations. Once it has gone, it is gone for ever. Wirral should adhere to the principle that development should not take place on green belt land. In particular agricultural land should never be built on. We are losing wildlife at an alarming rate Wirral has some remarkable habitats, linked to farmed land, which harbour for example, Barn Owls, bats, hares and numerous invertebrates that form the base of the food chain. Any incursions into these areas will reduce the biodiversity in the region for ever. Before contemplating building on green belt land, there are many derelict buildings/poor quality buildings that could be replaced with high quality, affordable housing in areas with existing good infrastructure including roads, shops and health centres.
DOR01518	Too much building on green belt land.
DOR01519	I have lived on the Wirral all my life and have felt very privileged to do so with the right balance of urban and rural life, and home, work and leisure. The local plan should focus on affordable social housing using brownfield sites first, as I am totally against building on green belt land in any form. This will reduce our leisure and pleasure areas for both local residents and visitors to the Wirral who take great pleasure in using these areas for walking, rambling, cycling, running, horse riding dog walking and many more outdoor pursuits which meets for a healthy environment and healthier living. I am totally opposed to this plan going ahead.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01520	Using the local greenbelt/brownbelt areas would ruin the character of the place I have lived in for the last 25years. Please preserve it for me, my children and my dog. I have loved walking through the woods and fields over the years and would miss not having easy or no access to these areas. It is part of the attraction of living in Irby and the Wirral.
DOR01521	I believe that the Government projection regarding housing is skewed. I cannot see the population of Wirral increasing causing a need for a further 12000 new homes. If we say 3 people per dwelling, this accounts for a population increase of 36,000. With an economy which is slowing down and if Brexit happens (decreasing immigration), I think that Wirral's population will decline. The Green Belt is the lungs of Wirral, enjoyed by all. Priority should be given to building on brownfield sites. Developers complain that brownfield sites are expensive to develop, but this is a lazy attitude, and permission to build on green belt should be refused until all brownfield sites are used up. The council should also "force" brownfield land owners such as Peel to develop their land for housing. If they cannot develop their land, it should be compulsory purchased and passed to a builder who can develop. I am also critical on how land is used / developed. For instance, where I live in Greasby, permission was granted to build a small Sainsbury store, the so called "Red Cat Retail Park". Building a convenience store was not essential as we already had a Co-op. So I question why this land could not have been used for housing? The land used for retail could have perhaps accommodated a terrace of 6 X 2 bedroom houses perhaps the council should look at land earmarked for industrial and retail use and reconsider it for housing.
DOR01522	As a long-term Spital resident with a dog, I am absolutely disgusted that you are even considering taking one inch of the Dibbensdale Nature Reserve. It is not only home to a variety of environmentally important species and plants but equally as important, a meeting place for people threatened with loneliness. It is also, as someone who contributes to the creative industries on Merseyside, a creative hub in itself full of imaginative people, part of what your own council want to do with Inspire Wirral. And, should one part of this amazing land be taken, rest assure, we will use all our global networks and local influence to make sure that everyone is made aware of your unnecessary tactics.
DOR01523	There does not seem to have been a review of all the brownfield land, and a figure given for how many homes out of the 12,000 it would provide. Otherwise it seems the council is planning to identify land for all 12000 to come from the Green Belt. Referring to section 3.11 of the proposed methodology which refers to the Government policy on the protection of the Green Belt, the 5 purposes identified would immediately rule out many of the land areas. The sprawl of Heswall would increase the size of the town by 30% placing undue strain on its infrastructure and change the setting and special character of the town. The merging of neighbouring towns such as Greasby to Irby to Pensby and Moreton to Meols should be prevented. The safeguarding of the countryside which gives Wirral its special character for the benefit of all residents. Farming, woodland, paddocks, wildlife etc. all need to be preserved and protected for our residents and future generations. The towns of the Wirral have a lot of history and special individual character which also must be preserved. Large developments are at risk of destroying this. And referring back to my first comment, the recycling of derelict and other urban land should be recycled.
DOR01524	The Heswall Society is currently studying the Cabinet Report on the Review of Development Options and will respond to the formal consultation in due course when the full details of the consultation become available "once people are back from holiday". In the interim I should alert you to the fact that in our view the "Supporting Information" contains a number of deficiencies particularly related to housing need, housing supply and the postulated need for Green Belt sites and we are currently collating our analysis, which will be reviewed in the context of the more detailed consultation reports.
DOR01525	I think the Local Plan is disgusting! I live in Barnston and these plans will have a catastrophic impact on local services, environment and our house valuations. Is Wirral Council going to compensate us all for falls in value of our homes? Do not destroy our precious green belt land because you can't manage your own budgets! The residents of West Wirral will oppose these plans in an army of numbers!
DOR01526	Where does the government think all these people are coming from to need all this housing? What about infrastructure, schools, jobs etc. All empty and derelict shops should be considered for change of use/demolition. According to a letter in last week's globe the population has reduced in the last 22 years. Although this is a lovely area I don't think so many people will be flocking here.
DOR01527	Redeveloped run down areas & empty properties first & foremost. Then use all Brownfield sites. Affordable housing would not be possible on green belt areas.
DOR01528	<p>The Government has said that it will consider adjusting the method for assessing housing needs after household projections are released in September. The notes for the overhaul of the NPPF published 5th March 2018 state that the Government proposes to, "Build the right homes in the right places" They also say that, "The minimum needed numbers should be subject to a significant reduction". If the numbers are reduced please ensure that the numbers in the local plan are reduced accordingly. The total proposed land to be removed from Greenbelt is 1,724 hectares. Even if there is a shortfall in brownfield sites and 4,700 houses have to be built on Green Belt, you are allowing for fewer than three houses to be built per hectare, a ridiculously large amount of land per house. Paragraph 134 of the NPPF has five purposes for Greenbelt.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Check unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. The site references SP030 and SP033 on the plan are huge. They are large swathes of land stretching from Mount Road in Bebington to Storeton Village and the M53. Building on this scale would be unacceptable. It would affect the environment of the whole surrounding area and be a severe encroachment of the countryside. The area of land adjacent to Mount Road is elevated and building on this would dominate the view from any Green Belt remaining to the west of the M53. 2. Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. If all proposed sites are developed, the building sprawl will stretch right across the east side of the M53 with negligible Green Belt remaining. Bebington would have no remaining Green Belt land and Wirral South constituency's Green Belt would be reduced by 33% from 3,670 hectares to 2,463 hectares. The whole of this area would become one massive built-up area. 3. Assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. All brownfield sites have not been reviewed and too much land in the same area is being considered for development. Once built upon the green space will be lost forever. 4. Preserve the historic setting and special character of historic towns or areas. Sites SP030 and SP033 are on either side of Lever Causeway. This is a beautiful tree-lined road, well known on the

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Wirral and used by many for walking, riding, jogging and cycling. It has historic significance as Lord Leverhulme designed it to join his manor in Thornton Hough to Thornton Road in Bebington. It is a visible reminder of the historical significance of the Lever family and their business on the Wirral. Building on these sites would also affect Storeton Village which has historical significance. The village contains Storeton Hall which is classed as an ancient monument. If these sites were built upon they would join up Storeton Village to Bebington and surrounding areas. The special setting and character of the village would be lost forever. The view from the elevated area of Mount Road Bebington stretches across the Green Belt with spectacular views across to the Welsh hills. This area should not be built upon.</p> <p>5. Assisting urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict urban land. Looking at The Plan, I am not convinced that all brownfield sites have been taken into account. I would like to know what criteria have been used to decide which brownfield sites have been included. Driving around the Wirral I have seen many sites not included in The Plan as either sites recommended for new housing development, or sites recommended for consultation for new employment development and mixed uses (appendix 1 and 3 in the Core Strategy Local Plan review of development options). These sites have never been considered for planning permission. If all available brownfield sites have not been included in the Local Plan, the council will fall foul of trying to recycle urban land and the Plan will be subject to legal challenges.</p> <p>Paragraph 119 of the latest NPPF dated 24th July 2018 reads, "Local planning authorities, and other plan-making bodies, should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, including suitable sites on brownfield registers or held in public ownership, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, where this can help to bring more land forward for meeting development needs and/or secure better development outcomes." The council needs to see how it can work with Peel Holdings, to ensure that they build the residential units they applied for and received outline planning permission for in 2012, or take appropriate action against them. To conclude, a Local Plan will have to be submitted to prevent Central Government intervention. However, there is no need to build on the Green Belt land as there is more than sufficient land on brownfield sites to meet Central Government's targets. Wirral Council lacks the political will to ensure that all the available brownfield sites are utilized, and are sacrificing Green Belt land because of this. The land that Wirral Council is proposing to remove from Green Belt is mainly concentrated in one area and this will cause complete change to the environment and the character of this area. This Local Plan is more of a political statement than a sensible document produced to meet Central Government's targets.</p>
DOR01529	The plan is appalling. The Wirral is a small area and does not need the proposed housing. Our green belt is precious and cannot be regained once it's lost.
DOR01530	<p>Firstly it seems unfair that all of the green belt land under review is mostly subjected to one area. Why is this? Needs an explanation, why all green belt is not under review? Central government policies can be interpreted to include most sites. Brown sites, Wirral waterways to be used first. Down by Eastham oil jetty, Bidston North end and around Birkenhead tip and the old Mobil site the land is overgrown and empty what are the plans for this? Peel holdings must be brought to account. They were supposed to be building the 13,000 houses. This is an outrage that can be dealt with, why should the many be bullied by this organisation? Around Birkenhead, the central hotel is empty, House of Fraser is going in January and the old shops and taxi rank and car park around this site need to be built into trendy urban apartments, or a village for the older population that will bring the need to use Birkenhead town again. With House of Fraser going and the shops on that block are empty and the owners will sell if you ask them. High streets are dying create further accommodation in place of shops. The Chinese community in Birkenhead built a gated housing block, copy that idea. The market could be moved to a different site and make it have the ability to be a farmers market or a car boot and craft type market on a Sunday. Lots of other areas have a regular area for a big car boot that brings in people from other areas. People who will spend their money here and it also helps local people recycle and earn extra income from selling on their unwanted items. Have somewhere that has cafes, green spaces to sit and maybe holds a music venue that could be used for concerts.</p> <p>Maybe the parks could be used as Sefton Park in Liverpool is or already Wirral has the square in Hamilton Square and what about the back of Wallasey town hall, it's already an auditorium where the steps could be seats. Use council buildings and convert them to apartments with shops in them, why do you need two town halls? Wirral's civic centres could be better used to consolidate offices or the one stop shops. Maybe look at building on the waste land there in front of the police station and old car park in Bebington, New ferry could be a very attractive and lucrative area to expand. Already it is near port sunlight that attracts tourists from all over the world, expand on that. With the cruise liners coming into Liverpool, business's over here on Wirral should be utilising the tourists that come in and encourage visits round the beautiful villages of Wirral that are now under threat. Use Wirral tourist board to join up with the big cruise line companies and promote Wirral for day coach trips and cycle trips whilst in port. Take people around the beautiful beaches and green belt villages and lanes, stop off at local cafes, museums etc. This is a huge money making possibility. Forward planning is necessary to enhance Wirral as a unique bio diverse area within a peninsula and a sustainable future economy can be promoted by keeping its individual beauty, nowhere else in Britain is like this, promote its uniqueness not create an urban sprawl. Wonderful Wirral. This potential is lost if you split Wirral in half to urban sprawl as shown in your plan. 12,000 homes is said to be required which I presume must include recent house building on Wirral. Housing estates are popping up all over the place at this moment. Regeneration of urban areas is the key. We need green belt for tourism, caravan park, glamping, cycle lanes etc., As a cyclist I know that Wirral is one of the top spots it's advertised nationally.</p> <p>Wirral have invested in these lanes so much and are still continuing to do so why destroy this. The green belt provided bio diversity, preserve green spaces to protect the environment. In all our green belt there are hedgehogs, owls, bats, birds of prey all manner of Wildlife what is going to happen to them? ☹. Everyday we hear our wildlife is dying off because of humans destroying their environment, how sad is that if it wasn't really necessary. Green belt land reduces carbon emissions and green spaces absorb carbon dioxide and produce oxygen, keep fields for cattle and grain. Isn't there a worry about future food provision? We will need these fields for crops. Green belt offers leisure and recreation, footpaths, walking, jogging, horse riding etc. it supports generational mental and physical health and well-being reduces stress. This supports a reduction of medical treatments and interventions. The green belt prevents flooding and landslides and damage to homes,</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>there are natural streams around the green belt that maintain the equilibrium of the local environment. Our green belt separates the wards and the historic townships of the original Wirral 100 villages. The villages like Irby, Brimstage, Landican, Storeton and Little Storeton date back to doomsday and have a recorded historic past. It cannot be lost in urban sprawl and suffer again like some villages in the past have suffered i.e. Bidston Village. What a travesty that was, buried away in urban sprawl. Wirral is a jewel that cannot be destroyed, learn from past mistakes. If any building does go on around these historic areas it has to be thoughtful and preserve the village feel and natural beauty of the area s you are looking at.</p> <p>Certainly not opposed to housing if required but should be added around existing built up areas to link with existing infrastructure, school, Gp's, shops. Maybe larger houses that have lots of land as gardens are able to sell them off to build other homes and get easier planning permission. Some golf courses are under review. If space is needed these should be a priority to close, other clubs can take on the members. Offer a voucher to join other clubs to those who are losing their membership. Green belt is for all of Wirral's population health and recreation benefits whereas a golf course is just for a small minority. Try to build around train stations and extend bus routes from stations to encourage people not to use their cars and to reduce carbon emissions. The empty sites round Conway park and Bidston, and Moreton stations especially would be good to expand. All stations could be looked at. It has been said land is to be sold to developers to boost councils balance and this land has already gone, and the policy to build on green built is the key, regardless of all the outrage and arguments not to carve it up. Local people are extremely upset, angry, anxious and stressed about this plan. Locals have invested money, a lifetime in their area, and it is said planners don't care if people love the area and it's been a place they have known as a child but yes this is really important. Memories from childhood stay with us for most of our lives, and positive enjoyable experiences bind people and communities together and improve relationships. Wirral is this place where the general population are based on generations of families that have lived here. It is woven into the fabric of Wirral society it is not a transient society and cannot be classed in the same light as the south of England, that house the majority of our law deciding government. Locals have a vast knowledge of their area and know what's best for their local community. Change is painful especially if you have no control over the change. These consultations are important and as we do not live in a dictatorship it would be beneficial to think positively that locals can have some control over the plan, and not have it be just a paper exercise or to tick a box.</p>
DOR01531	<p>I live between Irby & Greasby, so I'm pretty familiar with the numerous greenbelt sites being proposed around here. I think it's particularly ironic that you spent money last year proudly erecting 'earliest dated settlement in western Britain' signs all over Greasby, then are planning to destroy what character is left by building on its greenbelt. As a general principle, with the world's demand exceeding its natural resources more every year - https://www.overshootday.org/</p> <p>- Everyone of us needs to conserve what's left of the natural environment. Even in urban areas, the effects of paving over greenbelt will be felt in terms of more flooding (as the vegetation previously would soak up and control water flow), worsening air quality (as the destroyed woodland no longer remove pollutants), apart from the obvious benefits that green fields and quiet footpaths have on our collective wellbeing. So lucky that currently no one in Wirral is very far from such a site. Why would you want to damage that? In contrast, brownfield sites usually have better infrastructure and transport links in place, so less affluent families, who may not have car use, are able to access necessary services. Sensitive redevelopment of unsightly brown field sites can regenerate rundown areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I fail to see why greenbelt should be touched while many brownfield sites are crying out to be re-used. The obvious motive would be financial, I urge our council to resist this and do the right thing. A notable, additional point: • [There is only one GP Practice in the area] You certainly haven't checked about its capacity to absorb the increased number of patients generated as a result of your plans to build in the area. They have already absorbed another practice, are bursting at the seams and couldn't accommodate much more. Have you considered factors like this in other areas? • In summary: I strongly oppose ripping up greenbelt, I will be watching with interest who votes it through and who opposes. I will never vote for any councillor who doesn't fight the proposals and I will campaign to highlight this. See you at the council meeting on the 10th Sept. I'll be the one holding the placard • Though I think there'll be quite a few of us...
DOR01532	<p>Please ensure developers incorporate environmental measures in properties built. See Kingsbrook-Aylesbury.co.uk & the work with RSPB. Also incorporate design in new housing, not just rows of little boxes.</p>
DOR01533	<p>It would appear that there is not the need for the 800 houses the government say Wirral needs each year as the population is decreasing or static and is not growing. Wirral BC should make this plain to the government in no uncertain terms. We all know politicians pluck figures out of mid-air and if Wirral BC won't protect Wirral then we, the residents, will have to. Under no circumstances should the greenbelt be built upon. There is no excuse for building on greenbelt when so much needs doing to Birkenhead and Wallasey. What is needed is more creative thinking but that takes time and energy and what about houses that are standing empty. There is no excuse for building on the greenbelt - it is necessary for people's happiness and health. If it is developed, with less Green Belt, people will have to travel further in their cars to get to the open spaces we all need. Wirral BC should protect and stand up for Wirral and its residents and its businesses. Of course developers want to build on greenbelt. Its easy money. We don't want the mickey mouse houses that are like a big carbuncle tagged onto villages. It's all about money and profit and the residents are left with the rubbish developments. There must be no building on the greenbelt. The simple act of walking on fields, footpaths and woodland should be available to all and should not be threatened. Local authorities should not be dragooned by the government into doing what is detrimental for their areas. What about Wirral Waters? Is that housing going into the allocation – maybe, maybe not? There is no clarity and nobody is taking responsibility - a poor show. There was a time greenbelt was sacrosanct but now it's just a cash cow for the government, local authorities and developers and who dare stand in the way of profit!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01534	I am strongly against the use of green belt land for building. I am very concerned about the detrimental effect on the environment and quality of life for Wirral residents. As a resident of Barnston I am particularly concerned about potential for loss of green belt in this area.
DOR01535	I think more affordable housing should be built BUT NOT ON GREENBELT. The greenbelt protects our village and provides for wildlife. Plus I do not believe the road/schools/doctors could cope with any more people. It would destroy where we live. I do not understand why more isn't being done to re-develop Birkenhead. Make it a destination so people aren't going to Liverpool. It's on our doorstep! It's a great town, but it's sad and tatty. Many people go to Liverpool, as Birkenhead just isn't pleasant. More affordable housing built there, flats, starter homes, bigger but affordable homes, with shops restaurants etc. People are returning to city living, it's convenient. More people - more money for shops, restaurants, entertainment. Birkenhead could become the place to go. I do not believe greenbelt needs to be built on, I am certain there are other sites that could be redeveloped before destroying the countryside.
DOR01536	I know that new houses are needed, and that a plan is required. I think that the brownfield sites must be developed first before other sites, and finally green belt sites. To stop developers just sitting on land and not building, any planning permissions must be made provisional. If building is not started and progressed within a defined period perhaps the council could compulsorily purchase it at the original price. Some mechanism to ensure that when land is released for building it actually takes place. Also the new builds should be primarily the cheaper starter homes rather than expensive houses.
DOR01537	I would like to take this opportunity to ask Wirral Council to please please reconsider these plans. The green belt land which runs through our borough is so important to so many of us. It provides valuable homes for wildlife and is beautiful to live by. We drive past these historic fields daily and my young children love to look and make up stories about the fields. It is part of our heritage and has been here long before any of us were. It is part of our history and once it is gone it will be gone forever. I understand that new homes must be built but please could the council consider other places rather than seeming to focus mainly on West Wirral? There are places in Wirral which are in desperate need of affordable housing such as New Ferry. West Wirral stand to lose our entire identity if these plans go ahead. I have lived here my entire life and will no longer recognise my home.
DOR01538	High grade land such as the farmland around Greasby copse, (land classification grade 2) is needed for food production now and in the future. It has for many years made a considerable contribution to Greasby life. 534 new houses would place considerable pressure on local Schools, Hospitals, Doctors surgery and more traffic in an already overburdened road system, thus making the area less attractive and existing properties would lose value. Greasby copse is a site of biological importance and is home to a wide variety of wildlife, no conceivable "buffer zone" could protect the copse with that amount of housing in the vicinity. Near the copse is a Mesolithic site verified by Liverpool museum. The town boundary signs proclaim the site to be one of the earliest settlements in Britain, part of the Chester-Meols Roman Road follows the line of the hedgerows towards Barker lane the site should be classified as a heritage asset. The site will need considerable drainage and water supply infrastructure. There is no easy access from Rigby Drive. The nearest part of the site is over 800 metres walking distance from high frequency public transport. The development would mean considerable loss of amenity and open space with no likely reduction in council tax for existing householders. Wirral Council refused planning permission for a phone mast in February 1999 citing "disturbance and loss of important flora and fauna, visually obtrusive and out of character with the surrounding area ". So why would 534 houses be acceptable? Greasby has already taken its fair share of housing development.
DOR01539	Schools and doctors are oversubscribed in these areas already. They would not cope with the amount of new residents.
DOR01540	There must be alternative options to this plan this really is a tragic idea. The Wirral is a small area with not a lot of countryside accessible to it, taking this away will mean the Wirral is a very undesirable place that is congested, polluted and a concrete jungle. It means there will be no countryside for generations to come and is lining the pockets of developers. The other issue is, will the council/government going to build more schools, doctors surgeries, hospitals to accommodate all of the extra people? Not to mention all of the traffic congestion issues it will bring, it's already gridlocked in Bromborough when its school pick up/drop off. It's a nightmare trying to get a doctors appointment as it is (I had to ring 196 times at 8am in the morning before I even spoke to a doctors receptionist, last time I wanted an appointment), the hospitals are full and A&E is constantly issuing warnings it can't cope, and that's with the current population. The proposal to lift the ban in Bromborough and Eastham is a devastating decision the land around Bromborough golf club is valuable to nature. The land is rich in woodland, ponds and is home to numerous species of wildlife, including lots of protected species. We have regularly seen birds of prey, woodpeckers, owls, bats, field mouse, toads, bikes and hedgehogs (just to name a few), all of these species would be wiped out alongside all of the trees and flora and fauna. Why not develop the land that is already used for residential housing, in these areas why not build more apartments and flats like they do abroad and leave the wildlife to be enjoyed by the people that are living in the Wirral. Do your part for the environment Wirral Council and don't wipe out more of the countryside and animals and leave it for generations to come.
DOR01541	West Wirral is a beautiful place to live, friendly, well populated with fantastic schools and local businesses. All of these attributes would be put under huge stress with proposed building. Schools would be over populated and local parking, and beauty spots would be massively overcrowded and would make the area an unpleasant place to live. There are plenty of disused and abandoned buildings that could do with renovating and could be made into housing.
DOR01542	We need to protect our local green spaces we cannot take away the green environment without affecting the sustainability of our future generations. Education would be affected, local wildlife populations will be effected. These local green spaces provide local wildlife a habitat corridor and the local children a local place to grow play and learn.
DOR01543	Wirral is a beautiful place to live, this is due to all of the green belt we have. Building on this land is not necessary. We have plenty of space that needs renovations, look at Birkenhead, houses sold off, knocked down and now left, start here do not take away the beauty of Wirral.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01544	I feel there are plenty of other spaces that could be used without having to take up green belt land
DOR01545	I am very interested in all potential developments within the Saughall Massie area.
DOR01546	<p>I oppose the Labour Council plan proposing to allow Green Belt to be released for housing developments for the following reasons:</p> <p>Wirral does not need all these homes; the forecast is wrong as proven by local opposition.</p> <p>Wirral is a unique peninsula and has a less transient society which is why it is used in national research into child development because generations can be tracked and recorded because they stay in the area.</p> <p>Wirral housing needs can mostly be met with using brownfield sites. Many sites have not been put into the plan, empty homes to be used and renovated most people want to live in the community they have family in - Wirral still has generations of nuclear families who want to live near relatives and support each other with elderly care, childcare etc. Therefore building affordable homes and regenerating areas where many young families already live and rent would be important. Aging populations need bungalows or small complex's to free up their homes and town centres like Birkenhead, Rock Ferry and New Ferry need regenerating.</p> <p>Wirral Waters could be like Albert Dock or the Docklands House in Hull - copy these ideas. The Council should Work with Peel Holdings to invest in infrastructure that means working with them.</p> <p>I want to defend all green spaces, especially Storeton because of its historic value, world heritage status and having grade 2 listed buildings. This area has tourism potential based on its history and unique sandstone which is used for many historic buildings from Roman times. It includes arable and cattle farming so farmer's livelihoods are at risk and we need farmland for future food chain.</p> <p>Building on green belt increases the carbon footprint, especially with more homes and cars. A lack of fields and green trees will increase carbon dioxide and pollution, especially building 500 metres from the motorway where Storeton is located there is evidence of increasing respiratory problems, especially in children and increasing risk when they become adults.</p> <p>The infrastructure is not there for schools, GPs, roads and green spaces should protect our wildlife not destroy it by needless building.</p> <p>Storeton in particular is home to barn owls and bats that can be seen during the night in the lanes.</p> <p>Farmers need this land for their family business and have worked this land for generations so they need to be protected from planners and developers who care for nothing except profit.</p> <p>Growth in a short-term plan like this is useless, you need sustainability.</p> <p>Green spaces can provide this through agriculture, tourism and caravan sites.</p> <p>It's so near Liverpool and Chester and beautiful in its own right. Promote this, don't destroy it. Promote country sports and activities like walking, cycling and horse sports. Get local colleges to start agricultural courses and work with farmers to encourage the next generation to love the countryside and they will then want to protect it. Many young people who are not suited to current courses may be suited to working on the land. Working with animals has proven to be therapeutic. There are many disadvantaged young people from urban parts of Wirral that may benefit from this project. Help reduce the Wirral crime rate. Farming Wirral green fields could help Wirral remain a sustainable producer of food of Britain especially with Brexit potentially increasing food prices from imported food.</p> <p>All the residents in our village are worried upset, as are all residents in the affected areas and everyone who loves and appreciates the beauty and diversity of Wirral. Many meetings have been on all over the area of Wirral. Residents and the Council are guardians of the jewel for Wirral's green spaces and must work together to protect what is unique and not use this plan to be used as a political football.</p> <p>The green area round Storeton reduces risk of flooding on to the motorway which if this did happen would increase risks of accidents and green belt here is a safety zone for flight path for local airport.</p>
DOR01547	No more housing development in Greasby! The area is in danger of becoming a suburban sprawl without character or cohesion. Why can't the would-be buyers of new houses here see that they would be destroying the very thing that attracted them to Greasby, namely its green and open aspects. Greasby must not be regarded by planners as an easy option for withdrawal from the Green Belt. Keep it Green!
DOR01548	Very concerned about development taking place on the field that backs onto my house. We have small back yards so any buildings erected could impact on the quiet enjoyment of my home; block light, impact on privacy, noise pollution and devaluation of property, traffic congestion and impact on wildlife.
DOR01549	More housing is needed in general. This should entail a mixture of building on both brownfield sites and the green belt. It should also focus on building upwards in existing town centres, e.g. Five floors upwards in Birkenhead Town Centre.
DOR01550	Surely the Wirral must work to preserve its natural beauty. House building should focus on urban areas in need of regeneration and not on filling our green spaces.
DOR01551	I think the Green Belt has, for too long, been regarded as a sort of Sacred Cow. When it was first set up many years ago the population was far lower than today. We desperately need to build a great number of new houses to cope with this increase and, in particular, to help young first-time buyers to get on the first rung of the housing ladder. The other huge benefit of an increase in the housing stock would be to lower the cost of houses which is really a national scandal. When I was married in 1964, I bought my first 3- bedroomed house in Prenton for £2,300! Today, houses in the same road can fetch up to £200,000 which increase is wildly above inflation over the period. The simple solution is to release small parcels of the Green Belt for housing development.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01552	<p>The Wirral was once promoted by the council themselves as a pleasant place to live and grow. Part of that reason is the green and open spaces available to all. Releasing land for development in the west of Wirral and Bebington is really just environmental vandalism, which will also dramatically increase car and bus use. However, the major factor not addressed in the development plan is in recent years the traffic congestion has started to spoil the idyllic Wirral life. There are queues almost a mile long at times to get through the Arrowe Park junction at rush hour, similar queues are in Greasby. Driving into West Kirby is a joke, driving to Bromborough frequently has queues and at weekends trying to get through Heswall is also problematic. In addition the M53 Motorway has standing traffic for a mile every weekday morning outside school holidays from the point where the motorway drops from three to two lanes at Hooton. The Birkenhead tunnel often gets queues almost from end to the other. The infrastructure on the Wirral has been 'sweated' to get more through existing roads to a point where it can't take any more traffic. I have just been watching the television documentary 'The Five Billion Pound Super Sewer' for London' add to that they have Crossrail and Crossrail 2. The proposed Wirral plan has no provision for new infrastructure,- so if the central government requires or demands new housing plans, then they need or the developers need to fund major infrastructure improvements.</p> <p>Where in these plans are the new schools? Are you just going to build a new Pensby High school 2, on the existing schools' playing fields and additional primary schools built on existing primary schools playing fields too? So many schools in the north west have already had quiet places or light wells infilled and their very character altered so that additional places can be crammed into the existing school buildings and canteens. Please stop spoiling the character of the place we live in. Where with these plans are the new hospital places and doctors' surgeries going to be built? It is not just housing that is the problem, I and many other fear housing developers will just pick the prettiest places to build houses as that will ensure quick sales and additional profits – no developers will choose a contaminated brown field site if pretty green field sites are likely to become available. No additional housing should be built on green field sites unless an additional lane on the M53 through Ellesmere Port. Equally the M56 needs an additional lane from the M53 to the Mersey Gateway at Runcorn. We need to be able to commute in reasonable time in order to have a reasonable quality of life. There is an alternative:- Peel Holdings have a huge land bank around the West Float and housing density there should be increased. This brown field site is also near to existing transport links. This together with the other infrastructure improvements such as:- Additional train /tram capacity say from the Bidston Station.</p> <p>The original Birkenhead road tunnel was built with an idea of running trams under the carriageway. I know there are huge data and power cables placed under there at present – these could be run through a new small diameter service tunnel – far cheaper alternative than a new train or road tunnel. A new improved high speed ferry from Seacombe to Liverpool city centre. By keeping the development to a single brown field area, the council can improve the transport links to and from that area. Provide the required new schools, doctors surgeries etc. where new populations are concentrated. It could also keep any increase in car and bus use to minimum. (As a former resident of Irby, I know you need to use a car or bus for either shopping, entertainment or work as little is available locally). If by opening up lots of different green field sites, the infrastructure required would need to be far bigger- cause more traffic and far more likely just reduce the quality of life for almost everyone on the Wirral – therefore the plan to lift greenbelt restrictions should be rejected in full.</p>
DOR01553	<p>Green Belt is here for a reason. It is to stop the urban sprawl and provide a habitat for wildlife and possible farming opportunities, which incidentally, we may need more than ever because of Brexit. If you build on our Green Belt, tourists won't want to visit and residents won't want to walk around the borough either as it will end up looking like everywhere else - a concrete jungle. Leave well alone. Our small peninsula can't take this.</p>
DOR01554	<p>Why has the Council taken so long to get to this point? They have had years to get a plan together. If the aim is to build affordable housing and the Council has stated that they are reluctant to build on Greenbelt land, why are there already proposals under review for luxury Band H houses to be built on greenbelt land in Hoylake, and to whom are these luxury homes affordable to? If the Council is reviewing the proposal why not make the homes smaller, which will not only allow more homes to be built on the land but should also lower the price of them so that they are affordable to the many and not the few? From looking at maps of Greenbelt land under consideration on the local plan the vast majority is located East of the M53 (Birkenhead, Bebington, Bromborough, Eastham etc). These areas are already the most built up and congested areas of the Wirral and are the areas in most need of the greenbelt. It seems that if you are able to afford to live in the more affluent areas of the Wirral (Caldy, West Kirby, Heswall etc), which realistically, due to the house availability and prices in those areas, is unaffordable to the majority of Wirral residents, then you are protected from this local plan and loss of Greenbelt land at the expense of those less fortunate.</p>
DOR01555	<p>The council's proposals to release vast tracts of green belt are a disgrace. This will completely alter the beautiful Wirral landscape and remove huge areas of agricultural land. There are significant areas of brownfield land that should be utilised and Peel already have consent for 13,000 houses at Wirral waters, not to mention the existing vacant housing stock. If this is not stopped I believe there will be mass outrage across the Wirral.</p>
DOR01556	<p>Use more brownfield sites.</p>
DOR01557	<p>It's already been well documented in the local media about the proposed development of the dockland by Peel Holdings. When is this going to commence? I remember seeing Peels plans for the Wirral - did it have any timescales? Surely this can be worked up sufficiently for us Wirralians to keep our green belt. What makes Wirral stand out its greenery; let's not lose it.</p>
DOR01558	<p>There is no evidence of the need for housing demands on the Wirral.</p>
DOR01559	<p>How has WBC calculated the additional homes requirement and is the figure justified using the most recent regional forecasts. Will WBC offer evidenced research for each site in the proposed Greenbelt release?</p>
DOR01560	<p>There are many spaces from old knocked down houses along Beaufort road, Birkenhead also in other areas of knocked down housing in this area. Why can't you build on already built up areas instead of taking away the only green space our children will see. The Victorians made green spaces for the working class so they could enjoy time off. Now you want to take that enjoyment away. We may as well live 100 years ago.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01561	My neighbours and family would be directly affected by the proposals. I think you need to ensure any developments with permission are factored into the numbers and you need to look at the brownfield sites throughout Wirral before removing green belt status from any site. You need to look at industry, services, transport also and ensure funding is in place before house building, particularly when there are hundreds of empty neglected properties over in Liverpool in the ownership of the council.
DOR01562	It's on too big a scale for west Wirral. Other areas need to be considered. We currently only have a few schools - this many extra houses, the local services would not cope. People return to Wirral because of everything it has - including the green spaces. This would turn Wirral into a combination and maybe even like 'the city of Wirral' it will lose everything it currently has to draw people here.
DOR01563	Green belt land should not be released for more homes when the world is in a state of crisis from environmental damage, the Borough is already built up and the few areas of protected land we have are precious. If one is agreed it will no doubt be a slippery slope and nowhere will be safe.
DOR01564	I would just like to be kept informed of the proposed plans.
DOR01565	I hope that ALL brownfield sites are built on, before you start turning the green belt into brownfields and generally destroying our beautiful countryside. I am very much against building on the green belt and I hope all woodlands will be protected and retained.
DOR01566	This plan is lazy. Please take the time to consider all alternatives in particular brownfield sites. I live in Irby and don't want to see the countryside here eroded.
DOR01567	I oppose the Local plans proposal to release SP043 East of Poulton Road, Spital. This land is High Value Agricultural land, we must protect this as a key resource agricultural land should be valued extremely highly and be exempt from any Local Plan. This site is a working Farm and shop providing jobs to local people. It also provides locally produce to local people and local businesses. Access to the site is poor and already a safety concern with local residents, the road leading to Dibben dale from Spital is not wide enough for two cars to pass in places. The site has drainage issues with water pooling in the winter. There are numerous water courses on and around the site and a public footpath. The Site houses and borders Ancient Woodland. The Proposed use of this greenbelt would not be in keeping with the local area. Local services are insufficient to support further development. Most local residents work outside of the area due to a lack of jobs to support local employment. An increase in houses in this area would increase the burden on local services and road network.
DOR01568	The Wirral is only 7 miles wide and 15 miles in length. Green spaces are essential to protect for future generations and indeed current residents of Wirral. My understanding of the Local Area Plan prepared by Wirral Council is that nothing has been done in relation to this plan since the year 2000. It appears that there is now a panic to launch this plan before the Government becomes involved. I believe that brown sites should be redeveloped and that building on green spaces should not be allowed. The building of extensive housing developments on Wirral will affect the infrastructure of Wirral. Roads will become more congested than they are already, the strain on schools, hospitals and GP services will surely be excessive. Greasby is already a very busy village and the proposed development of over 500 houses on the site of Greasby Copse should not be allowed to proceed.
DOR01569	My concern relates specifically to the proposed use of the land off Grange Road. Although there are no specific proposals as of yet, Grange Road has a number of dangerous junctions. The addition of more housing would add to this accident black spot and we would lose valuable green space in this increasingly developed small town. I am strongly opposed to this proposal.
DOR01570	There is a reason that green belt land is protected to prevent us losing our precious countryside. If we build in it now to satisfy some random targets we will never get it back. There are other sites that can be used. Wirral waters have space for thousands of homes and there are other brownfield sites that can also be used. Don't hastily ruin precious land that our children and their children want to enjoy as we have.
DOR01571	Why build on green belt?
DOR01572	Hi, these are just my initial thoughts - you state there are not enough brown sites available, hence green belt grab. WBC have already given planning permission to Peel re Wirral waters, does this not make more sense to treat this contaminated land year by year and develop this in conjunction with Peel and be bold for a short term pain to have a long term gain from rates, employment, etc. that Wirral waters potentially will bring to the waterfront with the best views of Liverpool? The Green belt zones you have highlighted will not be houses that will be affordable for the majority, but for the minority - does this not go against your policy? This is a stated fact on Green belt 'grabs' throughout England? There are also large swathes of land around Birkenhead, which at present are eye sores! Surely the regeneration of these areas is paramount, not green belt grab?
DOR01573	I am very disappointed that Peel's much heralded Wirral Waters development in Birkenhead (first announced in 2006) has not materialised yet. This has been mismanaged for a considerable period of time. As long ago as 2009, there were problems with planning permission not being handled properly due to key retailers not being consulted e.g Pyramids, leading to further delay. Twelve years later we are still waiting for the transformation of Birkenhead! This matters because we are now facing an apparent housing crisis in Wirral with precious green spaces being placed under threat from housing developments. I have two adult daughters who would both dearly love to get on the housing ladder so I am not out of touch with current issues facing the younger generation. Consider Liverpool's waterfront development and the regeneration of previously derelict buildings or rundown areas near the city centre, plus the huge wealth this revitalised area is now attracting. Once this is replicated along Wirral's waterfront (don't forget the stunning Liverpool skyline views) many young people and professionals will flock to purchase apartments/homes in this area. This will free up current housing stock for families who need more spacious properties. It is not too late for Wirral council to turn this around. Look at the success of the Homes for a Pound Scheme in Liverpool. Of course there were problems in asking people to buy up derelict, dilapidated properties in crime hit areas and expect them to install expensive interiors only to discover their homes had been subject to break ins and goods stripped out and removed. More support with security should have been offered to these pioneering people who have demonstrated how it is possible to restore and modernise older properties rather than demolish and rebuild.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	Homes that will be maintained and cherished because their owners had a major stake in their development. Read this from Liverpool CC website: "Homes for a Pound is one of a range of measures Liverpool City Council is using to bring a total of 6,000 empty houses back into use. 1,500 properties have already been brought back into use since 2014, and in 2018 we are establishing a new housing company which is set to build or refurbish approximately 10,000 homes over a 10-15 year period." The £1 home scheme has proved to be so popular, it has become oversubscribed. So the desire and ambition to own and improve a derelict property is proven! I believe this is the way forward in Wirral too. Create gated communities while older housing stock is being developed to safeguard the properties and their owners. Make people feel proud of their homes and work with the genuine ones (not people trying to make a fast buck) to revitalise derelict and boarded up properties in Birkenhead. Do this and you won't need to spoil the ever-diminishing green spaces in Wirral. Because once they have gone, they will be lost forever. And give Peel an ultimatum because 12 years of empty promises is unacceptable.
DOR01574	The Government housing targets are over inflated and can and should be challenged. You want them to prioritise brown field sites as there are significant brownfield sites available to meet even the over inflated targets. You will be watching and won't vote for any councillor who approves building on greenbelt.
DOR01575	Wirral is crowded enough. Further development on green belt land will ruin the area. I'm sure that enough brownfield sites could be found particularly around the docks area.
DOR01576	I am concerned that the amount of Greenbelt land and the scale of the proposed sites will negatively impact on existing communities due to pressure on already public services.
DOR01577	You must Leave greenbelt land well alone, there are so many places in the Duke street area alone that can have new builds or refurbs - the old bed factory that burnt out has plenty of space for more unwanted housing - I do not see any reason ever to build on land that gives peace to people, animals and boosts health - without it we are a concrete jungle and quality of life is poor - please take listen and stop looking at paper targets for once - thanks
DOR01578	Fundamentally disagree with plans to build on green belt land due to the negative environmental impact. Also the extra burden on schools, already overstretched hospitals, local resources and the increase in road users.
DOR01579	I chose to live in Irby because of its proximity to greenbelt, presently it is a safe place to live with very little crime I fear if social housing is introduced it will change the demographic of the area. I would like to know if the proposed housing will be private or social housing
DOR01580	Green Belt land should only be released after thorough investigation of potential densities on brownfield land - old industrial and dockland could achieve high density to meet some of the need and not strip the Wirral of its Green Belt asset. A concentrated approach to development and associated needs such as infrastructure, roads + schools would be of greater benefit than widespread impact.
DOR01581	Why is the majority of green belt land now up for development located to the east of the motorway corridor? Surely it should be more evenly spread around the borough to allow residents of Tranmere, Bebington and Storeton, to retain some of the open space to continue to enjoy?
DOR01582	Don't build on the green belt, when it's gone it's gone, and make sure homes that are built are, at the very least, affordable, environmentally sound and have good transport links whilst properly consulting with residents.
DOR01583	For anyone to state building "affordable" housing in the lower Heswall area is clearly delusional. For a start, the average house price in this area is between £300,000 - £800,000. People like myself, my family and friends whom have lived here for well over 35years cannot afford to buy in the area let alone rent. To build on green belt is fundamentally and morally wrong and you should be ashamed of yourselves for even taking this in to consideration. There are so many empty homes in Wirral and Liverpool, empty houses on empty streets, warehouses, pubs etc. that can easily be transformed in to affordable housing. Why target green belt land. Once it has gone its gone forever. You will never get it back again give your heads a wobble. There is more to life than money and profit
DOR01584	It's another exercise taking away our Green Spaces. Although a lot are farmers' fields they will greatly impact those living in the area and traffic in already congested areas. I was very shocked when I saw all the areas impacted. Even by Broadway in Bebington the car park at the back of the shops is going. Where will people who want to use shops park. Fair well local businesses.
DOR01585	I strongly believe that there are other areas, such as brownfield sites which should be considered for development before greenfield sites are targeted. Greenfield sites are essential for the local wildlife and ecosystems to thrive and without these, many species will suffer. The Wirral is known for its areas of natural beauty and its supporting of natural habitats. I cannot believe that the council is willing to compromise this in order to make money from being in specific greenfield sites above developing existing housing or building on brownfield sites. These laws have been in place for such a long time but when it suits, it seems to be OK to bend these in order to fulfil government requests when there are still other options to be considered. Local residents are completely against the development of these sites and we need to be listened to.
DOR01586	I feel really strongly about this issue and completely oppose opening up the greenbelt to build on. Literally once it's gone it's gone and it will be a devastating loss to Wirral. One of the reasons Wirral is special is precisely because of the greenbelt areas which enrich so many areas and people's lives. There are fewer and fewer spaces for people to go and enjoy clean air, walks and the countryside. The barrier the greenbelt provides is essential for protecting wildlife and the countryside in Wirral. The current housing targets which have been published lack basis and I believe the housing targets are being over inflated and can and should be challenged. I strongly doubt the intonation is to build affordable housing as its being stated. If this were the case then let's build affordable housing in the Hoylake golf club site instead of 5 bedroom luxury homes. If you were honest about the requirement for housing needs then the Hoylake site would be being used to contribute effectively to your housing targets. How many 'affordable' homes could be built on the Hoylake site instead of 5 bed luxury detached? The most significant scandal of this consultation is the Peel Holding sites capacity to yield many of the housing numbers required. I understand their sites could hold the majority of the houses you say are needed and yet they have plans to build

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	only a few thousand. It would be an absolute travesty if these brown field sites were not developed first especially at the cost of opening up the greenbelt. One of the key aims of the greenbelt is to encourage regeneration. If the greenbelt is released, Birkenhead and other areas in desperate need of regeneration will continue to be neglected. Interestingly Phil Davis initially stated he would defend the greenbelt at all costs only to change his mind 5 months later seemingly due to the pressure exerted by the government. Well the government doesn't live in Wirral, and shows no interest in the redevelopment of the New Ferry disaster, so why should we be bullied by them in relation to our greenbelt. I will only be supporting local politicians who are supporting the greenbelt preservation.
DOR01587	Do not use greenbelt. The plans are diabolical. There is plenty of brown belt land available. What happened to 'Wirral Waters'? These places have room for small apartment blocks (3 or 4 storey) around the docklands etc, and town houses (3 storey) which will save space. Wirral is not a growing population, schools are closing. Where are all these people coming from who need homes? Make the maths transparent for all to see and offer alternatives. Don't be the ones that ruin Wirral forever.
DOR01588	I understand the need for more housing, but the sheer amount of green belt that is being highlighted to be built on is ridiculous. It won't even be affordable housing. It will impact on our area in many ways, volume of traffic, house prices, school intake, class sizes and loss of community. I don't agree with the amount of land being earmarked.
DOR01589	Extra housing in the Irby area would ruin the area and devalue existing property prices.
DOR01590	I am very unhappy about plans to build on Green Belt land. I am even unhappy about the way it is trying to be justified as if there is no other option. Firstly I question whether these housing targets are realistic, and would urge the Council to challenge these first before taking such drastic action. Even so, there are Brownfield sites that can be developed in order to meet housing targets without the need to release Green Belt land. There should be a Brownfield First policy and also a drive to make use of the 6000 empty properties on Wirral. There was also planning permission granted to build homes at Wirral Waters. As far as I'm aware this area has Housing Zone Status which means it is eligible for government grants. Why not meet targets by building homes there? Yet again, the argument being made for this encroachment on to the Green Belt is that there needs to be more affordable housing, yet from what I have read this housing will be executive housing and unaffordable for the majority. Why is the council so keen to build upon Green Belt land and for luxury housing rather than affordable homes? Millions of pounds were borrowed by the Council to lend to a developer for luxury housing on a proposed golf resort scheme, and the Council were prepared to spend millions more on roads for these plans, yet the council is not prepared to borrow money to develop affordable housing on Brownfield sites. These plans threaten the future of Wirral's countryside. I am one of many who oppose these plans and will do all I can to protect Wirral's Green Belt.
DOR01591	There is plenty of brown land to use on the Wirral before the council needs to touch one square foot of green belt land.
DOR01592	Bebington is already a housing sprawl, as is Bromborough, therefore I object to ALL plans to use our green land in these areas for future housing. Lots of vacant land in the Wirral owned by Peel Ports and other large developers must be built on first, to further support the need for economical, affordable, well insulated, and suitable housing for the next 70 years.
DOR01593	I believe green belt land must be protected and brownfield sites for housing should be utilised whenever the case for more housing is strong. The impact of the loss of green spaces is far reaching. I am particularly concerned about the resultant poorer air quality with potential associated health impacts and loss of wildlife habitats. I believe the case for more housing must be stringently proven and house building should not be carried out in order to financially benefit developers and generate revenue for local government.
DOR01594	I am very concerned about potential green belt development around Irby village & the possibility of distinct villages losing their identity & local services being put under pressure (particular ref: fields behind Glenwood drive/limbo lane). What about the rumoured 3,000 unoccupied homes on Wirral? What about brownfield sites?
DOR01595	Totally opposed to any development on green belt land. Need to consider options to create new homes in some of our derelict run down town centres such as Liscard & Birkenhead.
DOR01596	I am writing to express my views, as a Wirral resident, AGAINST the proposal to build new housing on Wirral Green Belt land. I understand the need for meeting a housing target set by Central Government as part of its National Housing Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this should not be at the expense of precious Greenbelt Land. Every effort should be done to regenerate brownfield sites such as Wirral Waters and the re-occupation of existing houses offering a total well in excess of the 12,000 homes required by 2035.
DOR01597	This is aimed at building houses that nobody under 50 can afford, in areas designed to maximise the appeal to the wealthy and therefore increase the profits for the developers. There are huge areas of brownfield land ripe for redevelopment around Birkenhead, Wallasey and beyond. The Council should come up with a plan centred on those areas and start by taking back all the dockland appropriated by Peel Holdings who have so far failed to build a single dwelling in ten years. Stop handing land over to supermarkets and commercial speculators. There is no infrastructure in the rural areas i.e. roads, sewers, utility supplies, and the increased traffic will impact even further....build homes that young people can afford in areas that have had the infrastructure for 200 years. There are hundreds of derelict properties and shops in the borough...redevelop those sites. The centre of New Ferry was destroyed yet nothing has been replaced. There are acres of land flanking the river that could take housing developments. Every tiny plot of previously developed land should be considered first before wreaking havoc on our local countryside. This is about future generations not about quick solutions for an administration with no foresight or imagination.
DOR01598	Please do not build on greenbelt land. There is plenty of brownfield that should be used first. Please do not build a housing estate and (another!) golf course in Hoylake. There are 14 golf courses already and we do not need another especially at the expense of greenbelt land.
DOR01599	I think the proposed use of greenfield land is a disgrace. There's so much brownfield sites around that should be considered first. Tearing up the countryside is not the answer.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01600	Like the vast majority of Wirral residents I am shocked and appalled at the possibility of developing our green belt, much of this land is high quality agricultural land, this must be stopped. Why does Wirral council think we need 800 houses per annum this is not the south east!!!
DOR01601	I think the consultation process from the council/ political parties has been absolutely awful. During the Brexit referendum my letterbox was filled with countless propaganda on a daily basis, yet when we have a local issue, something that is really important, we hear next to nothing from them about gaining our views etc. This is because consultation from them is lip service/ a tick box exercise, i.e. their mind is already made up!! However, I would urge them to re-consider. Irby is the only remaining 'village' (of sorts) that we have left on the Wirral. If they decide to release the greenbelt areas for development then Irby, Thingwall, Barnston, Pensby and Heswall will all merge into one huge West Wirral town. The infrastructure cannot meet the demand that new housing would create. I also question if there is enough employment to support people living in 12,000 new homes.
DOR01602	No to building on green belt land. Consider other sites first green belt land is only used for "executive "eg. expensive large houses.
DOR01603	Peel Holdings sold the council down the line 10 yrs ago with false promises. Please push them legally if possibly to commit to their side of the bargain.
DOR01604	The need for building new homes is overinflated and needs to be revised. The green belt must be protected other options need to be explored.
DOR01605	More housing in Wallasey is required - and urgent.
DOR01606	Do not think there is enough information available on what the plans are for greenbelt
DOR01607	Do not build on the green belt. There are empty homes and unused brownfield sites all over Wirral which should be used first. Property investors should not be allowed to hoard land and not develop it. Perhaps this could be tackled before vast parts of our beautiful countryside are built on. Finally, we are a small peninsula - there is nowhere for us to spread. If our precious green belt is built on, Wirral will simply become one big town. DON'T BUILD ON THE GREEN BELT! There must be a better solution!
DOR01608	No building on Green Belt land.
DOR01609	There is plenty of land around Birkenhead/Wallasey docks that can be used for new houses and there are lots of estates with unused houses. I disagree with using out greenbelt land. These are what makes Wirral a lovely place to live as you have somewhere local to go to escape the busy roads, estates etc when needed and we can walk with our children, dogs etc. This is also what attracts tourists to the area. Why do we need to turn it into a concrete jungle?
DOR01610	Brown belt sites must be built on first. Saying Peel holding will not build enough in time is a poor excuse, WBC has known for a long time that they need to build affordable housing and are wasting the public's money not theirs focusing on luxury housing and golf courses and debating which green sites to build on. Get on with negotiating with Peel holdings, give planning permission for affordable housing on brown belt. The Wirral is a small space and it is the small amounts of Green belt that makes it special.
DOR01611	Brown belt and derelict land should be used before green spaces.
DOR01612	My family and I have lived in Irby since 1996. I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Green Belt land, particularly in Irby village and the land at 'Greenheys Nursery', 41 Thurstaston Road, Irby. My reasons for this are as follows: There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. It will spoil the character of the area. The greenbelt areas provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. There are bats, owls etc living in the land at 41 Thurstaston Road. Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting, and causing the devaluation in the value of our homes. Increased traffic and major congestion – children getting to and from school is hazardous already. Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. Increased flooding at 41 Thurstaston Road – it already floods so reduced drainage will undoubtedly make it worse. Use Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes. Parking in Irby Village is already difficult. Getting a doctor's appointment is not always possible without a significant wait. Schools are oversubscribed as they are.
DOR01613	Wirral Council have failed in their duty to provide a development plan, leaving the government in a position to impose one. The Wirral is one of the few unspoilt areas left in England, to propose upon to 1/3 the remaining green belt to be developed, in an area already lacking in jobs and school places, is pandering to the developers alone and not considering the needs or desires of the electorate to whom you demand council taxes. For example, Irby is a village of 1732 homes, but there are proposals in place for 4 developments totalling 980 homes bordering the village, a 57% increase in size when the 2 schools are already full to capacity. Then Hoylake golf resort- as if we didn't have enough golf course already- 160 homes in 295 acres. Limbo lane in Irby 522 houses in 80 acres. If you must develop Hoylake- you could fit 2000 homes there at the same density. Wirral Waters!!! Brown field site desperate for development, 1000 homes already planned, and nothing happening..!!! Why not pressure Peel or compulsory purchase this land and sell to other developers at cost, rather than wipe out 1/3 the greenbelt. You councillors are not fit for office, and clearly in the pockets of the developers...
DOR01614	Disgraceful plan. The council are supposed to work on behalf of the people, not ignore them. The council should be challenging the government's targets for the area, not just plan to allow developers to build all over the greenbelt. Furthermore, if this was a feasible plan, where is the plan for the upgrade in infrastructure and services to accommodate all these houses? It's hard enough as it is to get an appointment at the GP or get a police officer to attend criminal incidents.
DOR01615	Leave the green belt alone.
DOR01616	You say Wirral has no choice and we must build 12,000 new homes in the next 15 year. We do have a choice. Please give us the information we need in order to challenge the national government policy that says we must destroy our greenbelt. Wirral has a fantastic mix of towns and country and we need to fight to maintain the great quality of life that it offers. If we don't it will just become a

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	soulless urban sprawl.
DOR01617	Please don't take more of our beautiful green spaces off us...they are what makes Wirral so special and free to be enjoyed by generations to come.
DOR01618	I am completely against this current Local Plan, do not support it in any way and believe that the rationale on which it is based needs revised. Precedent for is provided by the current revisions being made to the Manchester Spatial Framework. This is supported by their Metro Mayor and is being revised to reflect more adequately the long term needs of their WHOLE community and is based on a wider needs analysis - we need to do this too. The areas of land including greenbelt land identified for development seem to meet the very short term needs (and profits) of a small number of private landowners who will make a considerable amount of short term profit which is unlikely to be invested into Wirral rather than meet the long term strategic needs of the WHOLE community. This does not maximise the potential benefit of housebuilding in the Wirral and if the opportunity is lost to provide a visionary long term strategy now the opportunity to strengthen the local economy in the long term will be lost at this very important time (i.e. Brexit and Central Gov needing all UK regions (particularly the Northern Powerhouses) to strengthen their economic output). We have the rationale to fight this locally if the political will is there. A Local Plan that is based on a vision of supporting long term economic regeneration in Wirral and the Liverpool City Region is needed so that housing is built to meet the long term needs of the current population (considerably ageing - suitable elderly accommodation to release current larger houses), starter homes for young buyers (existing residents, recently graduates, young entrepreneurs looking for good quality of life) in areas close to work (and new industry being developed) and easy transport routes to Liverpool, social housing to meet needs and develop health and wellbeing and housing to be built in geographic locations that does not overstretch the limited Council funds in providing amenities and services. Innovative solutions are needed to solve some of these problems - we have the skills and vision but we need the time and community consultation to think about what can be done and how it can be delivered. This would create a housing plan that supports local, regional and national economic growth rather than a housing plan that lines the deep pockets of a few. However, such a plan that meets local community needs might not deliver maximum profit to a few private developers BUT where long term economic regeneration is needed this is never the case (there is a huge amount of evidence that can support this) so Local Plans should meet local needs and relate to local economic conditions if they are going to maximise benefits for the many for this generation and for future generations to come. Local dissatisfaction needs to be listened to if confidence and economic prosperity is to be generated in the Liverpool City Region and a Wirral Local Plan that meets Wirral's whole community needs (and not just a small number of private landowners and Peel Holdings) is a good place to start.
DOR01619	Wirral needs to protect its Green Belt, the importance and beauty of nature must be acknowledged. We need to preserve our beautiful peninsula, not have it swallowed up by more roads and houses. Brown site availability must be looked at.
DOR01620	I think the Local Plan is vastly inflated in terms of the land it deems to be required for these 12000 homes. Green Belt Land should NOT be required to meet the government's targets at all, as there are enough brown sites and derelict sections of housing estates that could be either regenerated or demolished for new build. We have precious little countryside as it is, and in times where the wellbeing of our environment is crucial, we as a society MUST protect and enhance, not erode, our Green Belt.
DOR01621	The village of Irby is just that, a village. We don't have the shops, schools, doctor's surgeries or other amenities to support all this extra housing. The reason people purchase houses in this area is because they like the fact that it is a small community. I am 61 and have lived here on and off all my life, I love living here and would hate to see the beauty of the village and surrounding countryside changed forever.
DOR01622	I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Green Belt land and in particular the Greasby Close land. My reasons for this are as follows: There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. It will spoil the character of the area. Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. Increased traffic and major congestion. Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes. The infrastructure of the Greasby area (schools, doctors etc etc) is insufficient to withstand such a development. This particular area of Greasby has already issues with flooding- building over this green belt area would surely make this issue worse as has been proven across the country when too much development has ruined the landscape. The green belt of Wirral is one of the areas main attractions.
DOR01623	There are plenty of spaces for new housing. Green belt areas will on my be affordable by the well off. NOT FIRST TIME BUYERS. The greed of the council astounds me. Never voting labour again purely on the basis of this. Perhaps if they hadn't given so much of our council tax away, they wouldn't be looking to destroy a beautiful peninsula.
DOR01624	We need to keep what's left of our ever decreasing green belt. Build on brownfield sites please.
DOR01625	I believe that the Wirral does not need all the housing that the government says we do. If you look at over 3,000 properties are on the right move site for Wirral are up for rent. These properties are all private landlords wanting to make money. There are enough brown sites and areas on the Wirral that could be built on without going into green belt. The green belt areas on the Wirral are small and they are what make Wirral what it is - a wonderful place to live. Also affordable housing is a must, not developments which are planned for Hoylake. All to make money for a small group of people and these are not affordable for the vast majority of people living in Wirral.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01626	Green belt areas should be regarded as untouchable. It is wrong to have wilful blindness of the long term consequences of piece by piece destruction of green open spaces, woodland, farmland and marginal places unbuilt on and therefore a haven away from concrete for humans and an vital habitat for the wild creatures who have ad much right to be on the earth as we do.
DOR01627	I would expect that the council will ensure and guarantee that the infrastructure to support additional people is in place before considering building any new houses. This means new schools and medical services. Also, all 'brown belt' land should be utilised first and evidenced to the public.
DOR01628	I am not opposed to the building of houses but there are plenty of brownfield sites to build without encroaching on green belt land.
DOR01629	I consider the Government's estimate of projected housing needs for Wirral is unrealistically high, so the whole exercise is based on a need that might not even arise. I trust that the Council will use ALL available brownfield sites before considering the release of ANY Green Belt land. The Wirral Waters housing (or lack of it) fiasco has dealt a blow to aspirations but solutions must be found. More small infill projects on unused/derelict patches of land rather than grand 'flagship' schemes, perhaps - as shown on the documents. I have grave concerns that not enough single person / starter / affordable homes will be built, as I believe this is where the greatest need lies - though not the greatest profit! Access to community greenspace / allotments is also very important for such homes and should be included in plans. As for appendices 5 & 6 concerning Green Belt, release of any of these areas should be an absolute last resort, as it is Wirral's green spaces that help to make it an attractive place in which to live and attract visitors. I am not reassured by the 'protect trees / river corridors' notes on, for example, SP013, SP109 & SP001. Proximity to housing will lead to over-use of such areas and degradation, light and other forms of pollution, disruption of wildlife corridors etc. Clear boundaries between communities should be preserved, to maintain their character and that of Wirral in general. Productive farmland should be treasured - who knows what the future holds? We should grow local and shop local. If any building does take place on sacrificed Green Belt land - and I hope it won't come to that - full archaeological investigations should take place ahead of any work. Wirral has a long, rich history; opportunities to add to that for future generations must not be lost.
DOR01630	As a family of 5 we love the Wirral and the amount of beautiful countryside. I feel that the government building plans are over inflated and feel that there is so much brownfield land it just be built on. Force Peel Holdings into a compulsory sale! I will be watching closely to see who votes for building on the green belt and will not be voting them in the next local elections! We will fight for our land and our walks build on brownfield sites!
DOR01631	Please use brownfield sites before greenbelt. Please consider the impact on the road schedule as public transport is limited in and around Irby
DOR01632	I and the other members of the household have grave concerns about the proposed plan to use of considerable amount of Wirral greenbelt land to build houses. As elected members you have a duty to be custodians of this borough and its existing population to protect their interests and wellbeing. Allowing the building on the green belt sites will not be in the interest of the local people. It will line the pockets of the developers who are itching to build on our land because as you are fully aware they will be building many expensive homes and not affordable housing. As elected members you should be demanding the use of brown field sites to be developed initially and then if there is evidence that more homes are needed look at the use of the green belt but not releasing the land at this stage. Wirral should now have a water front township in the open brown belt sites from Wallasey and Birkenhead. This area should rival the creative and successful housing development on the Liverpool water front. Why has Wirral not pursued such a magnificent development opportunity? The answer is because the land is owned by Peel Holdings who have reneged on building houses as agreed. As elected members the lenient approach to Peel Holding has to stop and legal action taken to make it compulsory for them to fulfil the initial agreement. It is incredulous to me that the compulsory purchase is not being enforced particularly as my family has been previously subject to a compulsory purchase order and the house was demolished to build a bypass. Why is there a disparity from compulsory purchase orders being imposed on individual residents and powerful large Companies? That does not seem to be fair and democratic to me. I understand that the Wirral population is fairly static and that homelessness is not an issue. Where is the work for all these people who you think will be moving into Wirral to live in these houses and what about the infrastructure to accommodate the needs of the people. We frequently read in the Wirral Globe that there are insufficient police to deal with antisocial behaviour some Wirral resident have to live with day in and day out. The Wirral hospitals are already under enormous strain. On 25 August 2018 the Merseyside mayor stated that the people of Merseyside might have to be asked to contribute more to fund the financing of the Fire and Rescue stations and that included Wallasey. So if we are already in dire straits to protect and meet the needs of the existing population how is life going to get better for all who live in the borough if the population increases.
DOR01633	I think it is the greenbelt land that plays such a massive part in making the Wirral as beautiful as it is. We specifically chose the house that we bought, based on how much greenbelt there was around us. By building on this land you would be devaluing people's houses and taking away reasons to love their home. We would definitely move away from the area if it became clear that development was inevitable so you are effectively driving people from their homes. The land behind our house is the Barnston area that links up with Gills Lane. The farmer grazes cows each year and bales hay twice a year on it. It contains a pond and a river that attracts wildlife that we regularly see. In particular we have an annual visit from a protected species; the black-tailed godwit, that comes to feed in the autumn and winter months. How this area is under threat, I do not know but I'm hoping by reviewing and rethinking these proposals thoroughly, the right decision will be reached.
DOR01634	Scrap Hoylake golf resort. Build houses on Upton fire station site-new fire station on greenbelt land-WRONG!!!!
DOR01635	If more homes are needed, they certainly NOT at the upper end of the market. Affordable homes, and 'council houses' are what the country needs.
DOR01636	Detrimental to the Wirral's special wildlife.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01637	I totally disagree with the proposal to build on green belt land, especially the 530 houses planned for Greasby copse, Greenhouse farm and its adjacent Land has been part of Greasby village community for many decades. Our green fields along with the wildlife, of which there is an abundance must be protected. Also, How will Arrowse Park hospital cope with all these thousands of extra residents, A&E has failed to meet with the guidelines many times over the last year, the hospital is continually operating at full capacity, unless massive plans are put in place to improve funding to Pubic Services these proposals will cause catastrophe problems.
DOR01638	We have a duty to protect our green belt for the next generations.
DOR01639	I totally disagree with any plans to build on green-belt land. It sets a dangerous precedent and makes a mockery of having designated green belt land in the first place, if it can simply be ignored and built on at will. The government should not be able to impose arbitrary housing requirements on local authorities without that authority buying into the numbers and being able to show how they will be accommodated without having to spoil the areas that make them so special in the first place.
DOR01640	I object to mass building on our green belt sites, especially when we have plenty of brownfield sites to explore. I won't ever vote for a councillor who approves releasing our green belt for development.
DOR01641	Too much building as it is, no green spaces should be built on. The Wirral is too small.
DOR01642	Having moved up here from Hertfordshire last year, we found a plentiful supply of houses available. More have joined the market recently. However, one of the key reasons we moved was for the variety of green spaces. These seem to now be under threat of development. When there are so many brown spaces available why develop an area prone to flooding for housing? Or is someone receiving a great bonus out of this?
DOR01643	Please look at redeveloping areas that need injection of modern housing and community eg New Ferry and Birkenhead. Plus brown sites before Green belt. Wirral has beautiful green belt for quality of life not urban sprawl. So thankful I live in Greasby that has good balance of town and country side.
DOR01644	New housing Sites - Ashton court West Kirby has been listed as being in Hoylake. Is this a deliberate attempt to distract from the fact this is a controversial site due to its history of dubious practise in gaining planning consent. Please relist correctly.
DOR01645	There is a lot of brown belt land available for development. Wirral should not consider building on greenbelt.
DOR01646	I have studied the proposals and the plans for the proposed green belt sites, and I cannot believe that Wirral Council are seriously considering building on and losing so much precious green belt land in Wirral. The very character of Wirral is centred around its green belt and its relationship with local communities. I live in Higher Bebington and the proposals with regards to the green belt sites are outrageous. Bebington will potentially lose a continuous corridor of green belt from Clatterbridge all the way to Prenton including the fields around Storeton Woods and Levers Causeway, extending urban sprawl to the M53 motor way and beyond. These areas are vital assets to the local community for leisure activities and Levers Causeway is a busy area for walkers, cyclists, horses and other outdoor activities. It also forms part of the national cycle network at Storeton. We regularly use these areas and routes for walking and cycling and my children have been brought up using these vital outdoor countryside assets. Storeton itself is another issue. These plans indicate the complete loss of green belt between Bebington and the village and beyond swallowing this ancient medieval village into the urban sprawl and complete loss of identity. This is completely at odds with government policy. Access is another issue. Mount Road is an intensely busy route from Bebington and Birkenhead to the M53 at Junction 4. There are regularly accidents on this busy route at the moment. The urbanisation of the green belt along its Western boundary would increase the volume of traffic along these routes several fold. Much of this road has only one footpath due to the proximity of the sandstone wall bounding Storeton Woods. This is surely an unviable prospect from a transport/safety viewpoint. I know from first-hand experience that local Junior schools are full and at breaking point. Where would the considerable influx of additional school age children go? Do the plans include new schools? It seems obvious to me that WBC has put no thought in to these proposals and has rushed these through at the last minute to hit government deadlines with absolutely no consideration to the wider impacts. The real problem here is the failure of WBC to deal with the Peel issue and put pressure on them to release and develop their sites and vast swathes of brownfield land to avoid this ridiculous situation they have got themselves into. This is the real answer to this problem. Does this Council really want to be remembered as the Council that sold the people of Wirral down the river and allowed urban sprawl to overtake our countryside and be responsible for effectively the end of ancient villages and communities like Storeton? We owe our children a brighter future than this. WBC should hang their head in shame.
DOR01647	There is far too much development, we are a small parcel of land and this constant building has to STOP. The infrastructure is just not in place. Heswall is a permanent traffic jam.
DOR01648	I think the proposed plan has not been thought through as the effect on the infrastructure to the local population and businesses will be devastating. Just take car parking everywhere in the area cars are parked on pavements more houses more cars more traffic more congestion and one day a disabled person or child in prison/pushchair will be seriously because they have to walk in road because cars are on pavement.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01649	We have to accept that, for some reason, we need all these houses. Question is where is the best place to put them? Ignoring the “not in my backyard” argument it is a question of reducing the impact on our environment as much as possible. This can be done by incorporating a green infrastructure in the planning including orchards, hedgehog highways, newt ponds, tree-lined avenues, fruit trees in gardens, bat, owl and swift nest boxes and nectar-rich planting for bees with decent areas of open space managed for wildlife. All too often these considerations are often made and then subsequently not implemented. Some developers have a better track record than others! Barratt Developments and the RSPB have signed an agreement to incorporate some of these principles across its future developments. This will include reviewing its landscaping and planting guidance to enhance wildlife habitats. please see http://ww2.rspb.org.uk/about-the-rspb/about-us/media-centre/releases/390633-barratt-developments-and-rspb-breathe-wildlife-into-new-build-housing .
DOR01650	Think again and leave all green belt alone absolutely silly once gone it's gone short sighted.
DOR01651	It is an outrage that green belt should be considered for building when there is brown field land not being developed. Any politician or councillor who does not stop this will NEVER receive my vote. I urge all residents to also use their voting power to maintain our environment. Cannot Wirral Borough Council take back the brown field land that is not being developed by Compulsory Purchase Order?
DOR01652	Green Belt should never ever be built on - once it's gone it's gone forever! Because this council is inept in its dealings with and managing its current housing stock, bringing empty houses back into use and building on Brownfield sites it now wants to make the panic decision to build on Green Belt which is morally wrong in so many ways! It's shameful to even suggest building on Green Belt OUR Green Belt is the lungs of the Wirral.
DOR01653	Please consider the possibility that life expectancy on the Wirral will follow the American model of decline. The council should campaign against the cuts that make this more likely, while drawing attention to the fact that the housing target is likely to exceed real necessity. Green space in Birkenhead needs preserving for poor residents, while the Green Belt in the centre of Wirral should only be sacrificed as a last resort.
DOR01654	I am completely against the building of houses on any greenbelt land within the borough of Wirral. This would destroy the area and damage huge sections of important wildlife habitat. Not only that the Wirral is struggling to cope with the level of residence as it is. Our services cannot cope with extra demand. This is a shameful land grab by the government to try and gain favour with the electorate. Wirral council should stand up for the will of the people for once and not its own agenda. We vote for you perhaps it's time we reminded you of that at the next election.
DOR01655	A quick drive around Seacombe, Poulton and Birkenhead shows huge areas of dereliction that is crying out for affordable housing development, in addition to the huge swathes of land earmarked for Wirral Waters and for which planning permission has already been granted for 1000's of homes. With so much 'brownfield' land crying out for development, it would be nothing short of criminal to destroy a single acre of green belt. Whilst I understand in an ideal World, the golf course and luxury houses proposed for Hoylake could be seen as an investment to bring in employment, we are not in an ideal World and the return on this venture would not come anywhere near balancing the environmental damage due to loss of greenery, "cleaning" the air and the obvious enormous increase to the flood risk in Meols and Moreton. I believe the proposed loss of green belt in Saughall Massie would have a similar effect north of Hoylake Road as the Arrowe Brook would be unable to cope without the rain absorbing effect of the green belt in the surrounding area. Local, petty, Party Politics need to be put aside. Instead of the Local Plan being seen as an opportunity to score political points, all parties need to work together else the only losers will be Wirral and its residents.
DOR01656	I strongly oppose building on green belt land on the Wirral that is what people love about the Wirral and why they have invested so much to live here.
DOR01657	There is not enough affordable housing in Wirral, but our council is determined to attack green belt land for higher profits and rates.
DOR01658	I think it is criminal and will not be accepted by the people of Wirral that Wirral Borough Council are considering development on precious green belt land, when there is a possibility to use existing brownfield sites across the Wirral e.g. Peel Holdings site at the waterside in Birkenhead. The Wirral is surrounded by water and we must cherish our green belt areas and preserve our heritage as most of the green belts are there to preserve areas protected by conservation orders or places of interest to the people of Wirral. Talking with residence and people of the Wirral we will not stand for this approach and will ensure that we stand united to stop this preposterous idea going any further.
DOR01659	There needs to be a balance across Wirral. The area to the east of the M53 is already heavily built up. The proposed developments take away nearly all the undeveloped land on this side of the motorway, whereas the area to the west of the M53 has far more space available.
DOR01660	Building should not be taking place on green belt land.
DOR01661	Firstly and I think most importantly, if any houses anywhere are to be built, the roads need looking at first, as getting in and out of the Wirral to and from work is already congested enough without the extra possibly of another 12000 plus car using the roads. Also we moved to our house in the Wirral 6 years ago and paid that extra to live in a quiet village so our children could have a good upbringing and good environment to live and play in. I fear this will be destroyed with the news that council houses will be built in and around our area which is green belt. One of the reasons we bought here.
DOR01662	I would like to see affordable, that is really affordable, housing built. I am opposed to the Golf Resort and Executive i.e. unaffordable housing on the green belt near West Kirby and Hoylake.
DOR01663	I believe this would have a detrimental effect on our local beauty spots and wildlife. Our beautiful views will disappear and we will lose our close community spirit. Our schools are already full to capacity with 30 children per class...will new schools be built? I think not! Doctors surgeries are struggling to cope already...will there be more surgeries built? I think not! Our village struggles already with the amount of traffic and idiotically parked cars and this will only multiply and the chance of fatalities will increase.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01664	<p>Firstly, Wirral is a small peninsula so where are all these houses supposed to go? The retention of Green Belt land is vitally important to farming, wildlife and the prevention of urban sprawl. Using our precious Green Belt means less regeneration of already neglected areas and also more cars, which then leads to increased pollution.</p> <p>Secondly, more and more houses are being built but no new schools or doctor's surgeries.</p> <p>Thirdly, is you are so determined that 'Wirral residents must have their say', why have Wirral residents been denied a 'say' in the unwanted Hoylake Golf Resort project? That is just a stealth scheme between Wirral Council and a company that is at best 'shady' to use Green Belt land to build expensive homes. Ask our views on that one!</p>
DOR01665	<p>These plans for green belt would appear to be financially motivated! The areas which you are looking to build are going to be used for unaffordable properties, because these properties would not generate enough financial potential to offset the cost of the land. As for the area where I live in Greasby this area has 3 schools in the immediate vicinity which generate enormous traffic disruption any plans for housing would only intensify this problem. Your ideas for affordable housing would be better suited for an area where you would find occupants for affordable housing.</p>
DOR01666	<p>Wirral council appears to have responded to Tory government demands with a knee jerk reaction. The offering up of huge swathes of Wirral's greenbelt is unnecessary when Peel holdings are previously on record committing to build 12,000 homes on brownfield sites. Why are they not being held to this? Upton is currently experiencing building development on 2 large sites. The effect this is having on local traffic with delays and damage to roads is significant. To hear that further development of Upton/Greasby/Irby is part of the plan is disturbing. Traffic around the Sainsbury's roundabout is regularly gridlocked and that at the Arrowe Park junction is invariably backed up. Wirral is a peninsula and these are the 2 routes to the M53, further developments will only add to this congestion and road safety will be further compromised. Cycling these roads is becoming increasingly untenable. Wirral, the leisure peninsula, whatever happened to that? Much of the greenbelt land is agricultural and provides a livelihood for small businesses, surely the council has a responsibility/desire to support and encourage these? I have campaigned locally for both our MP's and councillor's re-election. Destruction of greenbelt was already becoming an issue, well before this plan was announced. I proudly promoted Margaret Greenwood as a green MP and I know that this is still her stance. How therefore does this sit with our current council's policy? If this plan goes ahead, I am sorry to say, it will certainly be the death of Wirral Labour council.</p>
DOR01667	<p>Wirral is full. Cars are a real problem already. I cycle, I go off to Wales or Cheshire, come back to the Wirral and the volume of traffic is obvious. The roads are so busy now. More than one car per house hold. Parking in villages is a problem. The Wirral is a beautiful peninsula, with fields and walks in-between houses. Please leave it as that!</p>
DOR01668	<p>I am worried that the council will sell this green belt to the highest development bidder, with no consideration to ethical build design, to suit the environment keeping green areas and woodland, a pleasant place to live, not a mass of boxes with no or little parking spaces, or room for bins just like all the other mass builds across the northwest our primary school cannot cope with more pupils the classrooms are oversubscribed now, our doctor's surgeries are over run try getting an appointment now. This purely an easy option quick money for council coffers and god knows what incentives will be given to dubious developers. I for one will object, protest and fight for the right to keep Irby and its green belt ethical and natural. A developer that can prove they will keep its naturalness and woodlands which benefits us all in place with carefully designed houses with space and gardens that enhance the area and not take away and just add noise, more traffic, more litter then perhaps they would have my support. Please, please think about everyone not just your own pockets.</p>
DOR01669	<p>Wirral is known as the Leisure Peninsular...by considering the conversion of green belt land to housing stock this will completely disregard the whole ethos of this concept...Towns and villages will be merged into swathes of urbanisation and the rural landscape will disappear. Let's maintain the greenbelt and please don't allow large profits to be made by house builders who will not build affordable houses in these areas. They will build expensive houses for profit which will be way out of the reach of the population that this policy is aimed at.</p>
DOR01670	<p>Please do not build on our green belt areas.</p>
DOR01671	<p>These proposals, if implemented, will destroy a beautiful area.</p>
DOR01672	<p>I'm disgusted and furious about the plans to destroy our beautiful county for money! I am totally against any development</p>
DOR01673	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am totally opposed to any building on designated Greenbelt. 2. If my local councillor votes in favour of re-designating Greenbelt for any other purpose he/she will certainly NOT be getting my vote in any local election. 3. There are sufficient Brown-field sites on Wirral - these should be used in preference to Greenbelt land. 4. The council should accept that they over-estimated the growth within the borough and challenge the government's targets.
DOR01674	<p>I feel the plan is over inflated. Wirral is a beautiful place and I value the green belt areas for the health and well-being of myself and my family. I will not be voting for any councillors in favour of building on our green belt spaces.</p>
DOR01675	<p>This is a ridiculous idea and it will ruin the area! It will not be welcomed by us residents and our families! Don't spoil the area by building on green belt land!</p>
DOR01676	<p>We don't need more house in the area! We only have limited school spaces and we have to think of the effects it will have on traffic issues etc... What about the wildlife?! Don't forget there are living animals in these green areas and they need protecting and we should not be taking away their homes!!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01677	The Call for Sites request CALL16/001Land at Vineyard Farm by Persimmon Homes has been done twice before. Both times it was rejected due to access issues, traffic issues and social issues. The Vinyard Farm site backs onto both Brotherton Park and the Dibbinsdale SSSI. This is priceless. In our garden we have seen woodpeckers, mandarin ducks, tree creepers, foxes, voles, bullfinches and many other birds. It's amazing what we see. I believe this is due to the special environment surrounding Vinyard farm. I really do not want this habitat to be ruined. There is a grade 2 listed building on this site, I know it floods occasionally as I can see it. Where are the children from the new estate going to go to? The primary schools in Spital and Bebington closest to the farm are over-subscribed already. Where will the access to the estate be? Not down Poulton Road as that has been rejected before as too dangerous. Not through the existing Spital estate as this will cause traffic and pollution issues. The land is a working farm and produces food for the local community. We shop at the farm shop. There are other sites which if build on will not have the disastrous effect on wildlife that building at Vinyard farm will have. Once it's gone...it's gone.
DOR01678	I don't think there should be building on green belt land. There is a lot of brownfield site that could be utilised.
DOR01679	The green spaces in Wirral give it its identity and are to the benefit of all who live here.
DOR01680	One of my concerns would be flood control as we already know, unless regular maintenance is made, areas are highly likely to have localised flooding. I would suggest that areas that already flood, would get worse so whoever is responsible need to not just look but act on them now. More checks could be made to check that tenants actually live in the properties paid for by housing benefits. Existing landlords would be more willing to let benefit claimants rent if they had direct to landlord payments. There needs to be more single occupancy/affordable housing/direct to landlord to help people keep their roof over their heads. Surely the housing benefit payments would be better back in the council pot? All flats should have a security/camera play/outdoor space for children and a low level lockable buggy/pram/mobility/cycle store to encourage families to go outdoors. Just a few of my wishes!
DOR01681	Housing needs should be met by using brownfield sites first NOT green spaces.
DOR01682	The loss of green belt is unnecessary. House building should focus on land within towns to regenerate our town centres. There is a need to build affordable housing especially to help first time buyers and this should be brought together within a plan to increase jobs and attract new investment to our big towns. Expanding beyond current town boundaries, growing into green spaces leading to an urban sprawl from the Mersey to the Dee is the wrong thing to do.
DOR01683	I understand there may be plans for behind my road in Irby. [Plans 1774] However we have bats living there and conservation rules prohibiting moving such habitat. Please review. I appreciate housing needs, but you need to consider why the Wirral is the Wirral. It is because of the open spaces. People will not want to live here if our beautiful open spaces are filled with housing.
DOR01684	There is a need for affordable and social housing on Wirral and a huge need for starter homes. The housing requirement set by the government is a guideline and not specific for the needs of Wirral residents. Therefore this needs to be challenged as it has been in several other areas in the UK the nearest example being Manchester.
DOR01685	It is unthinkable to release green belt land until every bit of brownfield is developed. Including now disused fire stations!!
DOR01686	Wirral Council should not be planning to build on green belt. There are large numbers of unoccupied homes in the borough and also brownfield land that could be used instead. The council should not be taking the easy option they have a responsibility to safeguard our green belt land for the future.
DOR01687	Wirral's unique beauty and attractiveness to those who visit is its open spaces! Sprawling conurbations would destroy the very thing that sells Wirral to those who visit it and want to live here. Destroy its rural feel and you destroy its whole being for future generations. Protect this landscape.....Retain its green spaces...look to brown field sites.
DOR01688	<p>VERY ANGRY!</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Emphasis should be on using brownfield sites, of which there are plenty in the Wirral, before the green belt is touched. The council have been negligent in allowing Peel to hold brownfield sites and do nothing with it for years and to now offer to build far fewer homes than originally agreed. The excuse of lack of infrastructure can equally be applied to the green belt areas. The roads and other transport links, sewage systems, schools, medical services of these areas are already stretched and could not meet the needs of thousands of more people and cars. 2. There are 6000 empty homes on the Wirral. They should be brought into use before the green belt is threatened. 3. Parts of the Borough eg Rock Ferry, Birkenhead...are in desperate need of redevelopment. 4. The number of houses that council predicts Wirral will need over the next 15 years is wildly optimistic. It's based on economic growth figures that in the light of Brexit are simply not achievable. The Government has published (after pressure) an analysis of the possible effects of Brexit on the Regions. The North West is likely to face anything from a -2.5% to -16% economic growth depending on how we leave the EU. Plus once we leave the EU how reliable are the Government's promises of replacing EU funding. Andy Burnham has frozen plans in Manchester to develop on the green belt in the light of concerns about negative economic and lower population growth. Bear in mind that Manchester has a much more vibrant economy than the Wirral. 5. It is the green belt which contributes to making the Wirral such a special place. Once it goes it is gone forever and the Wirral becomes an area of urban scrawl. <p>I URGE THE COUNCIL TO RE-THINK ITS PROPOSALS.</p>
DOR01689	Green belt should be last resort for housing.
DOR01690	I do not understand why green belt land is being considered when there is ample brown belt land down by new Brighton that could be used. That area is cheaper so houses would be more affordable for people to buy. Instead of more shops/offices being built they could rejuvenate existing shopping in those areas, Liscard etc.
DOR01691	Wirral's roads are congested and services overstretched. Only small developments of 50 homes or so can be sustained. Green belt land is essential to maintain quality of life in the area.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01692	I don't agree with the council using green belt when there are lots of brown field sites. I don't think there is the housing demand in Wirral. Will the houses built be all affordable housing or only for builders to make a profit? Will there be new schools, GP surgeries built to cope for the greater population? How about the demands on the roads and infrastructure as at the moment roads are jam packed? I'm totally opposed to any building on green belt.
DOR01693	When it's gone it's gone! We cannot allow government targets of today to let us lose sight of the Wirral of the future. The green belts of Wirral make Wirral what it is, one of the most beautiful places to live. There is so much other land which can be used for new housing, new housing which would enhance those areas and rebuild them. Brownfield sites must be made the only option. Building on our green belts would have a detrimental effect on those areas and their wildlife as well as areas around them. Do not make building on precious land a quick fix for government targets. Please protect it however you can, whatever the cost!
DOR01694	Why destroy green belt forever when there is brownfield site at Wirral Waters. Redevelop run down areas - build town houses but don't ruin our green space.
DOR01695	I am deeply concerned about letting green belt land be made available for all the new houses. Where would current residents enjoy out door space. The schools are already full, doctors already full and the roads can't take much more. Why have the council said about 12,000 new homes. What about all the derelict houses and unoccupied.
DOR01696	I thought central and local gov were supposed to protect green belt land as far as possible and it seems there are plenty of exiting brownfield sites in Wirral, which could be developed before needing to look to green belt sites. I would also question the number of houses required as these figures seem to have been arrived at using spurious data and other have calculated far fewer house needed using altogether more sensible estimates.
DOR01697	I strongly oppose building on greenbelt sites
DOR01698	<p>We, the people of Wirral, are totally opposed to the proposed use of Green Belt land for the use of housing development. I personally, cannot understand a Labour council bending to the will of a Tory government and siding with big business whose sole aim is to make money out of Wirral's Green Belt. There are many Brownfield sites that can be used. The policy should be Brownfield first!! The majority of Green Belt is agricultural land. This represents somebodies job. Since when does a Labour Council decide that profit is more important than a man's job? Farmland is there to produce food. Once it has gone it is gone forever. Let's get this right. I and many others in this borough will NOT vote for councillors who voted to sell off our Green Belt.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Instead of blaming the Tories for the problems relating to housing development on Wirral please take charge and do what you were elected to do - represent the views of the residents. The building of any kind on designated Greenbelt land should NOT even be considered. 2. There is an abundance of Brownfield Sites on Wirral. There should be a strict policy of "Brownfield First" before ANY Greenbelt land is sacrificed. 3. I understand that Peel Holdings have planning permission for some 13,000 houses at Wirral Waters. They should be compelled to build these homes instead of sitting on the land. 4. I understand that Wirral Council have NOT questioned the government targets for housing development within the borough. Why not? 5. Specifically, the land between Limbo Lane and Parkway, Irby has been identified as a site for possible housing development. Is Wirral's Planning Dept. aware that this land is FARM LAND. We are struggling to feed ourselves as it is without allowing developers to ride roughshod through the wishes of local people and expect planning permission to build some 500 houses. 6. Are the Planning Department aware that men's livelihoods are at risk if this land doesn't remain as Farm land? This land is actually farmed. The farmer relies on it for his income! 7. The elected councillors MUST be aware of the resident's thoughts regarding the borough's Green Belt land. We elected you to represent us. We EXPECT you to represent us. There is a strength of feeling regarding Green Belt. [refer to the turnout at recent meetings] Please do your duty and represent the voting public.
DOR01699	This is a botched consultation using out of date results. You haven't even published the results of the public consultation into the Green belt review methodology so how are the public supposed to understand how you have undertaken the Green Belt Review. The Council should abandon this consultation and use the most up to date ONS figures. It is absolutely clear that there is no need to release Green Belt land as there are sufficient Brownfield sites to meet the targets. Government Guidance states that the housing targets CAN be challenged if there is compelling evidence and the Council MUST robustly challenge these targets and stop playing politics! The Council should work with Peel Holdings to develop Wirral waters. Climate change is happening now and the Council should be promoting sustainable development on Brownfield sites. Green Belt should not be released as it militates against climate change, reduces pollution and reduces flood risk. Green Belt houses will mostly not be "affordable homes" and will encourage car dependency. With Brexit, we will need our farmland more than ever! I strongly object to releasing any Green Belt for development, including the Hoylake Golf Resort! Build affordable homes on Brownfield sites and leave the Green Belt alone!
DOR01700	Please do not kill our natural habitat and farming land. Going into Brexit means that we need to be more self-sufficient in our industry and farming taking away land would make this impossible. Please look at existing buildings that are empty at present but could be converted. Additional housing is going to put more strain on our already overstretched services for example fire, NHS, Police, schooling. In son areas it's already difficult to access these services without increasing the population. Taking away Greenbelt will also have an impact on health issues.
DOR01701	The Wirral is a tiny patch of ground and i don't feel the decision makers have taken this into consideration. It needs to be brought to their attention before our council take any action regarding green belt. Surely there are exceptions where circumstances warrant it. Instead of new builds why doesn't Wirral do something unique and help upgrade all the rundown housing stock that blights every town on Wirral. They could give low interest loans to landlords or home owners to make what we already have better. Where there are very rundown or derelict houses or flats either refurbish them or demolish them and build new. If our council can give low interest to other councils then perhaps they should do it to upgrade and bring back into use what we already have. Please don't make Wirral a concrete jungle, what we have is unique. Sea, towns, countryside and the last of our rural identity. Thank you.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01702	To minimise damage to our green belt, which makes Wirral so beautiful, I think that the vast majority of the 12,000 houses ought to be affordable housing - around 10,000 at least. Large, expensive houses are great for the individual, but occupy lots of space which is then denied to the majority.
DOR01703	Our greenbelt is what makes the Wirral so beautiful and unique. Taking that away will turn us in to just another large town. If I wanted that, I'd move to Liverpool!
DOR01704	The plan is a terrible idea. You do not need to build on Green Belt. There is enough space for thousands of homes. Take back Wirral Waters, Peel are useless, thousands of homes could be built there. Other Brown Field sites are available too. Look at all the shops that are empty, they are going to stay empty, turn them and their upper floors into flats, not everybody wants a garden. I believe that will ease the so called Wirral housing crisis, I don't think there is one in Wirral, if there was one then Family Homes would be a lot more expensive than they are. The Council should look at the alternatives that I have suggested. Thanks,
DOR01705	Wirral Council is the sole architect of its own troubles in this matter. When was the last time, that Wirral Council actually built any housing for rental purposes as a Council? When was it that Wirral actually considered the housing needs of this Borough? Not for years and years. The crocodile tears that [the Council Leader] is now shedding will not wash with all sane minded persons in Wirral, why not do what you normally do with these exercises which is go right ahead and ignore the public's views and implement this plan because if you do not you will be in vast trouble with the National Government. Let's face it these consults are just 'tick box' exercise like the NHS does. I am totally opposed to this Green Belt, use all of the available Brown Field sites and what about the 110 properties on the Wirral Waters site, have they now disappeared?
DOR01706	I disagree with removing areas of land from the green belt. I think the housing targets are inflated and inaccurate. There are plenty of brownfield sites available to deliver the potential housing need especially through the Peel developments at Wirral Waters. I think there are compelling circumstances for reviewing the current plan. Finally there is emerging evidence from across the country that releasing green belt land does nothing to tackle the need for affordable housing but merely allows developers to cherry pick sites for executive developments.
DOR01707	I would like to see the evidence that so many new homes are required. How much of the new build will be affordable housing? The green belt is one of the things that make the Wirral a pleasant place to live. Why encroach continuously if there is no need. We are all aware of the brownfield sites that can be built on and the planning permission given to peel holdings to build housing is this included in the plan? If it is central government that has come up with these figures why is the council not brave enough to challenge them? Local councils are there to look after the interests of local people - give it a go.
DOR01708	It is important to me that green spaces are protected. Building affordable housing is important, but companies are more likely to fall into building expensive housing on green spaces as this is the "right" location for this and so negate the point of planning new houses. I support building on brown space, disused land, before building on any green belt or farmland. Farmland is important to the Wirral and also to our planet. I care for our children's futures, not just my own.
DOR01709	We, the council and the public, need to be very careful where we decide to build these 12,000 new houses. We are lucky on the Wirral and have a fair amount of green fields, open spaces and greenbelt land. This is what makes the Wirral such a great place to live. We need to not build so much that our villages and towns lose their individual identities and just become one large urban sprawl. I understand there is a need for housing but am concerned that we preserve our greenbelt areas not just for our generation but for generations to come and also to protect the diverse wildlife.
DOR01710	There is so much brown belt and derelict land in area of the Wirral that would make perfectly suitable sites for new housing. To encroach onto some of the most beautiful green belt land we are privileged enough to have on our doorstep, would be absolutely unacceptable. Wirral is such a unique area in the north west, and as a resident, I'm not alone in saying how fortunate I feel to have access to the outdoors and green spaces. I would urge the council to consider any and all alternatives to using green belt land before committing to future housing projects. It will irreparably damage the local environment and communities, some with limited means, who rely on access to these green spaces.
DOR01711	I strongly disagree with wbc allowing the majority of the build to be in Wirral west. There are many available sites in other parts of Wirral.
DOR01712	Stop plans to destroy our green belt.
DOR01713	There are already insufficient green belt areas in the Wirral as a whole. Also demand for allotments far outstrips those available to rent. Allotments should be a protected resource. Liverpool are encouraging development on brown field sites and areas, why can't Wirral? The government has set targets to build new homes but are not encouraging brown field sites, this should be done as a matter of importance they also need to think more carefully about the numbers that are actually needed.
DOR01714	The areas in west Kirby should be kept as they are. People go there to walk their dogs, stay healthy, view the wildlife & enjoy the greenery. WK is already built enough and shouldn't have more areas of cheap built houses bringing more people therefore more families where local schools etc cannot accommodate. Use the money to improve roads, pavements, wildlife areas and the war memorial how disgusting to want to over crowd such a symbolic location!
DOR01715	It's disgusting that Peel holdings are allowed to proceed with their development with 11,000 less dwellings. If green belt is released, why even call it green belt. It sets a precedent that will see all our tourism income drop as green spaces are developed into buildings that place pressure on already stretched resources like schools, roads etc. House prices will fall and it will no longer be the haven we know it as. Take it out on Peel, not Wirral residents. Any council who just shrug this 'oversight' on Peel's part off without tackling them will never receive my vote again.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01716	Being a resident of Greasby which is being affected by potential greenbelt release, I am very worried that the property I have worked long and hard for will be destroyed by cheap housing being built directly behind my house spoiling mine and 200+ houses views. Why would someone choose to live behind a new housing estate? If these new houses are built where will the children be schooled? As all 3 local schools are already at capacity and struggling to meet their current demand. The local doctors can't deal with Greasby issues already. How can land being farmed be considered for housing when there are areas or Wirral unused? Why have the brownfield sites not been developed before any greenbelt be considered? This is appalling by WBC!
DOR01717	1. This page was difficult to find and involved clicking several poorly signed links. 2. What have Magenta Living (Wirral's largest social landlord) contributed to house building in Wirral in the previous 10 years? How many affordable or otherwise houses do they intend to build as their contribution to the 'local plan'?
DOR01718	In general, I am opposed to releasing green belt for house building especially woodland, heath and prime agricultural land. Specifically, because I know it well, I am opposed to releasing parcel number SP013 West of Column Road. Over the years, many natural ponds have been built on In the area and consequently the bottom of Column Road floods after heavy rain. If this parcel is built on, the soak away provided by this area will potentially cause more flooding. In winter there are often flocks of curlews feeding on the field, in the summer Night jars can be heard and throughout the year barn owls and many other species of wildlife feed. Another worry is the traffic congestion and access onto the main road from a large development. Will more money be available immediately for the local schools and health care? The local authority needs to guarantee to provide the necessary infrastructure to support an increased population.
DOR01719	Green belt should be protected. There is no need to take our wonderful environment away from the residents who treasure it so much.
DOR01720	I support some adjustment to Greenbelt policy but the essential integrity of the GB must be largely maintained. Urban sprawl must be avoided and the semi-rural aspects of villages like Saughall Massie need preserving. Developers with unused Planning consents should be encouraged to build or lose consent. Also developers should be encouraged to build on brown field. They will always choose GB rather than BF as the rural locality enables more expensive housing.
DOR01721	No building on the greenbelt. Use brownfield sites. No houses built should be over £180.000 or they are not affordable housing.
DOR01722	Firstly Wirral Council have failed to comply with legal requirements to have in place a local plan and review it every 5 years. Had they done so then planning could have been done more appropriately and without such haste. The consultation process is by ticket only and flawed which will prevent many people attending meetings to object. The local council have failed to utilise brownfield sites to build affordable houses, and have not done all they can to ensure that empty affordable houses are developed. I am angered and upset at the wholesale demolition of beautiful green belt which encourages people to move to live here. The population projections should be reviewed and more research undertaken to ensure that we get this right because the current infrastructure will not support such development in many of these areas.
DOR01723	I wonder if our services will cope with 12,000 plus people with their partners and kids. Such as schools, hospital and doctors. We need more services to support the extra people.
DOR01724	Very concerned about the impact on wildlife and wild spaces that kids can explore. Impact on losing farmland especially with Brexit round the corner, we should be encouraging the / preservation of food sources. Also properties built on green built are not going to help those in need of housing. It won't be affordable and unlikely to be 1/2 bedroom properties which are urgently needed. Existing empty housing stock should be converted for these people and Brown sites must be developed for Wirral to improve. There is so much brown site on Wirral and areas in desperate need of redevelopment that opening the green belt for development is unethical and does actually help anyone in Wirral. Homes build in these sites will not be priced so they are available to first time buyers and there are lots of reports of poor properties being build and unethical leasehold practices being practised by development companies.
DOR01725	It sounds like the government have plucked figures from thin air and not taken what an area is like into account. One of the reasons Wirral is loved by those that come to visit and those that have always lived here (and come back to raise families) is the green spaces in pockets across the land. Too many houses on these green belt areas will ruin our gorgeous home.
DOR01726	The plans to build on green belt will not only ruin the area, but will cause a significant increase in the risk of flooding in some areas of the Wirral. This is wholly unacceptable. As this point has been raised, should this happen, as a council you will be responsible. Also houses built in these areas will not be affordable homes they are more likely to be luxury, which is against government plans. Deals are being made behind backs and the true facts are not being reported. There are plenty of empty shops and houses that could be renovated and brown belt land that should be developed first. The green belt is what makes the Wirral so popular for visitors and residents change this and you will change the peninsula for the worse. Do we really need as many houses as the council plan to build? Is there really such a population boom in the Wirral?
DOR01727	I understand that there is a need for housing on the Wirral, I oppose any building on Green Belt land in the Borough. The Wirral is an area of two halves, one industrial, one with tremendous greenery and beauty. Where housing is to be considered, all ex-industrial, brownfield and unused land should all be considered first before desecrating Wirral's Green Belt land. I'm not Wirral born and bred. I moved here from Cheshire a few years ago, but have worked on the Wirral, in Birkenhead, for over 15 years. Cheshire is another of those places that has a mix of green and industry. Unfortunately, over the years, the greed of the local Councils in that area has let the green areas disappear so much that you can no longer distinguish the two. In fact, where there used to be hamlets, villages and towns, there are now sprawls of urban development so large that they seem to become as large as cities. Once that sort of development begins, it doesn't stop as more and more people move into the area. Instead of helping local people, prices rise and young people can't afford to live where they grew up. Development on a small scale is fine but the sort of development that Wirral Council is suggesting, and in the manner in which is talking about (i.e. to pretty much wipe out an entire swathe of green belt land through the centre of the Borough) is ridiculous. In any event, the current housing market is slowing down so we could end up with thousands of empty homes across the Borough and the Council unable to secure the rates that it was hoping to gain. The plan is short-sighted and does not take into consideration the individual characteristics of this relatively small Borough, its people, its wildlife, its infrastructure or its future by any stretch of the imagination.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01728	Greenbelt land is precious & cannot just be handed over to developers. There are plenty of areas that could be regenerated.
DOR01729	I would not like to see houses being built on greenbelt land, we choose and pay the price for living in the countryside and it should remain this way.
DOR01730	I'd like to make a suggestion, I believe in the Birkenhead and Wallasey area alone you can comfortably build 12,000 homes just by clearing derelict areas and refurbishing derelict homes before even thinking of touching the greenbelt. Hoblyn road - Bidston, full of derelict unused homes that could be rebuilt. The church at the bottom of Worcester road- knock it down and clear it, could fit at least 8 two-bedroom homes on that piece of land. The docks around Wallasey, plenty of wasted land there to build houses and apartments on (its currently very depressing to look at so it could do with a change if I'm honest). The huge void of land between the Woodchurch and the Noctorum, its not usable as a park and there's already been development there, why don't you continue to use that piece of land? These ideas are to just name a few. I'm begging you not to use the greenbelt, the environment has suffered enough. We will lose our wildlife and the air quality will become poorer. Somebody stand up to the government on behalf of our residents.
DOR01731	Maintaining all green belt land, no developments on the green belt.
DOR01732	I understand the desperate need for more housing in all areas but am concerned that the individuality of Wirral villages will be lost, such as the separation between Pensby and Irby will be lost and Wirral will become a sprawling urban conurbation. Also with so much green belt land potentially lost how will this affect the health of inhabitants (more cars and pollution less natural habitat) and even tourism? Also when plans for housing are considered how can you ensure they are going to be affordable particularly for young people - in particular in the areas in south and West Wirral?
DOR01733	It's not just housing that this would lead to. For example infrastructure around Irby is limited - village parking is already problematic and the local primary schools are oversubscribed so where would children end up going to school?
DOR01734	I am aware that there are considerable brownfield sites available for building on. This coupled with the 6000 empty homes and the available land held by Peel Holdings should negate any need whatsoever for intrusion onto Wirral's Green belt to build homes. Wirral Council needs to exhaust every conceivable avenue and option even if this was to include compulsory purchase of Peel Holdings land. If the cost is greater by compulsory purchase and the use of Brownfield sites, so be it. The people of Wirral "DO NOT" wish to see any loss of Green Belt when the most obvious solutions are plainly there to see.
DOR01735	Should not use green belt land.
DOR01736	Greenbelt should not be built on when so many brownfield sites and empty properties available across Wirral.
DOR01737	The plan of connecting Irby the Heswall is the one is most concerning to me. The walks and natural beauty of this part of the Wirral was one of the main attractions to living here. It brings in tourism to the local area which should be valued as an income generator. Also, on more practical matters as a local teacher and a mother with school age children, what happens about schooling the new residents? Do they attend the small village schools that are underfunded and tiny? What about the local grammar school which is already at capacity has NO money? The roads, shops, doctors, hospitals. It's time we stood up to this government and said no!
DOR01738	My comments are concerning the village I live in (Irby), so there are 4 maps that will affect where I live (SP019 / 011 / 060 / 059). I've been a resident in Coombe Road since 1972 and saw the building work [for] the Wimpy estate, followed by the Maunders estate in the late 70s/early 80s and witnessed the noise, pollution and disruption that I don't wish to witness again! Coombe Road became a rat run for those new residents with cars because it was one of three roads leading into the estate (the other 2 inroads from Mill Hill Rd) - cars and speed restrictions of 20mph are still being ignored and 40mph is the norm. We have a primary school in the road, so I have been into the school many times to complain about parents parking badly in Coombe Road. It's also a regular road route for horse riders who trek through Coombe Road for daily exercise. We now have regular helicopters hovering over our house because of police searches over the estate - we know the estate has a problem with drug dealers and users causing late night noise and enforcement from the police. We also used to have a lot of wild birds in our gardens in Coombe Road, so that has been drastically reduced since the estates were built. Irby lost its GP practice around a decade ago to merge into the 'super surgery' in Thingwall, and since then, Irby residents can't walk to the GP, that used to be in Irby Village, so Irby in a sense is no longer the independent village it used to be as far as medical services are concerned. We now have to drive or catch a bus and walk down a dark pathway, and in autumn/winter on wet slippery leaves on the pavement by the bus stop where the leaves drop from the trees belonging to Arrowe Country Park. The bus stop returning to Irby village has a nasty wind tunnel whilst waiting for the bus, not nice if you're not well! Irby has a high population of elderly residents, so putting more pressure on the surgery with more residents will surely have an effect on their wellbeing - it's bad enough to accept that an appointment takes 3 weeks to book, so will this time increase? I worked as a volunteer at Irby library, and talking to residents, the medical practice is still a massive inconvenience to residents and they resent the closure of the Irby practice. We have one oversubscribed primary school (Irby primary) and the smaller school (Dawpool CofE primary school) - it concerns me how new residents will manage to get places for their children. Irby village shops - despite all units being full this year, they are of no use if you need food/groceries. Irby used to have a Cooperative Food shop, a Tesco, 2 banks, a petrol station, bakery, green grocers, butchers, 2 pharmacies. None of those exist now and we have to rely on travelling out of the village for food by car or bus. We have 2 small newsagents, both competing for business, and the small offering of dried/packeted/frozen food is overpriced, and often out of date or badly stored. No decent quality or choice of fresh fruit or vegetables seems to be on offer. Will retail improve in Irby for new residents? The bus service in/out of Irby - although suitable for Liverpool journeys (471), you can't travel to Hamilton Square station to use rail, or Woodside ferries - a decision Merseytravel made over a decade ago to centralise trips to the newer Birkenhead bus station. The smaller bus (475) is a lifeline for many of Irby's older residents, so would new building work affect the bus route? Services are limited to access other neighbouring residential areas therefore car use/ownership will always be high in Irby. We have no cycle paths and no rail on the west side of Wirral. Parking in Irby village - despite the recent parking restrictions (on times), roadside parking has increased. People using the free carpark all day use it to hop onto the bus to Liverpool, or staff from

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>the village shops park there because they can't leave their cars outside the shops due to the 2 hours time limit, so they use the free car park instead. The children's day nursery opposite the Roslin Road junction now has almost permanent parking on Thingwall Road - and it's a dangerous hotspot because people are parking at the head of the T-junction, causing obstruction to drivers trying to pull into Thingwall Road into the village. It concerns me that more residents owning cars will increase the traffic flow and parking in the village. I am now rarely able to use the free car park as it is always full due to the Liverpool bus travellers or the retail staff working in the village. I would actually prefer the council to introduce a time limit in the car park as I know one resident will park their car in the car park 24 hours a day! Countryside - my parents moved from Pensby and Seacombe in the 1960s to Irby, because of the 'countryside' aspect Irby had. From their bedroom window, they could just about see the Irish Sea...but when the Wimpy estate was built, it blocked the view.</p> <p>To this day, still resentful of that happening. However, due to ill health they weren't able to move house and still live in the same house, but without the sea view. The Thingwall Road land parcel where the service road is, opposite a row of bungalows no doubt feel the same way if the field opposite them is built upon. This field was often used by my family for walks all year round, and quite often little fishing trips to the ponds on the field as children. Limbo lane has bird life that would disappear without a doubt - feeding tables are hidden within the trees for a variety of birds. The green belt by Irby Hall - again, the view from Thingwall Road looking towards the Welsh hills would be lost forever. A local artist and teacher painted a mural in Irby's Methodist hall to partition the stage area from the hall - 6ft x 18ft - a fantastic testament to the countryside in Irby, depicting the village and its surrounding fields, trees and outlook to the sea. What will happen to the public pathway from the Irby Anchor Inn to Thurstaston? My next door neighbour moved to South Drive (behind the Anchor Inn) last year to escape from Hazel Grove neighbours building side extensions - and wanted a quiet open space - no doubt they will be distraught at the prospect of more building work next to their garden by the Anchor Inn/Irby Hall. The fields by Harrock Woods - every year without fail, water floods onto Thingwall Road from the field, through the sandstone walls onto the pavement - so where will this water be diverted to? It is well known that Irby has a problem with marl pits - my grandmother's house had to have a complete concrete base after the house sank on one side - a 1950s home - have any land surveys been carried out on the proposed land parcels? Having seen the recent housing development in Upton, called 'The Pines', I am at a loss at the confidence of land owners finding property developers who are capable of designing properties to reflect the existing architecture of many of Wirral's housing. Irby is full of 1930-50s housing, lots of sandstone walls, farm buildings, cottages, public buildings sensitive to the sandstone building material. The Wimpy estate is a typical example of budget 'starter homes for many' that we do not wish to see on our green belt. Irby has a history of farming - the library has archived paintings and photos of the history, including books written by local historian Greg Dawson, documenting the village history, the land, buildings and people. Irby has several societies working alongside the council (ITPAS, FOIL for example) and we already know that the local shops don't meet the local needs - we're overrun with pet shops and beauty salons, but can't buy a simple loaf of bread at supermarket prices - what can the council do to ensure that the retail side of Irby can cope with more residents? I hope my feedback gives you some small insight on the emotional impact of potentially 'filling in the gaps' with housing on the green belt land identified on the consultation.</p>
DOR01739	I'm fundamentally opposed to developing any green belt land until the brownfield sites have been exhausted. There are derelict plots of land (including ones with existing planning permission!) all over Birkenhead, that are being left abandoned. This lack of management of these sites leads to antisocial behaviour, and negative impressions of the local area. The consultation should consider forcing land hoarders to develop within a strict timetable or sell back to the council for cost.
DOR01740	I believe we shouldn't touch green belt unless it is vitally needed, which at the moment we have 91 brown field sites that can be used. Why doesn't the labour council who I voted for keep their promise for brown sites first....Other issues that are on my mind is with new housing coming to the Wirral and if these 12,000 new homes keep with national 2.3 occupants per household this will be an increase of around 27,000 in population.....what will this council do to also ensure the overstretched emergency services get the funds they need to carry out they're roles?
DOR01741	Appropriate low income housing is lacking and overpriced. My example being: my mortgage is £340...rent in my road is nearing £600.
DOR01742	All other options must be utilised before building on green belt is even considered. It is what makes Wirral such a beautiful place to live.
DOR01743	Why did the council not produce a plan in the time scale set out by the gov? Do the 13,000 homes promised by Peel include the target set by gov? Why not use brown field sites instead of green belt?
DOR01744	Surely you should be building on brownfield sites first. What about all the empty houses? Green belt should be protected isn't that why we have the town and country planning act.
DOR01745	It saddens me to see empty and derelict buildings, units and houses these should be renovated or restored first before any green belt land is used. I'd also be interested to know how with all these extra families we will school these children as most schools are at full capacity.
DOR01746	I am opposed to building on greenbelt especially as there are enough brownfield sites to build on! The housing targets proposed are so inflated, will SOMEBODY challenge these figures?!! Where's the infrastructure to cope with these homes - doctors, schools, roads etc.? Hard enough to get a doctors appointment, and the parking and traffic in Irby is bad enough at the moment. Why do you need so many houses especially as net migration is dropping? Once we've left the EU less people will be able to live in the UK. If you build so many houses what's the plan for the increased need for services such as doctors, dentists, roads, drains, water supply and internet? Bearing in mind it's hard enough at the moment getting a doctor's appointment and the roads around Irby are already congested. Where are the jobs around here to justify so many houses? Parking is an issue in Irby village already.
DOR01747	I love our Wirral coastal and green areas....Build flats or build below or use vacant buildings or extensions to yards or rooftop extensions....But don't use any more green or coastal. Stop encouraging foreign aid that places pressure on taxpayer and housing.
DOR01748	Very concerned about the loss of green belt, the impact on the identities of villages, the poor infrastructure in terms of schools, health centres etc and the increase in traffic on already congested roads.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01749	I think currently there is a shortage of new build bungalows for the elderly hence why they are staying in their 2-3 bed semis making it hard for new families on the ladder. We need some good quality 4 bed houses WITH a good size garden! Too many new builds now have now gardens! Way too tight on the plot - obviate money make for the builder but we don't want to buy them. I live in Heswall in a three bed semi, we want to move house to go up the ladder but have so few options to move to now near Heswall. We also need to build some more three-four floor apartments for families - 2bedroom, 2 parking spaces and a communal outdoor garden area. Stop packing us all in. People with buy if you build what is actually wanted rather than squishing is all together.
DOR01750	Dangers would be increased on the A540 road ref plot SP071, severe congestion is already here because of the traffic to Barnston school. The roads are very narrow and access to the proposed plot via suncroft would create havoc. Wirral council would be culpable for any accidents and injuries, especially to children, if suncroft road were to be open for access to this plot.
DOR01751	I believe that the numbers and methodology are flawed and that the Council needs to be much more robust in setting out the special circumstances which affect Wirral.
DOR01752	I believe this demand by central govt is wrong-headed and we should not rush to fulfil an obligation which could be reversed within the time span. Withdrawal from the EU and the resolution of the population bulge may make the destruction of Wirral's greenbelt unnecessary. In the meantime, upgrading of substandard or old, oversized housing should be the way ahead. Please have a look at this article: https://www.theguardian.com/commentisfree/2018/jan/27/building-homes-britain-housing-crisis .
DOR01753	There must be enough brownfill area to build on without building on green belt. Wirral has the largest percentage of land built on in the UK.
DOR01754	I understand the need is for affordable homes rather than say, 4/5 bedroom executive homes which I recognise is more attractive to build for building developers. Please can you publish the highest number of low rise developments that can be built on brown field sites throughout the Wirral clearly identifying the numbers for each brown field site?
DOR01755	Would it not be pertinent to look at all the brown sites first? Also there are many empty houses on Wirral which could be refurbished or the site they stand on be rebuilt.
DOR01756	Object to the inclusion of SP043. Using this site would have significant impact to Dibben dale Nature Reserve, the Area designated SSSI and reduce agricultural land. Drainage is a serious issue at SP043, and feeds Dibben dale Brook. You could house all 12,000 in a garden village away from existing housing that intersects the M53 and trainline to Heswall. If you really do need all these extra houses, create a new town centre off Levers causeway and use the M53 and Trainline rather than squeezing small developments in all over the Wirral.
DOR01757	Why is green and brown belt being built on? There are many derelict areas in Wirral, parts of Birkenhead and other areas in New Ferry and Rock Ferry. Why are you not enforcing the agreement with Peel to build the houses that they promised? Why can you not do up houses that are derelict? Why are houses/flats being built for example in Heswall that haven't been sold? Is this consultation a waste of time as it has already been done and agreed?
DOR01758	I disagree with removing areas of land from the green belt. I think the housing targets are inflated and inaccurate. In any case there are plenty of brownfield sites available to deliver the potential housing need especially through the Peel developments at Wirral Waters. I think there are compelling circumstances for reviewing the current plan. Finally there is emerging evidence from across the country that releasing green belt land does nothing to tackle the need for affordable housing but merely allows developers to cherry pick sites for executive development.
DOR01759	Council should concentrate on building on brown belt land. Not on green belt land.
DOR01760	Why use beautiful green sites when there are many ugly sites on the Wirral. Ditch this Wirral Waters scheme. It is never happening. I get fed up seeing these plans when there are demolished blank sites in areas where cheaper housing can be built. Building in Pensby Irby Upton areas will just be upmarket houses for the richer people not the people who need it most.
DOR01761	Wirral needs more social housing and affordable housing in areas where there is already infrastructure, schools and good health care i.e. GP's and clinics. We have many brownfield sites which could be used to provide good quality housing with green spaces for children to enjoy social interaction. We also have houses which are being left to become derelict compulsory purchasing these and renovating would decrease homelessness and unaffordable rents. Any renovations must be done to quality finish. Why is Peel Holding, as an example not building on land already held in line with their supposed commitment to Wirral? It would appear from local reports that they will only build if you as a council financially incentivise them. As developers is it not for them to take the risk as they will certainly take the profit. Please remember any money you commit is coming from hard paying rate payers in the main. Can you not as a council compulsory purchase land from developers which is suitable for building on if agreed planning outlines have not been started within 5 years. Or could you deliver financial penalties if not meeting agreed commitments to build by certain dates. Please protect our greenfield sites. As a peninsula we can all enjoy the beauty and if you managed our budgets better and removed parking fees they could be enjoyed by all. Our planning in Wirral has been a disgrace and once you remove a greenfield site you cannot rectify the damage you have done. Remember you are not just working for Wirral now but for future generations.
DOR01762	Building in relatively green areas such as Irby would ruin the whole area. We moved to Irby recently because of its small village feel, and the fact that it is surrounded by fields, woodland and farmland. Building on these greenbelt sites would ruin the feel of the village, de-value properties in the area, increase congestion and no doubt drive up crime figures in the local area. In my opinion there are numerous sites in more built up and industrial areas such as Birkenhead, which could easily accommodate thousands of new homes. There are currently streets in Birkenhead full of boarded up houses, and numerous areas of wasteland which could also accommodate vast new housing developments. Building in areas such as Birkenhead would be more likely to have a positive impact on the area, rather than negative impacts in areas such as Irby or Heswall, where residents have paid, and continue to pay, a premium for living in such area.
DOR01763	Greenbelt is there for a reason. Not for housing when Birkenhead is full of empty brownfield space.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01764	<p>There are a number of points I'd like to raise:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of properties that require building. I would like to understand how that figure is arrived at and what initiatives are planned to drive that growth. How credible is the target and the logic behind those numbers? 2. Unless I'm mistaken Wirral had a far higher population in the 1980's (340,000) v's the current projected increase (320,000) and did not need to build on these greenfield sites then. I do not understand why Wirral could support that population then but now needs to build on green field sites now. There is a proven record of being able to house more than the target population / household figures within existing land allocation for housing. 3. Assuming the targets for population and household increase are accurate, the council has already approved sufficient housing applications to meet the claimed future demand. The issue is builders / companies are sat on 'land banks' that could and should be used before any green belt land is put at risk. It would seem part of the plan to meet the population and household is about ensuring those approved planning applications are actually executed. In particular one organisation - The Peel Group - appears to have enjoyed significant council support over the years in this area without delivering very much in return. This council appears to be pursuing a strategy of engaging with private companies to deliver services to its residents. If Wirral Council is unable to effectively manage those relationships to deliver on the pledges then that entire strategy is flawed. To be clear Wirral Council does not need to build on green belt land, you need to get organisations to deliver on the pledges they have already made and build on the sites already approved. 4. It is very obvious developers prefer to build on green belt land because it's cheaper and easier for them. What is easy for developers is not necessarily the right thing for the community and people of Wirral. The right thing for Wirral is to repurpose and reuse land that has already been used rather than destroying large parts of the local environment enjoyed by residents and visitors. 5. I understood Wirral was branding itself as a leisure peninsula, a visitor destination, somewhere for healthy activities like cycling, walking, beaches etc....the building on green belt land will detrimentally impact on that positioning. If you want to bring tourism into Wirral you need to protect the environment that attracts visitors in the 1st place. 6. In 2015 the council set out its 2020 vision. A key statement of that vision was to protect the environment for future generations. I would like the council to explain how removing large areas of green belt land is delivering on that pledge. 7. Once green belt land is gone, it is almost never replaced or returned to that state. It is a finite precious resource. Any development or infringement on green belt land should only be an option of last resort. Wirral has great wildlife that needs protection. Once something is gone, it's gone forever. This is not something to gamble with. The environment is already under pressure from exiting industry, farming practices, climate change and so many other things. It feels like those who have a responsibility to protect this area often exploit it for their own ends. This proposal is certainly looking to exploit this natural resource that makes Wirral such a wonderful place to live and visit. 8. I will not vote for any councillor or party that executes this proposal. 9. It is appalling that the council has had so many years to propose and discuss planning options and solutions with residents and is only now, at this very late stage rushed out this 'proposal'. Wirral Council has done the whole community a disservice with leaving so little time for this situation to be properly discussed, reviewed and agreed upon. It doesn't feel like the people of Wirral have been given any credible options.
DOR01765	Wirral council should stand up to local government first and foremost. We are a green peninsula and want to keep it that way. By adding all this unnecessary extra housing on greenbelt not only makes the place a concrete jungle, it also requires large investments in roads, infrastructure, public transport, hospitals, fire brigade etc. We will also see heavy impact on the environment. Finally, the council clearly put all their eggs in one basket by trading exclusively with Peel - a firm notorious for selling hot air. Heavy executive pressure needs to be applied on Peel to deliver. We cannot agree with touching any of the greenbelt. I will personally fight this until the outcome is satisfactory.
DOR01766	Building 1,200 houses year until 2,035 assumes the population of Wirral will increase by at least that number annually. What evidence have you got that the increase is justified?
DOR01767	I very much hope that use of green belt land will be kept to a minimum. If it is used, there need to be homes within the price range of first time buyers and those moving house with a young family who do so for extra space. In West Wirral those people are too often priced out of the market at the expense of executive homes which attract greater profits for builders.
DOR01768	Labour has made a complete mess of the whole situation.
DOR01769	Our green and brown field sites are precious. Many are havens for wildlife. Others are historic sites which are part of the DNA of Wirral. We should treasure our open spaces. Regardless of government imposed targets is there a real and genuine need for so many new homes? If new housing is genuinely needed then the priority should be to restore existing buildings - empty, derelict houses, shops and industrial units and turn them into affordable homes.
DOR01770	There is no need to build on Wirral's precious green belt as there are plenty of brown field alternatives. Building on fields will change the feel and environment of our communities.
DOR01771	It must be a priority to build on brownfield sites. Peel Group must be forced to either meet the amount of houses needed or allow other companies to build. If houses are built in green belt the Wirral will lose its identity. I think that people will move out the area to mid-Cheshire etc. Areas of Birkenhead had hoisting knocked down and cleared for redevelopment streets like Livingstone street. Why are we building on green belt when you can start there?

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01772	SP043 is of Poulton road, Spital. This piece of land should not be touched. This piece of land is used by so many people in so many ways. They use it to walk their dogs, to get away from the stresses of work and life and to be at one with nature. This piece of land is home to thousands of animals. This is an amazing ecosystem that should have money put in it to conserve it not tear it down for extra houses. Many people throughout there life feel a sense of nostalgia and happiness when they walk around here and it would be terrible to take that away from them.
DOR01773	I am opposed to building on greenbelt land and the Government housing targets are overinflated and should be challenged. I want you to prioritise brownfield sites as there are significant brownfield sites available to meet even the overinflated targets. I will take note and won't vote for any councillor who approves building on greenbelt land.
DOR01774	Wirral does need extra housing but greenbelt needs to be preserved at all costs. It's Wirral's attraction. There are adequate sites for housing in Wirral without the need to use green belt land.
DOR01775	Why are vast majority of sights to north side of M53. No government will insist on building on green belt.
DOR01776	Green belt should be protected and only brownfield sites should be used. Any councillor voting for this will NOT be getting my vote. It is an outrageous idea.
DOR01777	I don't think any green belt land - or playing fields - should be used for housing. Existing houses should be used, renovating or rebuilding as necessary and new houses should be on brown field sites only.
DOR01778	If Peel Group holds planning approvals to build 13,500 homes and central government requires Wirral to identify land to allow for 12,000 new homes to be built by 2035, it seems clear that the land has already been identified and pressure must be put on Peel to develop, or hand land over to others who will before any green belt is built on and the benefits of living on the lovely leisure peninsula eroded.
DOR01779	I agree there is need for more housing. I also agree that it would be a shame to lose a lot of Wirral Greenbelt land. However as one of approx 20-30 houses that get flooded on average once a year sometimes more and where Leverhulme Estates whose land the excess water rolls off won't take responsibility, the farmer of Greenhouse Farm won't take responsibility, United Utilities won't take responsibility and neither will Wirral Council. We have been going round in circles trying to get this issue resolved for years! This happens when there is flash flooding. So in this instance, if building houses on the farmers land East of Greasby copse will alleviate this on-going problem? I would be happy for this land to be built on! Some of the people complaining are probably the ones who plough through the huge lake that forms outside my house in their 4x4 and don't give a damn that they are pushing more flood water and raw sewage into my property. So although I agree in principle to not losing all green belt land, if this particular land was built on and stopped this problem which goes down as far as Arrowse Road and affects various properties along the way, I would be happy for this farm land to be built upon!
DOR01780	As a resident of Irby, I am strongly opposed to the building plans for the surrounding areas. Apart from the fact that they will have a massive impact on wildlife, they will also create an enormous amount of congestion in the already congested Irby centre and the schools will struggle to absorb the extra pupils without having a negative impact. Also, Irby is currently a nice place to live for people who actually work for a living we'd appreciate it if it wasn't surrounded by the work shy and other dross. I understand the need for housing, but the planned areas are enormous, if they go ahead, will the estates be spread out with detached houses and include green areas or just the usual tiny houses crammed in?
DOR01781	Need to build on brown sites rather than Green belt. The proposed release of Greenhouse farm (which is currently greenbelt) for development is wrong on a number of fronts: The Copse which forms part of the farm is a site of Special Biological interest. The buzzards which nest in the copse use the main field for feeding. Bats have been seen flying (approx 3 weeks ago) in & out of copse. Drainage is very poor. Very heavy rain storm in recent years from the farm caused flooding down Rigby Drive. There is archaeological interest (Roman Road) on the site as well as megalithical (Items found) interest.
DOR01782	It is a disgrace that Wirral did not create a local plan - which would have enabled it to defend its planning decisions - years ago. The statement of housing need on Wirral is grossly inflated - and both WMBC and the Government are responsible for that. All Wirral's housing needs can and should be met in the Wirral Waters area. It is grotesque that WMBC has created a situation where it has lost control of building in that area and is apparently helpless to influence a situation where 13,521 sites with planning permission have apparently morphed into 2,700. Wirral holds the Green Belt in trust for the whole of Merseyside. Its role is to defend it against developers.
DOR01783	Wirral is not an area of immediate housing crisis, comments straight from the mouth of Sajid Javid. Homes that are needed are affordable, this means under £200,000. Otherwise building homes is simply just to make up the numbers. It is absolutely pointless. Most of the areas of green belt are in the affluent areas of the Wirral, often isolated communities. This proves that this will not be social housing. Furthermore, this will cut off open space and leave areas of woodland isolated, by removing wildlife corridors to build these homes. We must increase our green belt land, not reduce it. Please do what you were elected to do and stand up to central government. There is more than enough space in the proposed 'Wirral Waters' development to satisfy government targets. What makes Wirral a great place to live, is that it is not a concrete jungle. What happens when the next set of housing targets kicks in? Release even more green belt land? Enough is enough. I am willing to volunteer to make suggestions. Another point is only last year were bus services across Wirral cut, how do you expect to build these homes when bus services have been cut? I highly doubt that the level of supported services will increase with these housing targets. The whole concept is an absolute farce. Save Wirral's green belt - once it's gone, it's gone forever.
DOR01784	I'm against the building on green belt as many other sites are available and once gone its gone forever.
DOR01785	Building on land that floods easily, is not a good idea. The land beyond Rigby Drive has flooded many times.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01786	Use brownfield first and check the amount of houses needed, also increase what can be built people don't want huge gardens anymore.
DOR01787	Irby has a lovely semi-rural feel, we love the walks by the anchor, leave the green belt alone once it's gone it's gone.
DOR01788	<p>Objection to Greenbelt Release of SP043 east of Poulton Road. I have been reading through the proposal to release SP043 East of Poulton Road. Firstly I would like to say I don't understand why we need to release any greenbelt on the Wirral and knowing particularly well SP043, object to its inclusion in the proposed release of greenbelt sites. Having reviewed the 'evidence' available I find it deeply concerning that WBC are standing behind 'evidence' that claims to justify a 'need' for an extra 800dpa. ONS data clearly shows an estimate of approx. 10000 increase in population on the Wirral (3%) over the planning period yet the proposed Local Plan using the SHMA is proposing a population increase of over three times (over 10%) ONS evidence? With respect to the SHMA would kindly request that you look again into concerns I have regarding its core 'evidence' and challenge the numbers being used which are creating such a high and unrealistic figure for the Wirral. We must stop the Local Plan in its current form based on a flawed SHMAA. This is within WBC power and ability to do so. Please can you ensure WBC stop using incorrect 'evidence' and commission a SHMAA using the correct information? With respect to SP043, even if there was a 'need' I find its inclusion in any release appalling and in direct conflict with planning rules for the following reasons and request it is removed from the Local Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The site includes Dibben dale Nature reserve. Building on or next to DNR is encroachment and would have a huge impact on DNR. This is against one of the 5 planning rules and must be removed from the Local Plan. • The site includes SSSI status. Again building on or near to the SSSI will be to its detriment. This site and the immediate surrounding area must be protected. WBC own data includes Core Biodiversity Area for over 85% of SP043. • The site is used in part as a farm providing high value Agricultural Land, providing local produce and employment at the farm and shop. This must be retained as it supports local business. • Spital Road and Dibben dale Road are not suitable access to a proposed site for 200 extra houses. One route is particularly dangerous and barely passable in the winter without a 4x4, combined with the very busy Spital crossroads, Site SP043 must be excluded as the increase in traffic at this junction would be dangerous. I object to access to the site being described as 'suitable' it clearly isn't. • SP043 floods, the maps WBC hold also show pockets of flooding. The Fields provide drainage to Dibben dale brook into the Nature reserve by natural means. Building on the fields of SP043 will again have a detrimental impact on DNR and the brook and increase the flooding risk to existing properties and the new ones proposed. I know this for a fact and have evidence of land drains that where included on the site due to the flooding risk, soil condition is clay and SP043 provides a natural drainage function from Raby Mere, Building on SP043 will impact not just SP043, but all off the other environment connected to it. • Local infrastructure is not capable of supporting further development in this area. There is a small doctors surgery, no post office, no local playing fields or parks. Access to and from the site would be by car only. The local school is full. What services will these new residents use? I would be very keen to understand who is making the decision to include SP043 and how it can be that a site such as SP043 can ever find itself on a list of proposed greenbelt sites to be released for development when there are far easier and better alternatives. <p>Having reviewed what is required I understand Council Leader is keen on the idea of a Garden Village. As I said above I do not agree with the 'need' and can see as many others do that the proposed number 800dpa is far too high for the Wirral. However because I have reviewed the 'evidence' I would propose that if you must release greenbelt land you look at releasing the following sites and create a Garden Village away from any existing urban settlements and close to existing infrastructure. The sites that could be released and offer the least impact and best links to existing infrastructure are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • SP068 • SP069 <p>Both of these sites off no impact to high value Agricultural land, no Impact to Bio diversity, No flooding risk and are able to link to the M53 and existing railway. This could be a new Village away from existing urban settlements. Can this be explored before existing residents are again impacted by bad planning and poor judgement in site selection? I would be keen also to know what else can be done to protect sites like SP043. I am very concerned at its inclusion and for the reasons given above request it is removed from the Local Plan. Your support in the matter would be greatly appreciated. I object to the Local plan using greenbelt. Why have you not considered all of the greenbelt in your proposals? Why have you not done as you promised to use brownfield first and develop Birkenhead docks. Why have you not challenged the figures quoted that create the unrealistic demand of 800 houses per year? I strongly oppose this proposal. The Local Plan is flawed as it is based on incorrect information, and does not reflect the true 'need' for housing on the Wirral. There is more than sufficient Brownfield to build all the houses that Wirral actually needs and support the failing Birkenhead town centre. Wirral needs to produce a Local Plan based on facts that best serve the Wirral. The Local Plan MUST use derelict Brownfield and ensure it meets the true need, e.g. Single occupancy houses and affordable family houses, with Businesses close by to provide work. This attack on our Greenbelt is wholly unjustified and ill thought through, There is no infrastructure to support what is proposed, a lot of the sites are next to Ancient Woodlands that provide a habitat for protected species like Bats that are present around the Proposed use of land either side of Poulton Road, Spital. Access to this site is severely limited and one Road is impassable in the winter. Why would sites such as these ever be considered? How Many Empty Properties are there on the Wirral? 6000? These sites need to be brought back into use, before attacking Greenbelt is ever considered. How many Proprieties did Peel state could be built at the Docks? 13000? This must be pushed through at a more sensible figure than is actually needed before Greenbelt is ever considered. How many jobs are there on the Wirral? What 'New' businesses will there that will support all of these proposed extra residents? How has the population of the Wirral changed over the past 20 year? There were more residents 20 years ago than now. How can</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	there be a need now for more houses? How many large employers are there now on the Wirral compared to 20 Years ago? Where are all the extra jobs coming from? How will WBC upgrade / improve and expand the infrastructure needed to support the Local Plan. There is only one Motorway and the A41 that appear to again be taking all of the additional strain this flawed Local Plan proposes by filling up every site between the A41 and the M53. The Local Plan uses false information and baseless assumptions. I do not Support in anyway your proposed Local Plan and will ensure everything is done to Stop it using Greenbelt based on facts rather than the false information it currently uses to underpin it.
DOR01789	Precious green belt land is being taken away changing the landscape and view of the Wirral for future generations. The increase in houses will cause increased demand for schools and amenities, thus putting more demand on current facilities which will likely require more green belt to be removed to cope with the increase in demand. Once some has gone, easy target for more to go, as it appears we don't want to fight for where we live. People view Wirral as a lucky place to live due to our beautiful open spaces; remove it and it won't be anything different to another built up town. Long term planning for future generations need to be considered. Please fight to keep our green belt land.
DOR01790	At NO point should green belt land be built on when we have so much brown belt land and old buildings that should be used. Increasing the local population whilst reduce green space will increase pollution, the current infrastructure for primary / secondary education, health and transport struggles with the current population number, how will this be addressed moving forward? Peel holding where also given planning permission back in 2012 for 13500 homes, while local retail areas are currently struggling to stay open it makes no sense to build new retail areas without ensuring our current areas are utilised and profitable. Peel holding should only be building affordable homes as previously agreed. Our green belt needs protecting for our children future and beyond...don't throw away their future for your own financial short term benefit, because let's face it that's what you're doing! I have no confidence that you will listen or care about what we think but I do live in hope that someone, somewhere does actually care!
DOR01791	Against.
DOR01792	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We have more than enough people living in the borough already. 2. Planning permission has already been given for enough new housing in the dockland area. 3. Green Belt land should not be considered for housing - that's why it was designated in the first place!
DOR01793	At the moment the hysteria about this is out of control. I am very confused about exactly what is happening. Can you explain what you are considering building and where.
DOR01794	I strongly object to all building on green belt. There are plenty of brown sites suitable for building affordable housing on Wirral. I feel that the green belt houses will not be affordable for most people and we will lose our precious countryside.
DOR01795	There is no significant demand in Wirral for this level of development. Not only do we not have the adequate infrastructure to support these new homes in terms of schools and hospitals, most importantly once that green belt land is lost, it's lost forever. I work in a city centre, and my respite from that is walking through these fields with my dog at the weekend. I experience an enormous sense of peace watching the butterflies fluttering out of the long grasses, horses in the distance and the occasional sounds of ducks floating down the stream. Destroying this for row after row of housing that's not required is shameful.
DOR01796	It is clear that houses need to be built but I would question the local plan with respect to the greenbelt areas to be made available. The Wirral is most densely populated where it borders coastline and rivers and as such, these areas are generally the most polluted (air, noise, light) and have the least open green space being enjoyed by the most people. Central Wirral is the least densely populated with and as such is generally the least polluted (air, noise, light) and has the most open green space being enjoyed by fewer people. Making greenbelt available to build on in central areas of the Wirral such as Storeton, Brimstage, Clatterbridge, Thornton Hough and Raby, rather than around the Wirral peninsular coast would ensure a fairer share of the green space on the Wirral remains within reasonable distance of the majority of its residents. Green space is there for us all to enjoy and it is classified as greenbelt to retain its openness and character for the enjoyment of all Wirral residents. The local plan with respect to greenbelt will impact far fewer voting residents if it is confined to the central areas of the Wirral and so should give rise to fewer objections. Has it been considered that this may be an opportunity to create a new town in central Wirral with its own infrastructure and services rather than stretching already stretched existing infrastructure and services on the Wirral? I would also hope that the people making the final decisions on the local plan do so with the sum total of Wirral residents in mind and without bias to the wealthy minority or their own home locations.
DOR01797	The Local Plan is shocking in that it has knee jerked to selling off Green Belt land when there is ample brownfield sites available and being "land banked" by Peel Holdings. If Peel hasn't built any houses in ten years then pressure to do so should be the main initial priority not the selling off of precious green belt areas.
DOR01798	<p>We are concerned to discover the plans to release huge swathes of greenbelt land on the Wirral for potential housing development. We oppose the release of all greenbelt land but that which surrounds Irby in particular, as that's where we live, for the reasons stated below:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Wirral does not require 12,000 new houses. The Wirral is at the top of a small peninsula surrounded on 3 sides by water. Travel links to major employment areas are lengthy and expensive. (Mersey tunnel tolls, motorway congestion into Manchester, no direct train links other than into Liverpool). Employment opportunities on the wirral itself are limited. Therefore people rarely move onto the wirral for employment reasons. Housing needs are well catered for and Borough Council has stated that the wirral is not an area of high housing pressure. 2. Wirral Waters Development has approved planning permission for 13,500 homes. Even if it was agreed that 12,000 new homes were required, outline planning consent was given in 2012 to peel holdings to build 13,500 new homes under the wirral waters development scheme as yet not underway. As we understand it this site has housing zone status making it eligible for millions of pounds worth of government grants. Before any other land is acquired for housing purposes this company should be made to fulfil its obligations or forfeit the land it acquired under false

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>pretences. If Wirral borough council does not have the power to do this, government forces should be prevailed upon. Homeowners have 3 years to act on planning permissions; this company has already had 6 years! Could it be that peel holdings research has revealed that this number of houses are not required on the Wirral or are they just land banking?</p> <p>3. Wirral has 6,000 empty properties. The Wirral has plenty of as yet undeveloped brownfield sites and as we understand it, has 6,000 empty properties. These alone would make up half the proposed number. If the housing needs of Wirral were so desperate then surely these properties would be quick and economic to transform into modern homes without building on greenbelt land. Brownfield sites should always be built on before greenbelt.</p> <p>4. Infrastructure is inadequate. The infrastructure of schools, hospitals, doctors' surgeries, etc is hardly sufficient to cope with the present population and huge housing developments would impact on these already over stretched services. In Irby where we live both primary schools are already oversubscribed.</p> <p>5. Removal of land from greenbelt in the Irby area goes against the 5 express criteria for greenbelt status. As we understand it there are 5 green belt tests which should be applied to any sites before they are removed from green belt status. If any of the sites proposed around the Irby, Pensby and Thingwall area are removed from greenbelt then we will end up with a situation where Irby village is no more! We will be joined up to our neighbours in one huge housing estate losing the character and individual identities of all concerned! Please take note of our views and refuse all changes to greenbelt status on the Wirral Peninsula.</p>
DOR01799	There seems to be no proposed areas south of the M53. As such areas are largely inaccessible to most Wirral residents, and are currently undeveloped, why are they not being considered? Large developments north of the M53 are far more likely to run into opposition due to their greater impact. As it is not the function of local government to minimise the development costs of the private sector the suitability of these areas ought to be reviewed.
DOR01800	As a resident of New Brighton, I comment on this area only. As far as it goes the plan seems reasonable but doesn't go far enough. I know it will upset a few people but I consider the Cricket ground on Rake Lane a huge waste of prime space. There is another ground in Wallasey that could be shared making the Rake Lane site a valuable piece of land ripe for development. I am not anti-sports but consider the amount of time the site is used for activity against the demands for more housing.
DOR01801	I'm appalled by the lack of forethought in terms of using the Wirral's Green Belt land to build housing. There are plenty of Brown Field sites on Wirral to ensure adequate housing for many years to come. The Green Belt land on Wirral is what makes this place such a great place to live. Due to your inadequate planning and lack of forethought this is now in danger. The Green Field sites that have been proposed also won't allow for affordable housing which is what's required. A rethink on what's being considered needs to happen as a matter of urgency to ensure that the Wirral remains a desirable place to live.
DOR01802	Do not build on green belt.
DOR01803	As a lifelong resident of Wirral I know, use and take our visitors to the areas of beauty that we have locally. There are numerous potential brownfield sites for development that I MOST STRONGLY feel should be utilised before the further encroachment onto greenbelt land. PLEASE reconsider unnecessary building on our beautiful open spaces so that nature can be preserved and we can enjoy God's glorious gift to us that otherwise shall be lost forever.
DOR01804	I am extremely concerned and disappointed by these proposals. We are encouraged to "Go Green" and are told that the reduction in Greenland/trees is the reason for the climate change we are experiencing and yet you are proposing to take huge amounts of this away and building on it. Flooding is an issue due to lack of Greenland. Please do not build on our Greenbelt. Please keep it for future generations to benefit from and enjoy.
DOR01805	Please do not let our green areas be ruined by building on them and use brownfield sites only. We live in Irby and it would be awful to see this lovely peaceful village area spoilt by building new homes. It is and should remain a peaceful haven. The surrounding fields have so much wildlife and rare birds. Surely they cannot be evicted? Let our "green and pleasant land" remain and not lose its identity.
DOR01806	I worry about increased traffic, congestion, pollution of the environment. The increase noise levels as well as spoiling the local area where wild life and farms are concerned. Peoples livelihoods will come under threat. I am disappointed to think beautiful areas will just become a sprawling housing mess with lots of disruption to the local residents many who are elderly and just want peace and quiet.
DOR01807	I am saddened and disappointed by these proposals. We are encouraged to "Go Green" and are told that the reduction in Greenland/trees is the reason for the climate change we are experiencing and yet you are proposing to take huge amounts of this away and turn into concreted areas. Flooding is an issue due to lack of Greenland. Please do not build on our Greenbelt. Please for future generations to benefit from and enjoy.
DOR01808	We feel you should focus on sites already earmarked for housing. Not destroying the green belt land that brings so many people pleasure.
DOR01809	As a local resident I disagree with the proposed plans to development of green belt land areas. Redevelopment of existing brown site areas within Wirral is much better. Part of Wirral's appeal is that it offers beautiful areas for local wildlife and plants. These areas around the country are under threat from housing developers.
DOR01810	I object to the use of green belt land being re zoned for housing.
DOR01811	Please don't knock down buildings that are important to Wirral, I can't see why the like of St John's Church Liscard can't be made into flats, it may be a bit more expensive but worth it to keep the history of Wirral, please consider this.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01812	I am writing to express my views, as a Wirral resident, AGAINST the proposal to build new housing on Wirral Green Belt land. I understand the need for meeting a housing target set by Central Government as part of its National Housing Strategy and the National Planning Policy Framework. However, this should not be at the expense of precious Greenbelt Land. Every effort should be done to regenerate brownfield sites such as Wirral Waters and the re-occupation of existing houses offering a total well in excess of the 12,000 homes required by 2035.
DOR01813	Although houses are needed, we have to protect our green areas. We live here because of the natural beauty so please think carefully about where you build. There are some dilapidated lands that could be considered before using the green belt.
DOR01814	I don't see why Wirral council are accepting that Peel Holdings and "Wirral Waters" are only proposing that less than 3,000 homes are built over the 15 year life of the plan. This is a huge "Brownfield" site that is waiting for redevelopment. This alleged regeneration is moving forward painfully slowly if at all and could be one of the biggest cons currently in the country. How long is their plan or is it just pie in the sky? If the Government is proposing that the Wirral needs 10's of thousands of homes before 2035, the demand must be there and therefore Peel should be forced to use their Brownfield sites before any further Greenfield sites are appropriated and lost for ever. It would be scandalous to allow Peel to sit on valuable brownfield sites and do nothing whilst the Wirral loses more of what it is known for, its wide open spaces. These areas are the lungs of the community and are a valuable asset to the whole community. If Peel refuse to bring forward their plans to help the local community, then it must be obvious, that they do not hold Wirral in any regard, and are purely a greedy covetous business that do not care what happens outside the boundaries of their property! The council / government should use powers to obtain the land necessary within the docks area to offer to other developers willing to push forward with the redevelopment sooner rather than later!
DOR01815	I would like to make my opposition known to the destruction of our local green space know to WBC in relation to SP043 East of Poulton Road, Spital.
DOR01816	The council has not fulfilled in its legal obligations for a timely plan and is then trying to suggest that government pressure is causing this need for green belt building. I am not convinced of the numbers of houses being put forward as needed. I am not convinced that suitable brownfield sites could not cope with most (if not all) of the building need. I am not convinced that any of the greenbelt development will be affordable. I am concerned about food security, loss of wildlife habitat, and increased traffic. I will not vote for any councillor who approves any major building on the green belt.
DOR01817	A housing plan should be based on responding to need. So which areas in Wirral have the highest level of need and for what type of housing (affordable family homes, single occupancy flats, hostels for the homeless, higher end properties etc)? So along with an outline of Green belt areas that have potential for housing development there should be information about the type of housing that would be allowed and the infrastructure that would support it. Then an informed choice can be made. It's never going to be popular encroaching on the countryside and brown field sites should always come first. It's an inadequate response to appear to be looking for pockets of land anywhere in Wirral to put new housing on without making clear to the public the rationale behind the selection of these particular pieces of land.
DOR01818	Greenbelt building, particularly on local independent farms, lowers the quality of life for locals and reduces the sense of community in an area. Of course new and affordable homes have to be built somewhere, but quite why that has to be sprawl estates in green spaces remains unclear, and I hope this approach is reconsidered urgently.
DOR01819	Wirral Council have failed the people of Wirral by not carrying out their duties to produce their Local Plan in a timely fashion. Their housing requirements estimates are way, way too high and their prediction of population growth and economic growth on the Wirral peninsula are the stuff of fantasy. Their approach to this is typical of last-minute, haphazard and careless management we see from WBC, time after time. God knows what their priority list is, but is it any surprise the Local Plan is so far behind when Wirral's Children's Services are falling way below par? As a result, I have little confidence in the current Cabinet's ability to progress the Local Plan in a meaningful fashion. The Council Leader is inept on all issues to do with planning and development, relying on his Officer to come up with the figures and soundbites he cannot produce under his own steam. How much more can the Leader put on the shoulders of his Officer before taking some responsibility himself? I apologise if my comments are somewhat vexatious, but I can find little to credit this Cabinet for. If they have an ounce of conscience, they will seriously reassess their previous ideas on Wirral's economic and population growth, delivering a more realistic report based on local historical trends and making allowances for the uncertain future the UK has outside of the EU. The housing figures the Council have accepted are a sure-fire way to lose our Greenbelt and it is up to this Council Cabinet to prove beyond any doubt, that they are not secretly accepting the housing requirement figures as a quick route to building and Council Tax revenue from private residents and business. The overstated theoretical housing Need figures are driving this and must be corrected. All of the local organizations within WMBC area need to work to have this theoretical "housing need" reduced to a number that is appropriate to the WMBC area. We must not fall into the trap of having one area fighting another or one area repulsing their threat to the Green Belt only to see it appear in another area. The Labour Wirral Council has shown with the continuing Hoylake Golf Resort and the Fire Station at Saughall Massie that it will drive through anything it likes. The Wirral is effectively an island, there is no adjacent land West, North or East on that can be swapped to offset loss of the Green Belt. Apparently, CW&C have refused any transfer of housing need. Much of the land is farmland and produces food and we must remember the UK can only produce 50 to 60 per cent of our food needs. (That is before Brexit!) Green spaces reduce carbon dioxide...housing estates create a carbon dioxide. With the issue of climate change highlighted by this summer's temperatures we must preserve all are green spaces. Green spaces play a vital role in the cleaning the atmosphere reducing pollution and it's a threat to health. Four years ago, the Council met the housing need with some 50% excess AND had a draft Local Plan. What happened? We cannot hope for an Andy Burnham to intervene and save the Green Belt. Is this all to support the Council's economic scheme that more houses means more Council tax, being the only proposal this Council seems to have to address the reduction in central government support? What figures did Wirral Council send to the government that has caused the calculation of a theoretical need that is over three times higher for the assessment made in the regional spatial strategy from only a few years ago? Why has the Council selected such a huge area of Greenbelt Land that would with average housing density provide for some 60,000 new homes? Is the Council's need to

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>project highly optimistic figures for economic growth and hence housing need in any way connected with Council Leader's role as the leader for economic regeneration within the Liverpool City Region?</p> <p>These figures would likely have originated with the SHMA report of 2016. Surely up to date figures should be provided that can be used to test whether the optimistic projections are in any way valid? What progress has the Council made in replacing the housing that it cleared under the "pathfinder" scheme over 10 years ago? That the Council could reduce the number of houses without causing a massive, real, housing problem must indicate the wide gap that can exist between the theoretical need from that period and the actual need? The Council's very hurried consultation on its Local Plan, including re-drawing the Green Belt must be a concern for us all. How did the Council review and assess the plots of land as being suitable to take out of the Green Belt? The NPPF, the national planning policy framework stresses that new development must be sustainable. How can the loss of greenbelt/green field land be sustainable given its role in providing food and cleansing the atmosphere? Greenbelt Land exists to support the five purposes: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas; b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. (NPPF JULY 2018) <p>Surely the fifth point, "e", is the most pertinent to the planned urban regeneration of Birkenhead and Wirral waters? The Appeal Court has ruled that to be considered, a development need only be possible, not definitely deliverable. Hence some if not all of Wirral Waters 13,000 units must be considered. Public consensus is clearly commenting that the Council have used optimistic figures for the growth in jobs. This should be proven against actual figures. Some 40% of workers living in WMBC work outside the borough. Any creation of good jobs in the borough would surely attract some of them, without any need for new housing. Housing Need?</p> <p>Wirral has historically had an ageing and declining population. Any new housing must be to meet their needs and housing needs of the young. However, current house prices mean only well off pensioners can move to the area, increasing the massive load on Social Services and the NHS destroying the Council's hoped for increase in net income from more Council Taxes - if WMBC collects them. Peel is the only developers active in the 'Wirral Waters' project. It is very surprising to hear the Council is talking about Peel delivering only just over 1,000 houses during the planning period. I understand Peel has written to all Councillors clarifying that with certain support, they could produce 6,000 houses within the planning period. This would be half the theoretical housing need. One has to ask, why the Council are keeping to this very low figure? The Appeal Court (Lord Justice Lindblom) has ruled that to be considered, a development need only be possible, not definitely deliverable. Hence some, if not all of Wirral Waters 13,000 units must be considered. Whilst I can appreciate that the rules by the government are for new builds only, there must surely be a process to consider: -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> Existing empty houses (6,000) The availability of second-hand homes. The plans to demolish houses by St. James's church. <p>The fact Wirral Council have failed to deliver a satisfactory Local Plan within the required time scale has brought about this 11th hour desperate move.</p> <p>The Council could and should have made a more realistic assessment for housing needs and economic growth and delivered a more factual and representative figure for housing needs in the Borough.</p>
DOR01820	<p>I think that although new housing is obviously good, that the green belt should be preserved at all costs. There are many protected trees, and species within in the areas shown as potential sites. We do not have the right to destroy the essential character of Wirral. There are many brown site areas not shown on the listings published. These must all be used before desecrating the green belt which is essential to Wirral. Wirral green spaces are a major feature of living here. We must save the land and all open spaces for future generations. The number of houses needed has dropped, we need to defend our precious land from developers there's enough brownfield to use.</p>
DOR01821	<p>I am disgusted that anyone can approve building on green belt. I will never vote for a councillor that wants to ruin our beautiful peninsula, once built on there is no going back. There is enough brown belt land and areas that need regeneration this council is not fit for purpose.</p>
DOR01822	<p>Wirral needs to retain its green spaces to avoid our towns and villages merging into one. The road network and infrastructure is already struggling with current demand with traffic coming to a standstill across the borough during peak times and during motorway closures.</p>
DOR01823	<p>Absolutely disgusted with the whole idea of building anything on greenbelt. I cannot see how any level of government thinks that we on our tiny peninsula needs 12000+ more homes - we are a finite space, and from what I can see (e.g. schools closing or merging due to lack of pupils!) the population isn't growing as fast on Wirral as in other places. To build that many homes and lose our green spaces is unthinkable. The pressure on our limited resources would be ridiculous. 1,000 more houses in Irby would be a catastrophe - road chaos (Arrowe Park/Woodchurch Junction is already on the verge of daily gridlock), parking would be impossible thanks to the parking charge debacle, not to mention waiting times for doctors and dentists would increase further, and they are already long enough. These are just the pressures on the human side of things, but let's not forget that building on greenbelt will take away the small amount of greenspace available for wildlife, which in itself is already under tremendous pressure. Farmland birds, many of which are already on the red list, would be the worst hit as building is going to be on fields and farmland. It is, again,</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	unthinkable that this should be allowed to happen when green spaces are already so limited, so precious, and yet so under threat as they are. Soon there will be a point of no return, and if we allow greenbelt to be built on, it will pave the way for more loss of greenbelt, until there is no more and no way back. We have enough brownfield sites on the Wirral to fulfil our actual, realistic housing needs, without needing to resort to destroying greenbelt. And if Peel Holdings make good on their end, we have MORE than enough brownfield land to see us through beyond current housing needs. Also, these greedy developers trying to snatch greenbelt from land owners have no intention of building affordable homes. We have no need more for luxury houses and mansions if anything, we only need affordable housing. Myself, I struggled to get onto the housing ladder, even so I would not sacrifice greenbelt to try to bring down house prices. In reality it's the developers, the estate agents and greedy people pushing up house prices beyond the value of bricks and mortar! Ultimately, however, the problem is too many people, not too few housing, and it's that issue that should be addressed if we are to have any hope of a future for our children and grandchildren. We don't want nor need over 12,000 houses in Wirral to meet population demands as growth in Wirral is nowhere near that high. We definitely don't want nor need to develop on green belt. This all seems to be a way if developers making money out of ruining our natural spaces. Farmland birds in decline, so we should be protecting farm land not building on it. We don't have the infra structure to cope with that many more people. Roads can barely cope as it is, doctors and dentists full to capacity, schools oversubscribed, local amenities stretched. The answer is less people not more houses, certainly not luxury homes only the rich can afford, and at the expense of our green space! Once it's gone its gone! We can never get it back. Affordable homes on brownfield sites? Yes. Luxury properties and Golf Resorts on greenbelt? NO, NO, NO, NO.
DOR01824	We 100% protest the plans to build new houses on green belt sites. If more houses are needed, then put the funds into existing communities where there are empty houses and rejuvenate them. It seems nonsensical to build on the existing green space on the Wirral, we cannot expand....we are a peninsula and a beautiful one at that. We want to keep it that way; green space and villages.
DOR01825	We need to keep greenbelt as greenbelt so we don't over populate areas. We also need greenery rather than living in a concrete jungle. The extra pollution from building sites and extra traffic cannot be taken away if the greenbelt is taken away. As this required to reduce carbon omissions. There has been no additional infrastructure for existing residents or proposed residents. No more schools, doctors, dentists or other facilities are being provided.
DOR01826	DEADLINE APPROACHING! Just a reminder, this survey is due before 3rd September. It's about your thoughts on plans to dig up our greenbelt! I don't think you have to write very much. I suspect it's the number of forms they get which will show strength of feeling. Some suggestions for what to say: You're opposed to building on greenbelt. The Government housing targets are over inflated and can and should be challenged. You want them to prioritise brown field sites as there are significant brownfield sites available to meet even the over inflated targets.
DOR01827	Building on the greenbelt will have an immense negative affect on the character of the area and its current residents. Services and infrastructure in Spital are already stretched and would not cope with the building on the scale that is proposed. People have settled here for its character which will be irreversibly damaged and we will be living in the middle of a town without the facilities. Schools are already oversubscribed and the roads increasingly busy and hazardous. Flora and fauna will be destroyed forever.
DOR01828	I think that taking green belt in totally unreasonable, unnecessary and exceedingly bad for the Wirral. Wirral needs to ensure that the brown field sites such as Wirral waters project is put into effect to actually build all of the housing which has been approved already to actually enhance this area which provides optimal location for access to Liverpool, railways, motorways etc and yet does not have a negative effect on the natural environment.
DOR01829	I am cross with Wirral Borough Council for leaving this important issue until it has to be addressed under pressure. It is important that the peninsular retains green corridors to support wildlife and a pleasant environment. Emphasis should be placed on building affordable housing. It would be better if the proposed housing scheme near the golf resort comprised was affordable housing so that the residents could work at the resort.
DOR01830	Plans to build 4 houses on 93 to 99 Park Rd East. This land is part of the Birkenhead Park and is being used by Hype who has worked hard to make this a lovely area for activities for the children on the Wirral. There are plenty of areas of waste ground that would be more suited for housing. Therefore we object most strongly to the proposal.
DOR01831	In conservation areas you are limited to how many houses can be built, increase that number, they do not need huge gardens. As well as, use brown field sites.
DOR01832	Release of any green belt is entirely unacceptable, especially any land on greenhouse farm, arrowe road. Greasby copse will not be protected for long if houses are built up to the edge of the wood. It is a site of biological interest, grade 2 farmland, it is a site of archaeological interest, and the site also has drainage issues. The cost of providing the substantial infrastructure required would be prohibitive. This is not a high pressure for housing, and scores low on your points system. Stand up to the govt. instead of making a political statement. Releasing green belt would have a devastating effect on local communities and wildlife, and is land which could never be reclaimed.
DOR01833	There are already enough houses in pipeline to be built without resorting to green belt land. Our services are already stretched and would not sustain further population in the area. Brown fields are still available in any event before depriving our community of green areas. Trees not concrete are needed to avoid flooding.
DOR01834	The Green belt is very important to the people of Wirral, and there are many other sites that can be used rather than farmland and open meadows. So please leave it for future generations to enjoy. The Green belt is important to everyone and it's what makes Wirral a nice healthy place to live. So please use the many other sites that are available.
DOR01835	Save our greenbelt, use brownfield sites only, and reclaim/repurpose old buildings. NO new build.
DOR01836	One of the chief glories of Wirral, both for residents and tourists, is the magnificent open land so near the principal urban centres. There is no need to allow development on the Green Belt, and it should not be considered under any circumstances.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01837	I understand that the 12,000 home proposal would far exceed local demographically driven requirements, so how is this target arrived at? If 12,000 is a real requirement, why have the council put enough greenbelt land in the plan to allow about 40,000 average sized homes? The brownfield land owned by Peel Holdings within the Wirral borough would meet the needs of the 12,000 plan. Why is this not the mainstream plan, negating the need to develop on our Greenbelt land.
DOR01838	The council has left it until the last minute to set out their plan proposals. It is very easy to blame the Conservative government, for all the council's issues and I wonder if a Labour government was in power who the council would then blame? Once the green belt land is gone, the Wirral will never get it back. Building on green belt should be an absolute last resort and we should preserve what little we still have left. We used to live in a democracy but I doubt very much the views of the public will be taken into account.
DOR01839	We should fully exploit all Brown field sites before the review of green belt even takes place.
DOR01840	I believe that there should absolutely be a plan to develop brownfield or former industrial sites where possible. There are far too few green spaces on our congested peninsular now and there are lots of unused plots of land that were either factories before or are disused that could be built upon instead of using green belt land. Once our green spaces are gone, they will be lost forever and we should make it our priority to protect them.
DOR01841	'Bringing the countryside to the towns, not the other way around'. The government has told Wirral to provide enough land to build 12,000 houses over 15 years. According to the Wirral Intelligence Service the population of Wirral is forecast to grow by 13,265 over the same period (4.1%). That means each of these new homes would have just 1.1 people in them. That doesn't seem right. Whilst at some stage in the future it may become necessary to build on greenbelt land, this option should only be considered as a very last resort and only when all Brownfield options have been fully utilised. DO NOT underestimate the strength of feeling against building on greenbelt land. At PM's questions on the 20th December the PM stated, in answer to concern by a conservative MP on a proposed development on greenbelt land in his constituency, that " a local council may only alter a greenbelt boundary in exceptional circumstances". Not in a million years could the building of luxury houses on greenbelt land be considered 'exceptional'. It should be the priority of the council to make sure that we bring the countryside to the towns and not the other way around. That we way will stand a chance of keeping our treasured town shopping centres and centres of commerce alive and reduce the amount of travel people need to make to reach them. Indeed, transport hubs are based in town centre areas, again, helping to alleviate the amount of travel people need to make in their cars in already over congested areas. On the subject of transport...and more particularly parking. In Hoylake where I live the council gave approval for the conversion of the disused Presbyterian Church in Alderley Road (SHLAA 1830) into 15 dwellings, without any provision for car parking. This could mean up to 30 extra cars parking in Alderley Road where parking is already at a premium. If this scheme goes ahead in its present form it will only lead to chaos.
DOR01842	If conservation, recreational, parks and walkways are left untouched then a percentage of green belt and redundant farm land should be considered for development in to affordable housing and housing schemes for new home buyers/renters and to support an ageing community.
DOR01843	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> a. The Councils delay in producing a Local Plan has meant there is now a rush to satisfy unrealistic targets and to release Green Belt unnecessarily. b. The Council should be challenging the unrealistic targets. The target figures stem from the Councils own inflated population and economic growth projections c. The Council should be compelling Developers to build on Brownfield sites using powers such as Compulsory Purchase Orders d. There are more than enough Brownfield sites to meet the targets without releasing Green Belt. (especially if the targets are reduced to a more realistic level) e. The Council should be compelling Peel Holdings to build the 13500 homes at Wirral Waters for which it has planning permission since 2012, using Compulsory Purchase Orders if necessary - as per the new National Planning Policy Framework sect 119:" Local planning authorities, and other plan-making bodies, should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, including suitable sites on brownfield registers or held in public ownership, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, where this can help to bring more land forward for meeting development needs and/or secure better development outcomes. f. Wirral Waters has Housing Zone Status which means that it is eligible for £millions of government grants. g. Why are the Council prepared to borrow £26 million (at a reduced rate) to lend to a Developer to build luxury houses for a Golf Resort on Green Belt in Hoylake, but will not borrow money to develop housing on Brownfield sites? Why are the Council prepared to spend £17million on roads for the Golf Resort yet they say they have no money to purchase or redevelop Brownfield sites? h. We need affordable housing not executive housing on green belt i. Rather than using all their power and resources to develop offices and retail in Birkenhead they should be building homes and communities in deprived areas. j. The Council should be following a "Brownfield first" policy and should not release any Green belt land until all the Brownfield has been exhausted and the 6000 empty properties on the Wirral have been brought back in to use. k. The Council have recently appointed a new Corporate Director for Housing and Economic Growth whose wife is the Development and Planning Manager for the Peel Group - is this not a "Conflict of Interest" and how can we be sure that the new Corporate Director is representing the Council's interests when undertaking negotiations with the Peel Group about housing plans for Wirral Waters? l. New studies show that 78% of houses built on Green Belt are not affordable. Developers used Legal Loopholes (viability assessments) to avoid building affordable homes on premium Green Belt sites. We need affordable homes not executive homes. Please ensure you register for the tickets as soon as possible and send in your comments. We need to ensure that the Council know that the people of Wirral will not tolerate Green Belt Development when there are sufficient Brownfield sites available. Save the Green Belt, Once it's gone, it's gone forever.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01844	It is imperative that ALL currently unused and empty properties and brownfield sites are considered for development BEFORE any thought is given to building on the Greenbelt, which is protected for good reasons. The current road set up on Wirral will not support additional housing on the Greenbelt, particularly not on farm land.
DOR01845	We love living in the area that we do because of the green belt land. If these areas are considered for building land it would remove the desirability from the area. I feel it is important to keep the village feel of the areas as it has been historically- building on many of the proposed areas means that our villages will be lost. Green belt land should not be considered as building land - it would affect house prices within the area and I believe there would be a lot of opposition. There are many other disused plots of land that should be considered- not greenbelt. Particularly in the areas such as Mill Hill Rd. and Thingwall Rd, the wildlife and tranquillity of the woods would be adversely affected by building so close. Building around Irby, Heswall, Thingwall, Greasby and Pensby would not particularly be affordable housing, and if it were, it may discourage people from the area.
DOR01846	There is enough brownfield sites, there is NO need to build on Greenfield areas
DOR01847	There is land in the North end that was once a housing estate. Why not rebuild there.
DOR01848	We need affordable homes but we can't have one village 'bleeding' into another which is what will happen. Appleby farm should remain as it gives a great sense of well-being as you approach into Greasby. We will need better amenities for the added population.
DOR01849	We do not need any further housing in Wirral. The population is static or dropping, there is no economic boom to occur, the housing calculation is incorrect and based on government figures due to the councils inability to complete a land survey. The housing need is a creation that gives income to the council. We need our green belt as once destroyed it can never be reclaimed. I have lived on the Wirral all my life and it is now time for the people to have a council it can trust will perform the needs of the population and not its own ineptitude.
DOR01850	I am very concerned that the Wirral will lose its villages. Particularly Irby village. There are already too many people for the services to cope.
DOR01851	No building on Green Belt or open fields.
DOR01852	SP043 is a bad choice for development because: It is working farmland. Vinyard Farm has been there for centuries and contains historical buildings. The land slopes towards and borders Brotherton Park and the Dibbinsdale SSSI. This area of Wirral should be protected and not encroached upon. I fear for pollutants running into the River Dibbin and the woods themselves. By building there it brings Bromborough very close to Spital hence little separation between the towns. Poulton Road is too narrow and 'bendy' to be used as an access route into any new estate in SP043. The only other access will be through the Spital estate. This only has 2 access roads itself. This would cause major traffic delays getting into and out of the estate. There is only 1 primary school on the Spital estate. The nearest is in Stanton Road. These are already subscribed and so I cannot see where families from the new estate would send their children. We need more housing but Wirral's charm is i's green belt. Is there such a demand for 12,000 houses? We have an aging population with the number of people under 49 has been falling since 1996. https://www.wirralintelligenceservice.org/this-is-wirral/wirral-population/population-data/ . Infact the population has been projected to fall. Ethnicity 2015 2020 2025 2030 Change between 2015-2030 Total Population 317,452 316,699 314,439 310,908 -6,544. So it would make more sense to hold off building on the green belt until the brownfield sites are full. By that time we may not have to. Peel Waters have withdrawn their claim of 10000 residences and this has upset the plan. In my view building on farmland should be a last resort. We need food. Build on non-productive land. Force landowners of this land to release it for development.
DOR01853	The proposal to build houses on green belt land in Greasby to the east of Rigby Drive ignores and negates all of the reasons for the existence of the Green Belt. The proposal is on agricultural land and is taking away some of the precious remaining buffers between "villages". Greasby has in the past 30 years contributed more than its fair share to the housing needs of Wirral and this proposal would be devastating to what little remains of its individual nature as a village. The easy option seems to be being pursued here in that there are acres of derelict dock land and industrial estates around the borough that should be redeveloped before precious green belt is sacrificed. The Greasby proposal east of Rigby Drive will place intolerable pressure on local services, schools and doctors surgeries, etc. as well as causing increased traffic problems. Access to the land can only be from the already busy Arrowe Road or the busy and quite narrow Arrowe Brooke Lane or worst of all options, the overused Rigby Drive which would not be wide enough for the increase in traffic, not to mention the danger to children walking to and from the existing three schools at the end of the Drive. The village of Greasby has recently erected signage celebrating the fact that it is one of the earliest settlements in Britain, approx 10500 years old. It contains a site of biological importance and a Mesolithic site and has a heritage as an early Viking settlement. It would be an act of vandalism to further swamp the village with the proposed 500 plus houses that would turn a village which has so much history into just another urban sprawl. I am aware that much of the derelict dockland in the borough is designated for houses but that the owners of the land are dragging their heels in committing to building, perhaps the council would be better employed sorting that mess out before throwing away precious green space. In more general terms, it seems to me that all brown field redevelopment should be seriously investigated before the option of destroying the green belt is considered. The plan strikes me as a panic move to cover up a serious miscalculation on the part of the council. It is telling that Wirral Council seems to be lagging so far behind other councils nationally in formulating a plan for housing, and I believe that council will never be forgiven if this plan to use the green belt ever comes to fruition. People are already asking questions about the council's lack of a proper, sensible plan that utilises all possible redevelopment land before green belt, and are asking if the council itself or its officers are responsible for ignoring the Government's instructions to come up with a proper thought out housing plan.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01854	Building on the green belt will be disastrous for the 'leisure peninsula'. We need green belt to feed the millions more people that will populate these islands. Concrete won't feed them. Water resources will be scarcer too. Wildlife will be decimated. Global warming is happening right now. Pollution will be increased. Traffic is already at a standstill around Arrowe Park/Mill Lane Greasby. The infrastructure will not cope with any more development in this area. Green spaces are imperative for the health and mental well-being of the populace. This is the attraction of living on the Wirral. People will vote with their feet and leave. People who have businesses will leave the area. Jobs will be lost, tourism will be decimated. Schools will be oversubscribed. The Tories and Labour have both made a complete mess of this so I will be urging everyone to vote for the Greens in future. Brownfield sites must be built on. The Peel Ports land should be compulsory purchased. North Birkenhead is derelict. Work needs to start there. Was this delay in providing a housing plan a deliberate strategem to provoke the Tory Government into imposing their will on local issues, therefore alienating those who locally vote Tory? Or was it just incompetence on your part? Either way it's a no win situation for Labour or Tories because our way of life is being threatened and we will fight back. Rest assured.
DOR01855	Completely disagree with building on greenfield sites. Developers will try to cram in as many houses and not take into the local surrounding area. The Wirral has been voted a top destination to live in the UK in the national press. Don't ruin this privilege by allowing our natural beauty to be ruined by profit hungry developers building on green belt.
DOR01856	Could we not develop Birkenhead and New Brighton area's for affordable housing which would be cheaper than west Wirral area's as they would be affordable for first time buyers
DOR01857	The Farce that is Wirral waters needs to be pushed ahead with or the land brought back into public ownership and offered for the housing we allegedly need.
DOR01858	We live on Whitehouse Lane and bought our house here only a few years ago. We purposely moved to Whitehouse Lane from Manchester because we wanted our children to grow up in a rural area. Our surrounding countryside is beautiful and we do not want it ruined. Our value of our houses in this area would go down in value which isn't fair on us! We strongly oppose this plan and will do everything in our power to oppose this horrific plan of ruining our lovely scenic neighbourhood.
DOR01859	As Chairman of the Friends of Dibbinsdale, I have an interest in protecting the environment surrounding the SSSI local nature reserve as well as the reserve itself. I am personally in favour of there being increased housing in Wirral but would wish there to be the right type of housing that meets that need, where those need exists.
DOR01860	What Local Plan? There hasn't been a (published and approved) Local Plan for, at least 14 years. The Government has not demanded that WMBC release Green Belt. It has said that Wirral needs new housing. This is an easy way out and more needs to be done to define what sort of housing and all the associated infrastructure services (roads, schools, social, medical, shops, employment, leisure etc) to say nothing of environmental impacts.
DOR01861	We are currently far too congested. Far too many cars and houses. Lack of green belt and loss of natural habitat for wildlife. Encourage more houses means more hospitals, schools, medical centres. We cannot sustain more houses. Need to build on brownfield sites. There is insufficient land on the Wirral for more housing. Why are we not building on brownfield sites around Tranmere-Birkenhead. What about the implication of more traffic. Will they build more schools???? We do not need more houses we are completely full as it is. Loss of green fields and open spaces.
DOR01862	Where on earth did you get this figure of 12,000 from? The population of Wirral has remained static over the last 15 years and there is absolutely no reason to believe it will grow over the next 15. Any jobs growth forecasts for the next 15 years on which your projections have been based have almost certainly failed to take into account the effect of Brexit - recent Government Impact Assessment show NEGATIVE growth for the North West ranging from -2.5% to -12% neither do they consider the loss of European funding. How long do we think it will be before Peugeot pull the plug on Vauxhall E.P.? Andy Burnham in Manchester has had the common sense to order a review based on lower than expected growth figures. Will Wirral do likewise? The Local Plan proposes building on farm land at a time when the Government is proposing stockpiling food in case of a shortage. Also the amount of land identified for development far exceeds that which will be required even in the worst case scenario - once it is designated as available for development there is no going back - it is lost. What about previous promises the Council has made to protect green spaces - was that just so much hot air? This overall proposal is based on extremely optimistic growth figures and totally unrealistic population growth figures so you need to follow Manchesters lead and do the sums again based on sensible figures. The whole point of this exercise is to BUILD THE HOUSES THAT WILL BE NEEDED not some fictitious quantity. Get Real.
DOR01863	New housing plan should include well-planned and appropriately retained or recreated green spaces to provide health and well-being benefits for residents. Council should implement compulsory purchase of grey land and undeveloped space with existing planning permissions, where no development activity has been undertaken.
DOR01864	What is needed is affordable housing and would think there would be far too few built as house builders want to maximise their profit per acre. I do not believe that the up-front planning to improve infrastructure to cope with extra housing would be done. This would only make what is already a stretched peninsular worse.
DOR01865	I believe that any new residential development should be on brownfield sites or other vacant sites within existing urban areas, of which there seem to many within the Birkenhead area particularly. I consider that release of the large areas of greenbelt for housing would be totally unwarranted given the historic population figures for Wirral which show virtually no overall growth over the last 20 years. The age based changes in population over that period also suggest that the need for housing of larger families is reducing and that there is a need for smaller units housing individuals and couples over 50. On that basis I consider that increased densities of development within existing town boundaries could be positive. Finally, I do believe that release of any greenbelt for housing should take on board sustainability issues, and the limitations of Wirral's highway network. This should mean development within 300 to 400 metres (i.e. walking distance) of a railway hub with a frequent service. In relation to this cannot see any excuse for release of land at the end of Pipers Lane a long distance away from any rail links and a very long walk to any bus service with better than one an hour frequency.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01866	<p>I am very saddened to read the proposed use of green belt land for housing development in Wirral. I have lived in Wirral all of my life and have been fortunate over 40 years and a number of moves to have been able to move from the heavily developed areas into an area boarding on the greenbelt. Remove greenbelt and you remove aspirations for people wanting to bring up families in a good environment. I have two children who also live in Wirral and are keen to remain but do not want to live in a faceless urban sprawl with no boundaries between areas. Yes it is vital that a mixture of good new social housing and private developments are available for young families and the growing population of older people. Looking at the plans/appendices it is difficult to see that all options on the development of brown field sites have been explored. The vast amount of land around the old docks, the waste land near the river in Bromborough and the run down areas of Wallasey and Birkenhead are crying out for investment in housing and better use of the land. After living in both Wallasey and Birkenhead in the past it is easy to see how the deterioration has taken place with a lack of thought in how to develop housing. Have no lessons been learnt in just putting large developments into place without consideration of the chance to have unspoilt areas near to where we live? I have never complained about anything in the past including Council proposals, but the destruction of what I consider to be my home is so unbelievable that I feel I need to object and object in the strongest manner. Once the land is taken it will never return. The green areas of Wirral along with its historical sites are what make it somewhere special. Looking at the proposed plans it appears that someone has just taken a pen and drawn around land without houses or industrial development and said "let's use this".</p>
DOR01867	<p>There seems to be a lot of inactivity with regards to the redevelopment of brown field sites for example around the Birkenhead docks. What happened to all the plans there? Using green belt land is a quick fix and once it is gone, it is gone.</p>
DOR01868	<p>Comments and some opinion on housing policy and needs in the Borough in connection with the preparation of the Local Plan. The former Wirral UDP adopted in February 2000 notes, in paragraph 6.7, that the Government's Strategic Guidance for Merseyside "recognised that there are significant constraints to new housing development in much of Wirral, with its tight Green Belt, extensive areas of good agricultural land and sites of ecological importance." and in para 6.8, that the housing allocations in the UDP "support the wider aims of sustainable development and reduced energy usage in that they concentrate development within the urban area, minimise use of previously undeveloped land and reduce the need for travel." These are sound principles that continue to accord with National Planning Policy Guidance and therefore must not be compromised. Indeed, this strategy has been very successful over the life of the UDP and is to be commended, both for protecting open land within Wirral and in encouraging the redevelopment of brownfield sites, often with good quality and affordable housing, particularly with Birkenhead and Wallasey. The UDP anticipated a need for 10,500 new dwellings (an average building rate of 700 dwellings per annum) over its fifteen year life. This turned out to be a wild overestimate of need. In fact, over the fifteen years from 2000 to 2015 a little less than 5,000 new dwellings (just over 300 a year) were completed in the borough: a little over half the anticipated need and building rate. And over the last five years the average rate of dwelling completions has fallen below 250 dwellings per annum. Evidently the local housebuilding industry does not see a market for any higher rate of housing completions in the Borough. On this basis Wirral is only likely to see between 3,750 and 4,500 dwellings completed (250-300 pa) over the next fifteen years. The housing development target of 12,000 dwellings, set by the Government, is clearly wrong and must be challenged. According to your own SHLAA data there is capacity within Wirral Waters for 13,521 dwellings and, in table 4.2, you identify capacity for a further 7,435 dwellings (Excluding Wirral Waters and Green Belt Sites, etc.). The dangers of releasing more land for development than the housebuilding industry is prepared to develop, are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) It becomes probable that some open land will be needlessly developed whilst; 2) At the same time it becomes more difficult for the Borough to encourage the redevelopment of brownfield sites. <p>If the Borough was experiencing some significant actual or predicted upswing in employment then there might be some justification for increasing the amount of land zoned for housing. However, although the population of Wirral has increased by around +6,100 or +5.2% over the last ten years, employment has increased only marginally (by around +5,000 jobs or +4.5%) over the same period. That is to say, employment has increased at a slower rate than population. The result has been a rise in net outward commuting: a growth in the number of people travelling to work elsewhere (e.g. to Chester and Greater Manchester). That is to say, Wirral is increasingly becoming a dormitory for people working elsewhere, with the result that the need for travel has increased - in direct opposition to the policy of the 2000 UDP. Continuing to build dwellings at a faster rate than employment growth will only exacerbate this problem.</p> <p>In summary: The principle of supporting sustainable development by concentrating development within the existing urban area and minimising the use of previously undeveloped land is sound and must continue. The Government target of 12,000 new homes is wrong and must be rejected. A target of 3,750 and 4,500 is much more realistic. The Borough has more than sufficient land within the existing urban area to meet this target (and indeed to meet the Government target). The dangers of releasing too much land are that the open land is unnecessarily lost to development, brownfields remain undeveloped and need for travel is increased: all of which contravenes national planning policy guidance and Wirral MBC's own stated goals.</p>
DOR01869	<p>Response to Council consultation on releasing green belt land for development I am resolutely opposed to any building on Wirral's green belt for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Wirral Plan has projected the need for between 15,750 and 22,230 additional homes need to be provided in Wirral between 2014 and 2032; and between 19,665 and 27,255 additional homes between 2014 and 2037. These are very high estimates (apparently arrived at because of representations to the Council) - as many comments to the 2016 SHLAA noted. In a study done in 2018 by [another respondent], projected growth in population was identified to be nearer to 280 people per annum, and not the 800+ per annum identified by the Government. The target figures stem from the Councils own inflated population and economic growth projections, therefore it would be a straightforward matter to correct them. The Council could also challenge robustly, the nature of the housing need in Wirral. At present, many families are struggling on low waged jobs, and are unable to consider buying a house. If there is an economic downturn after Brexit as expected, there is likely to be even less demand for new housing. The overriding need is in the affordable social rented sector, and not homes to buy. New studies show that 78% of houses built on Green Belt are not affordable. Developers used Legal Loopholes (viability assessments) to avoid building affordable homes on premium Green Belt sites. The Council could be campaigning for housing to be made available via refurbishment and renovation of empty and unused domestic and commercial properties. My fear is that the Housing White Paper is for the benefit of the

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>politicians, land speculators and property developers, and not for the benefit of the people of Wirral. Instead of doing the Tory Government's dirty work, the Council could be challenging these unrealistic targets, and the argument that only new build will meet Wirral's housing needs.</p> <p>2. Wirral has existing planning consent for 16,000 homes on brownfield sites; more than enough Brownfield sites to meet the targets without releasing Green Belt (especially if the targets are reduced to a more realistic level) the Council should be compelling Peel Holdings to build the 13500 homes at Wirral Waters for which it has planning permission since 2012, using Compulsory Purchase Orders if necessary - as per the new National Planning Policy Framework sect 119:" Local planning authorities, and other plan-making bodies, should take a proactive role in identifying and helping to bring forward land that may be suitable for meeting development needs, including suitable sites on brownfield registers or held in public ownership, using the full range of powers available to them. This should include identifying opportunities to facilitate land assembly, supported where necessary by compulsory purchase powers, where this can help to bring more land forward for meeting development needs and/or secure better development outcomes." Wirral Waters has Housing Zone Status which means that it is eligible for £millions of government grants. The Council should be following a "Brownfield first" policy and should not release any Green belt land until all the Brownfield has been exhausted and the 6000 empty properties on the Wirral have been brought back in to use</p> <p>3. Existing greenbelt in Wirral is there to fulfil the 5 principles of green belt</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another • To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment; • To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns; and • To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land (NPPF paragraph 80). <p>Taking even one area of green belt for building on immediately negates the purpose for which it was designated i.e. the above.</p>
DOR01870	Greenbelt is designated as such for a good reason, and should be preserved at almost any cost. Only once ALL brownfield sites have been redeveloped (and proven to have been) should greenbelt use be considered, and even only if there is a clear and demonstrable need - never just to provide cheap land for developers.
DOR01871	I didn't agree with building on green belt. There isn't enough infrastructure for that many houses, if you build them. They should not be for sale they should be council houses.
DOR01872	It is a real concern to me and my family; it will change the village feel of our area, affect wildlife and increase traffic which is already an issue on the main road on which I live. There are far more appropriate sites to build on.
DOR01873	Use brownbelt land & existing empty housing as a priority.
DOR01874	I am a firm believer in building more homes, but not at the expense of the nature and wild life. I am sure there are many areas that could be developed eg brown field sites. I also worry that Irby does not have the infrastructure to cope with more people living in the area eg a rubbish bus service. There are also very little jobs/employers in the local area!
DOR01875	There should be no building on greenbelt. There are plenty of brownfield sites across Wirral and you should be pressing ahead with Wirral Waters instead of looking at other sites.
DOR01876	I am very proud to live on a Wirral - The Leisure Peninsula. The perfect balance between town and country. The local plan for the Wirral should not undermine this. The local plan should focus on real population estimates, and on using brownfield sites first. The plan should include working with Property Developers who are "land sitting" on brownfield sites need to lake them build housing in line with the regions requirements. I am wholly against building on green belt land in any form. Taking away green belt land will result in urban spread and removal of stunning leisure areas reducing the places where Local residents walk their dogs, teach their children to ride bikes, spend quality times with families etc. The result of any building on green belt will result in a less desirable place to live and is highly unlikely to result in affordable housing.
DOR01877	I think it's disgusting that green belt is being used for housing and a possible golf course. There are more than enough brown field sites that can be used all across Cheshire and Wirral. Another golf course close to West Kirby is also a disgusting waste of green belt. We live in an area where huge numbers of birds live, breed and spend the winter. These sites should be protected not used for housing or leisure.
DOR01878	No consideration seems to have been given to the effects of climate change and the reduction of farming/food production when reducing the green belt and increasing human habitation on the peninsular.
DOR01879	I am against the plans to build on green belt land in the Irby area. We regularly walk in the woodland there, but I feel the developments would threaten local wildlife. My little boy is due to start school this year and I believe the school is already oversubscribed. I do not feel the schools have capacity for more students. In my opinion following through with these plans would ruin the village completely.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01880	<p>I think many people in the borough have become anti-development and I feel this is with good reason. There are very good examples of new housing/mixed use developments nationally (e.g. Accordia, Lilac Grove, Leeds and Abode, Great Kneighton), yet it seems that they are a minority. There are some fantastic developments on the Wirral too but these are often only one or a small number of houses. It would be nice to see this quality extended to larger schemes. I feel that we are stuck in the past in terms of how residential developments are designed and the general layouts of these. I would have a less of an issue with land, including green belt (where appropriate) being developed if it was going to be high class. I often find myself looking at period properties and thinking why is it that we can't achieve the same quality of housing and place making today and what will large swathes of the country's residential areas look like in many years to come? I think the reason that so many people are against development simply comes down to the quality of developments; from architectural style, lack of quality materials and vegetation, poor streetscape design and the general layout of sites. I have set out more specific points under the headings below:</p> <p>QUALITY OF MATERIALS:- Poor quality materials means that as time that goes by since a development was built it starts to look poor quickly, I have seen this with certain types of cladding and cheap materials generally. This also comes down to maintenance by homeowners too, but if we start with something better it will wear better for longer.</p> <p>ARCHITECTURAL STYLES:- So many schemes are built where the style of housing used is just the same as many other sites all over the Wirral and nationwide, there are no bespoke elements to them, nothing that gives a place a soul, character or a sense of place that reflects the local area or vernacular. It is interesting to see examples in Europe that are trying to get away from common types of development such as in Almere, Netherlands (REF: https://www.theguardian.com/housing-network/2015/dec/15/almere-dutch-city-alternative-housing-custom-build). Here they are pioneering a new approach to large scale house building. The idea of a new garden village as discussed by [the Council Leader] in Wirral View could be fantastic but only if a more radical approach is taken.</p> <p>LAYOUT:- Numerous schemes display peculiar layouts, they seem haphazard in their arrangement of winding roads and cul-de-sacs that don't appear to relate to anything with no hierarchy to roads/routes. I think that simplicity here is key, some of the best housing in the Wirral are the older streets, they are simpler in their arrangements with clear routes and focal points. It is clear that the quantity of dwellings is often a priority over layout too. Houses are packed so tightly together, I'd rather see a little more land used to achieve better masterplanning solutions where densities are concerned.</p> <p>STREETSCAPE DESIGN:- It feels like this is something that is often overlooked, the appearance of a street is important in creating continuity and an attractive development. Simple things like creating proper boundaries to frontages i.e. brick walls and hedging, not using cheap fencing or simply running grass or the same old shrub planting up to pavements that only becomes untidy when not maintained by owners.</p> <p>LANDSCAPE:- Time and time again you see new developments pop up and they are just a mass of bricks, the landscape seems to be an afterthought. "Where are the trees?", is something I often find myself thinking, if they are planted they are small and over little impact for years. When I pass through some areas of housing that were built in the latter part of the 1900s it is clear nobody thought about this, there is barely a tree in sight, nothing to punctuate or break up the mass of bricks and mortar. It is not just trees either, it is the public open space within developments too and how these are treated from a landscape point of view. I understand the consultation period on the contents of the proposed Residential Development SPD currently being prepared by the council is over but I hope that this will provide strong guidance on these issues and help to strive for more quality development from both designers and developers. My final point relates to the protection of places, particularly their features, once they have been built. Conservation areas have strict planning policies over what can be done to the exterior of a property and its frontage generally. It is a shame that so many other neighbourhoods aren't offered the same protection. I've seen beautiful Victorian properties ruined by being covered pebble dash, without any regard to feature brickwork. There is nothing wrong with it as a material, but it should be used where appropriate. Similarly, bespoke boundary walls are knocked down and replaced with ugly fencing or rendered over; front gardens are ripped out and covered in an array of paving types. The more people that do this kind of thing the more the continuity of the street begins to fade, it looks untidy, chaotic, and all together a less appealing place to live. It would be nice to see stricter policies in place to prevent this happening.</p>
DOR01881	I'm sure my comments will echo most, please do not take our green spaces. Utilise all the unused building and derelict factories. There is so much potential there and I know good can come of that, but little can come from taking natural habitats and our vital green space.
DOR01882	Whilst it is important to build new houses for people to live in, removing active farm land hurts local business and economy as well as quality of life for local people.
DOR01883	I know Wirral Borough Council is struggling for funds, but the knee jerk reaction to sell off Green belt as a 'Quick fix' is a crazy one! Once it's gone its gone!!!
DOR01884	I would rather the council keep the greenbelt areas as greenbelt. I oppose the building on the greenbelt areas - in particular the area surrounding Storeton Woods
DOR01885	I am absolutely horrified to see that the Council is considering looking at Green Belt land as part of this proposal. There are swathes of unused industrial land across the Wirral that could be utilised and would maintain the green and open space that is one of the main attractions of our peninsula. I suspect it is far easier to consider Green Belt Land but it is not right to take the easy (or lazy) route with an issue like this. I cannot believe that there is no significant development planned for the docks that have been sitting idle since my childhood. I don't want to use the word incompetent as it is rather inflammatory but it is the word that comes to mind when the suggestion of using Green Belt land comes up.
DOR01886	It seems pretty clear to me that all opportunities for developing brownfield sites should be progressed before the exploitation of the Green Belt should even be considered. If Peel Holdings are not moving quickly enough, then allocate the land to someone else.
DOR01887	I think it would be sensible to re-review the quantity of housing perceived to be required. This may well have been exaggerated. There should be no reason to use green-belt land; development should be restricted to genuinely brown-field sites with the priority of all development (ie what is planned to be undertaken first) being to improve the appearance of our Council area.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01888	The council should not in general consider building on the Green Belt. There are large areas of brownfield sites which should be developed, particularly those already with planning consent such as Wirral Waters. Developing brownfield sites enhances the environment, making Wirral a more pleasant place to live and work. Developing Green Belt has the opposite effect.
DOR01889	We do not want more housing surrounding Irby village. It's already badly congested with both people and vehicles.
DOR01890	Cutting down green belt to make room for houses is entirely unnecessary. There are plenty of places across the country to house people that do not require the destruction of green belts and our historic towns. This feels like an unnecessary step taken by government to allow blanket house building in the interest of fairness when these houses could be built elsewhere or outside of green belt areas. It is not necessary to modify the Wirral in this way. It is not that Wirral council is doing anything wrong, but this should be challenged at the highest levels to reduce the requirements here and keep the greenbelt areas we all hold dear.
DOR01891	People struggle to buy houses on Wirral due to the value and desirability. The release of greenbelt will anger residents as cheap houses will be built wrecking people's views and spoilt with cheap housing estates.
DOR01892	Brownfield first focusing on Birkenhead and the dock areas.
DOR01893	I strongly object to the Council plans to allow housing development on selected Green Belt Land, there are plenty of Brown Field sites available across Wirral that could be cleaned up and used for housing. Using Green Belt is a lazy, cheaper solution and is depriving future generations use of recreational areas, which are an essential and attractive part of the Wirral way of life!
DOR01894	Before destroying forever our countryside every brownfield site should be considered for development for housing.
DOR01895	No circumstances have been identified to warrant the council proposals. We have enough empty houses, brownfield sites (Peel holdings having been given pp for 1,000's of properties) and Levers being currently up for sale to satisfy the declining population of Wirral. How many properties has WBC given Peel holdings planning permission to build?
DOR01896	The plans show a number of proposed 'greenbelt' sites more or less surrounding Garden Hey Road and further afield across to Greasby. Garden Hey Road is unsuitable for any further development as it is a narrow lane and struggles to handle existing traffic. It is currently poorly maintained and dangerous for motorists, cyclists and pedestrians alike; further development would exacerbate these problems. Furthermore, the main roads to either end of Garden Hey are themselves congested, especially at rush hour. In addition, development of the proposed sites would completely destroy the village feel of what is, after all, a conservation area which has already been scarred by the new Fire Station currently being constructed.
DOR01897	There are several houses in our area that have been empty for over 12 months can't the owners be encouraged to sell. There are small plots of brown field available as well.
DOR01898	Greenfields are set aside for very good reason they must not be encroached upon. The priority is clearly for affordable housing this will be most easily achieved on brownfields sites of which Wirral has many. Only when all available brownfield sites have been built upon should greenfields be considered.
DOR01899	I am strongly opposed to the release of any greenbelt land on the Wirral. I do not believe that there are any exceptional circumstances which justify the release of greenbelt especially in view of the proposed development at Wirral Waters. I will set out my detailed position in an email to my local councillor.
DOR01900	I see no housing crisis in Wirral and presumably the council and housing association still demolishing housing suggests that too. There is an urgent need for regeneration particularly in Birkenhead and Wallasey. Allowing high density, high quality, affordable homes to be built on the north end wasteland (destroyed by the council) and the empty shopping areas would be an obvious place to start. A clearly stated apology from the council for wasting 13 years and not producing a plan until forced to do so is also a prerequisite.
DOR01901	I have looked at the plan and it includes development of farmland behind our home in Brookhurst Road. The drawing includes part of our land as the boundaries of our properties run to the Dibbin Brook. I assume that your undertaking to exclude the Plymyard Dale will preclude building on my garden, but the red lined area on your consultation map includes my garden and those of my neighbours. The boundary for any proposed development should be the west side of Plymyard Dale.
DOR01902	I object to developing any greenbelt SP043, Lancelyn farm and the land around Spital is a SSSI, houses grade II listed building and is of great archaeological importance. It is biodiverse and high value agricultural land that stops Bromborough and Spital merging.
DOR01903	To consider building on green belt land is ridiculous. There are plenty of brown field site that can be developed first, especially the Peel Holdings site. The council need to get a grip with them and make them build what they have proposed. The council have published the 5 green belt tests and have completely ignored them if you look at the proposed sites. One of the tests is to prevent neighbouring towns merging. If building goes ahead on some of the sites they propose then many villages WILL merge into one. Also there will not be enough schools doctors dentists etc to cope with this sort of expansion. Wirral is a peninsular and therefore cannot expand beyond the river boundaries so do the council really want to turn this green and pleasant place where many people come to relax and enjoy the outdoors into a giant concrete blot on the map. Mental health institutes constantly tell us that being out in open spaces walking and being with nature aids our mental health. Take our green belt away and I am sure that there will be many more people suffering with mental health issues. It would be nice to think that the council will listen to people's views and not be bullied by those who live down south and have no knowledge of the Wirral and the way it works and that they will stand up to protect our green belt, as once it's gone it will never return.
DOR01904	I don't believe that we need greenbelt to be used for housing.
DOR01905	Whilst I understand there is a need for housing, especially affordable/social housing I think that brown fill sites should be used first. Our green spaces are disappearing, once built on there is no turning back. The Wirral is a very special place to live because of the green belts being protected.
DOR01906	I value the green space in my community and am against development in the Greasby, Irby and Frankby areas.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01907	Why are you threatening to destroy the stunning areas of green belt we have in Irby with hundreds of houses that could easily be built elsewhere on brownland? You will ruin the village life and wreck the lives of the residents most of whom have worked long and hard to afford houses in such a stunning place, build on the empty land by the Mersey, stop giving me sleepless nights worrying about losing thousands off the value of my home.
DOR01908	Don't Peel Holdings have the sites available to meet the target in the time frame available, presumably using brownfield sites? Why should they be allowed to get away with holding back usable sites to the detriment of our Green Belt Land? We need to ask in what way they are benefitting in this way against our loss.
DOR01909	To destroy the very fabric of this beautiful peninsula by building on our precious and protected Green Belt land would be sacrilege. What kind of legacy would it be for future generations, to know that this Council voted against the wishes of the people and destroyed the heritage? Planning permissions granted to Peel Holdings alone cover most of the required housing figures (which, by the way need to be challenged!) and the use of existing brownfield sites NEED to be used INSTEAD OF (nor simply "before") using Green Belt land. Part of Wirral's beauty and uniqueness is the space between most towns, protected by Green Belt, which could be significantly reduced if building on Green Belt were to be approved. The people of Wirral are watching carefully and any Councillor who votes to build on any piece of Green Belt land can be sure of losing huge numbers of votes in any future election. PLEASE do what you know is right, to protect the heritage of this beautiful peninsula, if not for this generation, but for the sake of YOUR children and Grandchildren. Once it is gone, it's gone for ever and you would never be forgiven.
DOR01910	Any developments must take into account the impact of lack of primary schools in certain parts. Access roads must connect efficiently to main route and take into account of current traffic demands and impact this is not done efficiently often enough. It is not enough to think it is ok to whack a set of traffic lights and say 'yay done' the impact in our area has been a nightmare on A41 on King Hill and the altered A41 Port Sunlight roundabout has been disastrous. The quality of new build house in the UK is appalling and vastly overpriced. The commercial builders are not accountable for the rubbish buyers have to put up with. Our family speak from experience. Compensation for existing home owners who put up with having their homes impacted of loss of environment and also whilst builders go about their business. Wirral's lack of plan is down to the council not having one and this has resulted in building work being appealed and council loosing cases because of your lack of plan. So in truth I really don't mind if Wirral council or the government make the decision as Wirral Council haven't done a very good job to be honest over the last 30 years. Sorry, but I love Wirral but you the council have repeatedly let us down.
DOR01911	Although I recognise the need to provide affordable housing within the area I am concerned about the amount of green belt land which will be lost and the obvious difficulties which will be caused by the extra traffic in the Spital area on roads which are already congested and subject to frequent accidents.
DOR01912	There are plenty of empty houses and brown belt land that should be utilised before using green belt.
DOR01913	Would any councillor/ politician like houses built next to their property if backed into green belt? Property prices fall....Resentment builds....Why ruin beautiful tourist attracting countryside and destroy wildlife? Spend on run down unoccupied already built up areas. Obviously!
DOR01914	Please save the Greenbelt/Greenfield sites from houses being built on them especially along Lever Causeway and Chester High Road. There appear to be enough Brownfield sites on Wirral to build 18000 new houses on. The beautiful Wirral Peninsula must be allowed to retain its existing Greenbelt land for future generations to enjoy as much as we have.
DOR01915	I understand the need for development in the green belt. The brownfield land along Wirral's east coast isn't feasible for development due to the high costs of build and low resale values. A plan that expects the housing requirement to be fulfilled by development in these areas is simply wishful thinking - the fact peel did not deliver a single unit for their consented land demonstrated this. Developers will not develop on areas where build costs outweigh resale prices...! West Wirral's undeveloped land is almost entirely green belt, and therefore relaxing the green belt in certain areas is essential for the proliferation of this premium area.
DOR01916	[SAME AS DOR01843]
DOR01917	I am astounded that Wirral Council is not proposing another attack on our green spaces. This is both unnecessary and unwarranted. How about you focus development elsewhere that actually needs it, instead of trying again, to get your greedy fat cat hands on land which is protected and should stay as such. The residents of Wirral will fight this, just like we fought you on your dog ban plans. You're a disgrace and I can't wait for the local elections to force you lot out.
DOR01918	SP062 - The area of land to the West of Barnston Village, immediately to the rear of Napps Way, has been previously identified as top grade agricultural land. In addition it provides a small segregation between the historic and protected Barnston Village and the Eastern side of Heswall and Pensby. Part of the rationale between previous green belt planning has been to ensure that villages are not absorbed by sprawl and towns do not become merged. There is no local demand for a large number of properties to be built in this area. Furthermore, there is not the local infrastructure in terms of schools and services in place to support a large development. I think it is outrageous that this area of landmark should be considered for release from the green belt. Doing so goes against all previous policy rationale and serves to deprive the locality of some of its prime agricultural land whilst lining the pockets of developers and landowners. In summary, given the quality of the land for agriculture, its proximity to the historic and protected Barnston village and the impact it will have on the properties immediately surrounding the land I would like my objection to releasing this land to be noted. Such areas of land should be the very final parts of the green belt to be released.
DOR01919	These plans are crazy. Areas involved would be ruined, as would the wildlife and environment. The prices the houses would achieve unaffordable to most if in keeping with the area. Immoral to ruin our beautiful peninsula when we could redevelop Birkenhead and Wallasey to make them great towns to live and work in.
DOR01920	Green Belt land should not be used for housing. There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01921	New homes are important. The protection of green belt is very important for many reasons- as a place to maintain wildlife environments; as green breathing spaces between towns and villages and as places for leisure. Old housing should be renovated and utilised before using brown field sites. Housing should reflect need not to be seen as an opportunity for more expensive housing with greater council tax returns. The proposed golf centre should be abandoned.
DOR01922	Please use all possible brown belt sites and empty properties. I do not believe there are not enough areas ripe for redevelopment. What are Peel Holdings doing with the land they acquired?
DOR01923	There needs to be more focus on brownfield sites, Wirral Waters needs to be accelerated and improved transport links. Green belt should only be touch when all currently viable brownfield sites have been exhausted.
DOR01924	Local infrastructure not sufficient to support the plans - schools, roads, GP access. Distinction of villages needs to be retained in the plans.
DOR01925	I have read that peel holdings are land banking and have been for over 10 years, I thought the government were bringing something in to stop this happening? Why not CPO the land and build the housing that is needed? We all know that developers want to build in areas that they can make a huge profit and pay the government off on the percentage of affordable housing. What makes parts of the Wirral such a beautiful place to live is it's Greenbelt and we need to protect this otherwise it will become a free for all. You will be selling off the parks (that nobody uses because of the PSO) next!
DOR01926	There is plenty of other land besides greenbelt land that could be used for building houses. One thing that makes Wirral a beautiful place to live is our greenbelt land.
DOR01927	Brown field sites should actually be developed before green belt land is even considered. Once the green belt is gone it is gone forever so it should be protected. It should be worked out what sort of housing is needed - if most of the 12000 needs to be affordable then planning should only be agreed for that type of property not just a token amount to please the developers. This shouldn't be an excuse for green belt land to be destroyed to build lots of expensive detached houses which the Wirral certainly isn't short of.
DOR01928	Surely building up would save our green places but also increase housing.
DOR01929	Disgusted by the amount of green belt proposed for building. Will ruin the character of the Wirral. How will schools, doctors and roads cope?
DOR01930	SPO43 East of Poulton Road, Spital. I strongly oppose to my local greenbelt being approved for a housing development. This is the only area for me and my young family to play and enjoy the wildlife. We don't have any local parks in Spital, so this is the only area within walking distance for us to enjoy. If we lose this area to development we would be forced to use the car for what is at the moment a very pleasurable & simple nature walk, on our doorstep. I spent my childhood playing in the nature reserve and would love my children to do so.
DOR01931	I agree more houses must be built but they need to be affordable and invest into transport infrastructure to cope with extra people.
DOR01932	I'm concerned that this plan doesn't seem to take into consideration the need for smaller, affordable housing. It seems that the cheaper option is being exploited before the better redevelopment options can be explored.
DOR01933	Do not build on green belt land. Do all you can to protect it and redevelop run down areas, derelict housing and former business sites instead.
DOR01934	Expanding building land at the proposed rate is not sustainable. Within a few short years, there will be no green spaces left and we will be living in towns which border towns with no recreational areas. Continued development will also destroy our local wildlife....who would be left without habitats. Firstly, I believe that more emphasis should be placed upon education - ensuring that people understand that it is not viable for the human race to continually expand. Young people should be educated to consider delaying childbirth, and also to limiting the number of children that they have, to ensure that there will be adequate housing and food available and to limit our effects on global warming and damaging the planet and its other inhabitants. Secondly, I believe that the council should focus their building sites on areas which have previously been developed but which have fallen into disrepair. There are numerous examples of rows or blocks of houses which have been demolished- within Birkenhead and Wallasey regions- which have been allowed to grass over. It is stupid to convert houses into patches of grass within built up areas and to simultaneously destroy fields with vibrant animal life within them on green belt land. Furthermore, there are large areas of land which have been concreted along Wallasey and Birkenhead docks, which have not been used for years. Surely this land should be utilised before green belt? Finally, in an attempt to reduce the negative impact of building on the environment, Wirral council should consider building multi storey homes so that housing targets can be met without destroying more land than necessary. There is also concern that there will be no regulation upon the type of houses that will be built and that house prices will remain too high for younger generations to be able to purchase them.
DOR01935	Not happy at all that the green belt land is being considered. Green belt is meant to stay untouched. The residents of Irby live here for the green belt land and feel that we are not being considered at all by the council. The council should not be able to just overturn the status of this land without a full vote of the residents and public (not MPs). There must be other land available and brown belt land etc. Please do not spoil our countryside there will be nothing left otherwise.
DOR01936	Please make Peel Holdings build the houses they promised when they were sold the land cheaply. No houses have been built. Please do not go for the easy option of giving up our precious green belt. Use brownfield sites and upgrade existing poor houses.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01937	There are many brown field and derelict areas in Wirral that could be transformed into areas suitable for housing. It is shameful to build homes on green belt land which is already diminishing in acreage. Also Wirral council should put all its available cash into council housing at affordable rents before investing in other schemes. It should be their top priority to ensure that every person living in Wirral has decent affordable public housing if they require it. I have no idea and dread to imagine what the council is paying out in housing benefit to subsidise the lifestyles of private landlords who charge much higher rents than the council would have done in the past.
DOR01938	I agree yes we need more housing, but I feel that taking away our green belt land will be bad for the local community, who use it to relax, being healthy. Needing to get away from the busy roads. These places are needed for our children to get fresh air, to help lower the obesity issues. These fields are used by all generations, some who possibly don't walk far or have cars, to meet others and to help with loneliness. Take this away, people will either have to travel on our already busy roads out to other open spaces or people won't bother to go out especially the elderly who require friendship. Meeting people while out walking in pleasant surrounding safe from vehicles. I cannot understand why land cannot be found from disused buildings and derelict areas and make these areas nicer rather than taking land that is used by all!
DOR01939	[SAME AS DOR01391] [SAME AS DOR0770]
DOR01940	I have reviewed the west Kirby sites for housing and do not feel that the sites selected are a sensible choice. Grange Road is already a busy road that would not cope with additional traffic well. It would make getting into and leaving West Kirby more difficult and therefore significantly affect local business. The picturesque views upon entering west Kirby would also be spoilt. I have significant concerns about the potential areas chosen. I also do not feel additional housing is required here despite the government "directive".
DOR01941	No to Green Belt development in Spital. Redevelop empty properties and derelict property in other sites or use brown belt.
DOR01942	There is enough empty housing on the Wirral, destroying the green belt when there are empty houses sitting everywhere (why is the council not buying them from the landlords or forcing the landlords to actually rent them instead of keeping them empty? I lived next door to an empty house with no front door on it for 6 months. Destroying the green belt would be a travesty.
DOR01943	Having moved to the Wirral from the overcrowded and under resourced South East where there are far too many properties and people than can be supported by local services and infrastructure, the Wirral was a real breath of fresh air. I find this proposal to build on Greenbelt land something that will end in huge problems for the Wirral as has been seen in the South East. There is a lot of housing and buildings already here that could be renovated and re-used on the Wirral without decimating the countryside. Hundreds of school children are eating packed lunches in the Wirral during the summer holidays provided by private citizens like myself, because the Council is under resourced to provide those in poverty with adequate help. Rather than waste money on hugely expensive consultation processes, how about you make some of the existing housing more habitable for those in need. Locate areas of old buildings that can be demolished to build new or renovate structurally sound buildings that are close to existing infrastructure and resources. In these times of greening public policy is it not ironic that you wish to build on and destroy Greenbelt land and kill plant life and wildlife in the process? Please learn from the debacle of London and Brighton and keep the Wirral a haven for green spaces. Spend the money on those who require it now rather than on those whom you may attract to the area by building new housing that those already living here, in poverty, could never afford in any event.
DOR01944	Greenbelt is important for humans and animals. We need to build on brownfield sites. According to Wirral Council there are 1,250 empty homes - let's get those back into use. Building on Greenbelt land contravenes the Wirral 2020 pledges, i.e. 'We will review the borough's leisure and cultural offer to make it fit for the future, and optimise the use of public spaces, parks and gardens across Wirral as community assets.' Public spaces equates to Greenbelt. Preserving Greenbelt is so important to all of us. At the simplest level we need trees and plants to breathe. Greenery, as the council have identified on their 2020 pledges makes people happier, healthier and better. Let's keep the Greenbelt. Let us not destroy it. After it's gone it's gone and you will never get it back.
DOR01945	I believe there is no need to use green belt land to achieve housing targets and that the targets are unnecessarily high. I urge you to only revisit any potential need to concrete over our green spaces IF AND WHEN ALL brownfield sites have already been built on - not just subject to plans. Greenbelt land is intended to preserve the distinct identities of villages but the proposals to build on green fields surrounding Irby would result in the merging of the distinct communities of Irby, Thingwall, Pensby and Heswall and a substantial loss of character and identities. In addition to my absolute opposition to building on ANY green belt (created for very good reasons that remain valid) the areas being considered do not allow for any extra provision for doctors, schools and other community resources as well as traffic improvements. The current infrastructure does not support further residences. I work in supporting people in emotional and mental distress and access to green spaces is absolutely fundamental to mental health and wellbeing as well as providing spaces for physical activity - all of which are essential for the health of the current residents of the Wirral. Please register my wholesale opposition to building on any green belt land. I urge you to reconsider this proposal and to listen to the people who voted you into your positions.
DOR01946	It has become clear that there are 3,000 empty properties in Wirral and enough brownfield land to build several thousand new properties, so the easy option of building on greenbelt land is unacceptable and will reflect in local elections in future.
DOR01947	The Council has not made sufficiently clear how it has established that there is insufficient land on brownfield or urban sites to meet the housing targets. Indeed, there appears to be more than enough land around the Birkenhead and Wallasey docks to fill this without encroaching on Greenfield land.
DOR01948	The Council needs to protect Wirral greenbelt land. Its one of the many things that attract people to the area. If they build on this land the Wirral will become less attractive, wildlife will suffer and developers will profit. I've seen this happen first hand already where I live in Wirral, please don't keep destroying greenbelt.
DOR01949	The greenbelt around Irby where I live should not be considered for housing as it is an important flood plain, it is a natural habitat for wildlife and the roads in the area would struggle to cope with increased demand which would result in further destruction of green belt to improve the service roads. Wirral needs to protect its green belt and concentrate on regeneration of brownfill and unused industrial areas.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01950	I am wholly against building on green belt land. Part of the attraction of the Wirral is its open green spaces. I don't believe that the current brownfield land is insufficient. I have seen too much green belt be lost to housing already, it needs to stop.
DOR01951	I find it incredible that Wirral's green belt is even up for consideration which makes it very clear that the local council has not really put enough effort into planning and considering how Wirral could in fact be improved by redeveloping some of the areas where derelict properties exist and properties are already empty. The emphasis should be put on brown field sites and regeneration. The infrastructure does not exist to add housing estates on Wirral's green belt. My family moved from Bootle Summer 2017 and really struggled to find a school place for our son as all schools in the area are already filled to capacity. By joining up villages and removing the green belt the Wirral will completely change. Much of Liverpool including Bootle suffers with crime and gang crime and without doubt the main reason is because of the Geography and how all areas ultimately make up one large suburb creating rivalries from one area to another and Merseyside police on Wirral do not have the resources required to deal with that.
DOR01952	I think this is a disgrace, as I was born and raised on the Wirral living from Birkenhead to Oxton to West Kirby. I have seen the estates built in the 70s ruin lovely little villages in the Wirral, this was done to move people from the Birkenhead north area these estates have now been emptied and it would be easy for the council to use this land build and regenerate these areas this would provide the housing needed without ruining what truly makes the Wirral great our green belt, I would ensure I protest this at every turn, and as a social media manager, I understand the power of the new media and will happily assist in any battle to keep our beautiful Wirral green belt ...
DOR01953	The green belt plan is NOT happening! This plan must be resisted and Peel Holdings pushed into action to either do something or release the brownfield area they are sitting on with planning permission for 13,000 homes. Wirral is 50% built on now, NO MORE.....
DOR01954	This Green Belt 'plan' is a knee-jerk reaction due to a total lack of planning over at least the last 15 years by WBC. There are many brownfield sites that should be prioritised for development before anything else is considered. Once our green spaces are gone they are gone forever. Building on Green belt is a disgraceful idea, and this council should be ashamed of themselves, for jumping at this easy option. Our Green Belt environment should be protected.
DOR01955	Why does the council think the population of Wirral is going to expand by such a large number of people when it has hardly changed in the last ten years?
DOR01956	Green Belt must be protected against wholesale housing development. Brown sites must be a priority as well as empty houses that can be renovated. Where are the promised houses from Peel Holdings that have not been built? Community and affordable housing must also be a priority. Local houses for local people built away from green belt land.
DOR01957	I am strongly opposed to any building on Wirral's precious greenbelt land. The Government housing targets are over inflated and can and should be challenged. I want the Council to prioritise brownfield sites as there are significant brownfield sites available to meet even the over inflated targets. I will be watching the outcome of the consultation and won't vote for any councillor who approves building on greenbelt.
DOR01958	<p>I am completely against building on green belt at the potential scale currently proposed on the Wirral which could forever change the nature of the Wirral, threaten current residents (including wildlife) environmentally, deliver a much lower quality of life and stretch the already overburdened infrastructure. The council's position appears to be one of "there is no choice" but this is not true. It is clear that central government is being blamed by Wirral council for the situation that has arisen -i.e. 12,000 homes to be built over the next 15 years and more, potential reaching 27,000 by 2034. It is now clear that these numbers are not are not from central government and is the conclusion of Wirral Council - as confirmed by James Brokenshire's office. The council cannot hide behind the fact that they had not produced a plan, which if done properly would have allowed for some progress and review of demand-proving evidence to resist unnecessary destruction of green belt. Demand or the lack of, is central to this debate as migration to Wirral is negative since 2001 and future economic activity and job creation are forecasted to decline in the area (forecasted to decline even further post Brexit), this is supported by the work commissioned by Wirral council and undertaken by Nathaniel Lichfield and partners (see report sections 3.22, 3.30, 6.38, 8.23), findings are in Wirral SHMA and Housing Needs Study May 2016. Furthermore, there is significant brown field land available to make a start on new affordable housing, and although some is held by Peel Group, the council is simply stating it cannot make compulsory purchase due to the cost-however, if there was a demand as articulated by the council then why would Peel not commence building? The decision by Peel not to build is also based on lack of parallel programmes for new infrastructure this is a recurring theme- infrastructure and has been largely ignored by the council in its attempt to make the case for new housing, while simultaneously disregarding Wirral resident's best interests and future quality of life.</p> <p>The Wirral cannot be considered to be equivalent to most parts of the country in that it is surrounded on 3 sides by water and has only the M53 and A540 as major access roads. These roads are already extremely busy the worst case being the 2 lane section of the M53, the building plans will encourage more commuting mostly out of Wirral for work on a daily basis and it is therefore completely reckless to put in place house build on this scale without parallel infrastructure investment. If the infrastructure cannot be built due to lack of funds then house building on this scale is idiocy. Impact of this will also be felt by the Cheshire councils as most commuters with the exception for Liverpool will need to travel through neighbouring counties. The pollution and environmental burden on the Wirral will increase with population growth and more vehicles-this has not been assessed. The consultation process is too short, which suggests this is merely a rubber stamping exercise and is therefore fundamentally inadequate and suspicious. The few that stand to gain from this are developers, Leverhulme estates particularly land between Heswall and Barnston (ironic given how Levers were so intrinsic to making the Wirral a desirable place to live), land owners who have already displaced farming activity (for example the north of Whitehouse Lane proposed development area) which all suggests that this is a done deal. However, if the demand does not materialise then this small group that stand to make a lot of money will not and this process will serve only to upset Wirral residents and free up green belt for future development when the "time is right" for maximum financial gain. The debate needs to avoid not in my backyard politics which will inevitably be the case if the fundamental proof of demand for housing is not established and kept as the central requirement to the review process and the consultation that</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	begins on 3rd September.
DOR01959	<p>I have grave concerns over the proposed development on the site of farmland around Greasby copse - please see below my views on this matter. Greenhouse farm has tendered the grade 2 agricultural land for many generations and is part of Greasby's identity. I feel British farming is already struggling and with a withdrawal from the EU, we should be supporting our farming community not forcing them from lands, which has provided for communities for so long. Has the council considered local brown field sites first, such as the brown field land at champion sparks 1 mile down the road and which would provide substantial acreage? Recently Greasby has celebrated an unique distinction of being one of the earliest settlements in England, indeed the area in and around the copse was identified as a Mesolithic site by Liverpool museum and as such should be considered as a site of historical importance. The copse and surrounding areas enjoys a rich and biodiverse habitat, and no amount of buffer zone could protect this against proposed housing development, destruction of hedgerow has been proven to negatively impact on ecosystems. Building of 534 houses would have a significant and detrimental impact all wildlife in this area. Indeed this argument was put forward by Wirral council themselves when a phone mast was erected in 1999, (APP/98/05749) siting "disturbance and loss of important Flora and fauna". I would imagine 534 houses would have a catastrophic disturbance and loss to flora and fauna. Currently I have 2 children who are of pre-primary school age, and I have been in the process of enrolling them in the local school, which has proven difficult to get the chosen school due to local demand on places. I'm concerned that 534 houses would only add to these difficulties for future generations, in addition my local GP surgery is struggling under the demand on its services, which the local counsellor is already aware of, I feel further demand would push this practice to breaking point. Therefore I feel the proposed development would push Greasby's infrastructure too far. In addition the government housing schemes are aimed at building affordable housing, however the average house price paid in this area is £245,700 which is out of each for most first time buyers. This makes me question the motives of the councils put this land forward for development rather than land more affordable. To sum up I feel the farm land and copse at the back of Rigby drive has and continues to be an integral part of Greasby's identity, as a working farm its continues to provide resources for the community and is a core biodiverse area. It historical significance stretches back over 10 thousand years which could be irreversibly destroyed for a short term housing crisis. The impact of development on infrastructure would be considerable with Schools, GPs and Shops all being effected not to mention the disturbance made by construction. I feel developing 534 new housed on this site is not only not in the interest of the local area but irresponsible, especially when there is plenty of areas which do not have all the above factors.</p>
DOR01960	<p>I don't believe that there is a shortage of housing on the Wirral which is fast becoming 'The not so pleasant place to grow!' Wirral is overpopulated as it is. Just look at the ridiculous amount of traffic on our roads which would increase with further building, causing even more funding issues. There is very little green space as it stands without eating into local beauty spots. I strongly object to such building for the following reasons:</p> <p>More traffic on the roads unnecessary housing.</p> <p>Further pollution.</p> <p>Catastrophic effect on local wildlife, flora and fauna.</p> <p>Increase in population means more demand on public services.</p> <p>Where do people seek healthy, outdoor leisure time?</p> <p>Wirral will become an urban sprawl with no defining boundaries and will no longer be defined 'beautiful'!</p> <p>I am horrified!!!</p>
DOR01961	<p>Feel strongly that a combination of using brownfield sites and Peel Holdings building as promised will more than cover Wirral's new housing needs. Leave our green Belt for future generations to enjoy. For wildlife and conservation.</p>
DOR01962	<p>It appears that the council has taken the stance not to believe that housing in Wirral Waters is being developed even though work is in progress. Peel did not force WBC to sell them the land and have not reneged on their promise of a 30 year plan. However I don't think that the type of aspirational housing that is planned for this area is what the council needs most, which is social housing. There are disused warehouses and car parks in this area, opposite the Wirral Waters site which could be demolished and used for housing - the local infrastructure will be soon in place conveniently provided by Peel.</p>
DOR01963	<p>I think it's disgraceful that the council want to build on greenbelt land. There are ample brownfield sites that can be used without destroying our beautiful countryside. I recently moved to Greasby and live on Rigby Drive overlooking the farmer's fields where it is proposed 534 houses are to be built. I bought my house for the beautiful open aspect. I love watching the cows daily & have seen calves being born. Greenhouse farm has been here for many many years, it is a community farm with a fantastic farmer selling raw milk. Now it is threatened. How can you possibly want to take away the farmers livelihood & the many years of hard work that has gone into this business. This is only my example of using the greenbelt land there are many others in Wirral. We need our green spaces we need to enjoy the green open land. We can't have houses spoiling the areas when there are sufficient brownfield sites available. I understand the need for housing but it doesn't need to take away our beautiful countryside. Where is the infrastructure going to be to support another community? With 534 houses plus more on the land around Pump Lane that means at least 2 adults per house then the children so potentially this could amount to over 3000 people. Where will they go to visit the doctor? Our surgery is already overstretched and impossible to get a same day</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	appointment. The hospital is a shambles with no beds and extortionate waiting times. Where will the children go to school as they are all full? The whole proposal is just detrimental to our area and should be abandoned immediately. Brownfield sites should be the priority then also what about the people who live in council rented property with larger houses than they need. If this issue was addressed then there would be more properties available for families. DONT TAKE AWAY OUR GREEN SPACES. There should be no building on greenbelt land. We live in a beautiful area of the country, with country parks, open spaces and farmland. The Council do not need to consider building on farmland this will ruin our green spaces. Please build on the brownfield sites first before you consider taking a working farmland to build houses on. Where will the infrastructure be built? Schools, doctors, hospitals - we are already overburdened with lack of places, what will the Council do with even more people?
DOR01964	The Wirral is a green and pleasant land. This plan will destroy the Wirral. The roads will clog up. The buffer zones will go and so one area will run into another. We will become like everywhere else. There won't be enough school places, doctor's surgeries, hospital beds etc. You can't afford to conjure up that infrastructure and the developers will just pay lip service to it. I don't know how you can sleep at night with that potential destruction being down to you, the councillors in office at this time. You know we don't need all those homes - this is not an area of large population growth. Do not roll over and do this. Fight to preserve what we have. Keep our buffer zones. Keep our green and pleasant land.
DOR01965	Over and over again it's just housing that is mentioned. What about infra structure?? I wait 3 weeks for a doctor's appointment and a month for a dental appointment. Where will all these new residents go??
DOR01966	We need to be really mindful of the future when building more homes. The use of beautiful green spaces between our villages and towns give Wirral its unique quality. This is appreciated by all residents when driving round the area. Once covered in concrete and tarmac the land can never be reclaimed and we will have lost our identity.
DOR01967	More housing is good as it is required - plenty of unused land available. Just avoid green belt & consult properly.
DOR01968	I understand the necessity of more housing being enforced by central government. However green belt is green belt, i.e. in United Kingdom town planning, the green belt is a policy for controlling urban growth. The idea is for a ring of countryside where urbanisation will be resisted for the foreseeable future, maintaining an area where agriculture, forestry and outdoor leisure can be expected to prevail. The fundamental aim of green belt policy is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open, and consequently the most important attribute of green belts is their openness. The Town and Country Planning Act 1947 give strict guidelines regarding green belt areas. In addition, if urbanisation is not controlled, from where will future generations get their fresh air leisure areas and walking? Good health has been proven to be as a result of outdoor activities and people generally being more active. The NHS is already inundated with bad lifestyle illnesses. There are plenty of brownfield sites and old housing areas that can be re-used.
DOR01969	Housing does not need to be on green belt land which should be kept unspoilt, there is brown land which should be used, that is more likely to be in an area more suitable to affordable housing.
DOR01970	30 years ago local residents including my 6 yr old daughter with the school, planted hundreds of trees to help the local environment and wildlife. Use brown field to build on first, if you must. Greenbelt was put in place for a good reason.
DOR01971	We need the green belt for the health of the planet and all living things. There are plenty of brown field sites on the Wirral which should be built on first. Wirral does not have a great homeless community but just needs truly affordable housing to be built. There are a good number of empty houses on the Wirral which should be refurbished for housing.
DOR01972	I think that the green belt on the Wirral should be protected as much as possible to enable the Wirral to remain as it is now. If the green belt is built on many villages will all merge and the Wirral will become essentially a suburb of Liverpool. We live in Meols and know that the land around Rycroft Road and birch road is a potential site. If this were to be built on the increase in traffic coming on to Birkenhead road would be huge and create lots of problems. It is already hard enough getting out of these roads. This area also provides woodland and habitat which is not really anywhere else in the area.
DOR01973	I am against the use of greenbelt land for building new housing. I am also against the golf resort development. Golf as a sport is in decline. This land will end up with houses on after a change of use. Please don't build on green belt land. This land should remain protected.
DOR01974	I believe that Wirral requires more housing and, it requires existing vacant properties to be put to appropriate use whether for housing, commercial benefit or demolished with appropriate properties rebuilt in their place. A serious concentration of social and or supported housing in any one area creates its own issues and as such as far as possible should be shared out across the whole peninsula rather than concentrated in Birkenhead, Rock Ferry etc. I feel that the current plans do not dovetail in with the bigger picture for the peninsula as a whole and that the council could be selling the vision of Wirral far better outside of the region than is currently the case. Wellbeing, mental health considerations and work life balance are all becoming more important considerations when people are looking to relocate, and this is the type of lifestyle that the peninsula can offer in abundance which could be a significant attraction for those looking to relocate. This would create demand for the type of property which brings in revenue via council tax but - without a clear and far reaching marketing plan this is a missed opportunity. Works need to begin in Birkenhead centre as a matter of urgency as the town is in a dreadful state and in order to reengage the business and residential communities the council needs urgently to hold open conversations on this. Currently it is unlikely those with the luxury of choice would opt to buy in Birkenhead which ensures that the redevelopment of the Town and the creation of properties around it may not have the deeper and longer lasting impact that it should and could. It is my option that Birkenhead needs to develop its own total USP in order of having any chance of real success. What about the development of the cycle paths and the installation of electric vehicle charging points working towards becoming the first clean, green and carbon neutral town in the UK. There is a huge amount of green space, free exercise opportunities and developed correctly this would add a premium to the area. And in the same way that Bristol and Brighton are considered disrupters and

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	rule breakers, our peninsula could be seen as a forward thinking and proactive place to want to be a part of both from a business and residential perspective and, if the council do not take this opportunity to genuinely do something bold and different the chasm between the 2 sides of the motorway will continue to deepen and it will be a huge opportunity missed. I absolutely love living on Wirral and I appreciate the need for development but I think that it needs to be done in a proactive and forward thinking way. What and who will need houses in 20/30/50 years from now? How can they be built to manage the changing needs? In the same way that Port Sunlight was ahead of its time, created to look after the residents and workers of Wirral and incredibly designed, that could be done again to create a legacy and reinforce the idea that we are an area and you are a council that cares about the area and the people. Seek out developers that do that...clearly that is an expensive way to go about things and won't work for all of the areas and time scales but I think that the long term environmental impact and cost needs to be a key consideration for ALL the builds, not just those in the right postcodes.
DOR01975	Initially, why do we need To build 12,000 homes? Where has that figure been taken from? I'm not aware that there are 12,000 people/families living on the Wirral needing homes?
DOR01976	Don't use the green belt, do up the empty houses! The houses to be built would be unaffordable therefore NOT solve the 11,000 housing problem! If it is to be built on make sure the council provide FULL closure of the type of houses to be built and at what cost, so this is not just a money spinner for the profits to be squandered away in the council black hole of expenditure!
DOR01977	Please, please, please before developing green belt look at the demolition of disused properties and redevelop those houses. The properties by Birkenhead North station is a fine example of this.
DOR01978	The greenbelt of Wirral is what makes it such a beautiful place to live and if you think we will stand by and watch you destroy our home you've got another think coming. My family has lived here for generations and my grandparents and parents used to play in these areas as I did myself and the children of our family still do today. You will not turn our home into some concrete jungle no matter what the government has said. There are brown field sites that can be used, and Peel can get their arses in to gear and start building Wirral waters but 12,000 houses IS NOT HAPPENING. Just because someone who doesn't live round here has opened up google earth and seen a few fields and woods they don't care about, does not qualify as a reason to irreversibly destroy our home. There's plenty of greenbelt down south if the government want to wreck it let them do it down there because over my dead body is it happening here.
DOR01979	For the lazy local councillors to stop targeting green land and use brown sites.
DOR01980	I believe that there are a lot of unused premises, empty housing and brown belt land that can be used instead of Greenbelt. The Greenbelt land is a draw for tourism and this will suffer, money into the area will reduce and have a huge impact on residents.
DOR01981	The first and most important issue is the protection of greenbelt. The dwindling and limited green areas on The Wirral must be protected at all costs. Once brownfield sites have been identified imaginative planning is required to encourage commerce, then infrastructure and then housing. Regardless of government housing targets, there is no point building houses if there are no jobs, schools, doctors etc. for the potential buyers.
DOR01982	The existing balance of green spaces and housing makes the Wirral an attractive and popular place to live. Removing the vast swathes of green belt as proposed in the recent council documents, removes one of the fundamental reasons for the Wirral's current success. Redevelopment of brown field areas, particularly those around Birkenhead, would give a better reward from council time and money invested.
DOR01983	There are too many plans in recent times for local government to simply buy and sell off land in the name of" housing development " when all we see are ideas rocked back and forth for grand schemes that only seem to benefit the local council and line their pockets, there is an inevitability in this case that no matter what local population say, councillors will all vote overwhelmingly and to the detriment of the general public. Our green spaces no matter what, should be cherished for all, past, present and future and not be seen as a chance to pillage our countryside and what little remains. Any development should be reviewed with the utmost thought but in the grand scale of things, to the benefit and agreement of all local population be they residents or passers-by.
DOR01984	This latest attempt to land grab on the Wirral Peninsula is another appalling demonstration of the incompetence of our Local council. There should have been more pressure on Peel holdings to start the construction process on the Wirral waters project instead of allowing them to hold onto the land and wait for the value to rise. Also the Wirral is a peninsula and as such should be considered in the same way as an island we already have over 50% of our land mass built on and with a declining population we don't need any more houses built on green belt land. This latest push for land is driven by greedy avaricious developers who want to build high cost high value houses on land which is easy to developer but doesn't have the infrastructure to cope with it I'm talking about gas supply, water supply, sewer drainage and surface water run-off. There have already been developments in Ellesmere port and little Sutton which have resulted in older areas being flooded after heavy rain were it never happened before. Where we live the water pressure is so poor that my shower almost stops working in the summer and united utilities answer is there's too much demand on an old network, what would happen if you add 500 houses to that (old) network? The really distasteful part about all this is we are being told we need more low cost housing but none of the proposed developments is for low cost housing and we certainly have no need for another golf course the existing courses in the Borough are struggling to survive. I feel that this whole plan is driven by developers and money any nothing at all to do with a need for housing.
DOR01985	Green space is vital for the health and wellbeing of everyone. There are many other options for housing. Please do the right thing.
DOR01986	The bbc recently had an app showing percentage green land in areas against population, compared even to Liverpool the Wirral was one of the lowest. I am totally against building on green belt land, not adverse however to regeneration of the vast areas of near derelict land.
DOR01987	Leave the beautiful Wirral Green belt alone, to continue to give what is so special to the next generation. Compulsory purchase Wirral Waters from the time wasters at Peel Holdings who have said many times what they are proposing to do and do exactly nothing. The area is desolate and an eye sore. What an opportunity to renovate it as new housing.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR01988	West Kirby and Caldby area do not need any new housing developments, what makes them desirable areas to live in is the fact that houses are not readily available cheaply! People don't want loads of affordable homes in the area, as it will affect the local communities adversely and will spoil the area for what it is!
DOR01989	Before building new houses anywhere surely it would make financial sense for at least 98% of council (magenta) properties are fully occupied then as far as I'm concerned you should build where you like. The problem with the people from Greasby is they forget they only bought their house, not the whole area they are just plastic snobs, after all most of the Wirral was green space at one time but they forget that. Take no notice of them they objected to a fire station being built there that's how much they care about their own community. Good luck with whatever you do. It's funny how at election time Greasby is full of vote conservative posters but when the conservative government won't give the council enough money to function then it's Labour's fault. Oh the irony is lost on them.
DOR01990	There are enough brownfield sites to accommodate the housing shortage. There is no need to destroy historical green belt areas which make this area a pleasant place to live.
DOR01991	There are many other places to build other than on green belt. The sites proposed are not going to be for affordable housing which I think is the objective?
DOR01992	I think it is wrong that the striking feature of the proposed developments removes all green spaces EAST of the M53. Wirral has low-grade farm land that supports sheep or nondescript cattle (you don't see any pedigree herd claims). This land – WEST of the M53 - should be developed AND some of every development parcel turned over to tree plantations. In the circumstances that Wirral finds itself in, farmland is lower priority than natural woodland or heath. If all brownfield sites are already used, then low grade farmland should be next but, PLEASE leave some green, open spaces EAST of the M53.
DOR01993	We are a peninsula with few ways in and few ways out - it's currently next to grid locked at certain times of the day - where are the cars - possibly two per new build - going to go - the roads can't cope and neither can the schools or hospitals - the extra approx 24,000 cars plus deliveries would grid lock our roads totally as they are already back logged at busy times, we've all paid extra for our houses to enjoy the green open spaces, you will destroy the integrity of the area. I don't believe affordable housing would be built on this land but more executive housing, get Peel Holdings to transform that run down area along the dock lands and that will generate a community that will in turn help generate that pitiful town Birkenhead as it could do with a boost and leave our green spaces alone.
DOR01994	The proposal is a disgrace; an insanity. Unspeakable. Total failure to protect the people of Wirral now and for future generations. Who would have thought that local governors could become the enemy of the people?
DOR01995	There must be green belt land in other areas. I do not agree to use green belt land surely there is enough brown belt land to use. There must be run down areas which could be redeveloped, to enhance communities already there which has schools and local trading. Where are all these people coming from to live in these new developments? Where are the schools, shops, doctors for these people? Wirral borough council cannot afford elderly care for residents we already have. I think this Labour council is just blaming a lot of this crisis on the government to use green belt land in affluent areas.
DOR01996	Absolutely no need for green belt to be used. Plenty of brown belt sites or existing dwellings to be used.
DOR01997	No one can argue that as a nation we desperately need more decent housing. However, it isn't enough to just build 800 new houses per year. Developments must be accompanied by all the other buildings and services that go along with that. GP surgeries, hospitals, day nurseries, schools etc. These must be up and running at the same time, as I don't suppose the homes will be solely taken by people who already live here on Wirral. More people mean that we must be careful to retain sufficient greenbelt land. This isn't just about parks. Currently, lots of people don't live in easy walking distance to a park, but do have other sorts of green areas nearby. Losing too many of these would dramatically alter the character and individual beauty of Wirral. The special thing about Wirral is that almost everyone can readily walk to a green area - even if you live in an urban area. Be careful to keep this!!
DOR01998	1. Majority of housing that is being built is not 'affordable' housing. Recent houses built on Beer's site in Eastham averaged £300,000, not exactly aimed at first time buyers 2. Where are the plans for transport, schools etc? Many areas schools are already oversubscribed. 3. What alternatives to green belt land have been looked into?
DOR01999	Any planned developments in the West Wirral area.
DOR02000	Green spaces need protection. Use brownfield sites and regeneration, not further infringement into precious spaces. There are preferable imaginative solutions for the housing crisis.