

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02001	Please protect our green belt
DOR02002	<p>There are lots of empty spaces that are not green belt and there must be ways to avoid losing green belt. All the brownfield spaces in Wirral should be shown as part of the consultation. I am particularly concerned about Column Fields.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Column Fields are a part of the very precious area from Caldly Hill/Stapledon Wood to Thurstaston Hill/Royden Park. - To destroy Column Fields would be a disaster as Caldly Hill/Stapledon Woods would become an "island" surrounded by houses with negative impact on the whole area and in particular on Stapledon Woods. - The views from Thurstaston to Caldly Hill and vice versa should not be blighted by and estate on Column Fields. The area from Caldly Hill to Thurstaston Hill, including Column Fields, is an iconic area, and a priceless asset to all Wirralians and the many visitors from outside Wirral. - There would be an adverse impact on wildlife and the environment, over the whole area. - opposite Column Fields there is a wildlife pond that is home to many birds/ducks/geese that migrate every year to this area. The loss of Column Fields would have a significant negative impact. - The traffic on Column Road and Caldly Road is already at high levels (dangerous levels in Caldly Road which is narrow and winding) and a further increase in traffic would affect the whole area.
DOR02003	This plan encourages the unrestricted sprawl of the large built up areas in Wirral to encroach into the precious and small green belt areas we possess. It will dramatically reduce the opportunity for urban regeneration by discouraging the recycling of existing brownfield sites especially in socially deprived and derelict areas of Birkenhead and Wallasey. The precious WIRRAL countryside, far from being protected, is being sacrificed for low density, high cost executive developments when immediate investment in brown field affordable homes is essential not only to meet housing needs but also to promote the economic and social regeneration of town centres that have suffered decades of neglect.
DOR02004	I am emailing you in response to the proposed release by the council of the land east of Poulton road (SP043) .Namely Spital field, brotherton park and dibbinsdale local nature reserve. Firstly I'd like to say I appreciate the council's position with regards building new homes in the borough and meeting targets set by central government. To my knowledge there are 6,000 empty houses in Wirral which could be made ready for those requiring a home. There are also 5 planning applications for developments at Wirral Waters, which were submitted way back in March, but as yet have not been brought to Planning. There are more than enough brownfield spaces. I have to say that I am aghast at the above mentioned proposal! I find it incredulous that it has even been earmarked for consultation. As you are no doubt aware the afore mentioned land is part of a unique and very special green belt area which includes ancient history , home to rare wildlife , and has its own eco system not to mention it's popularity for dog walkers and ramblers alike . I know it is stated that the LNR and Brotherton Park is to be protected but if this is the case why is the whole area(brotherton park) outlined in red on the map. If ANY of the land in this area is used for housing development it would bring about end of all the benefits and qualities this land has to offer for today's and future generations. For me the whole area is something to be very proud of as a community and should never be considered for any kind of housing development.
DOR02005	<p>[SAME AS DOR01546]</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 that is Wirral. Many meeting have been on all over the area of Wirral and residents and council are guardians of the jewel that is Wirral green spaces and must work together to protect what is unique to Wirral and not use this plan to be used as a political football . Just to add also 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>
DOR02006	Greenbelt parcel SP010 Greasby Copse. This is high grade agricultural land (presently a dairy farm), a site of biological importance (a core biodiversity area). I have personally seen foxes, owls and bats at the site as well as birds of prey flying over the field. It is near a Mesolithic site verified by Liverpool Museum as circa 8500 BC and has a Roman Road running adjacent to it. The site should be considered a heritage site and not just greenbelt that could lose this status and be built upon. I am amazed that it is even on the list of sites for potential future development.
DOR02007	I would like to add my voice to the thousands already opposed to the development of green belt sites across Wirral. There certainly needs to be a brownfield site first policy, adopted by Liverpool City Council. Wirral waters appear to be doing a sterling job of regenerating these brownfield areas. Which will lift up those locked in expensive private rental agreements and inject life in to otherwise forgotten derelict areas of the Wirral. In my opinion the development of green field sites would not lead to sustainable housing, which could be afforded by those who most need it, but instead create extra pressures on schools, and other council services (refuse collection and bus services). Not to mention the impact on congestion and associated pollution to an already busy infrastructure. I hypothesise the housing built in these greenfield areas would be by their very nature and position be for upper middle class families and not those of lower incomes or younger working professionals who need help to get on the property ladder. The areas of green belt suggested also a butt tenant farmers land, which combined with the threat of a no deal Brexit, do we really need to saddle these farmers with reduced fallow land and income in an already perilous economic situation. This isn't about being a NIMBY it is about common sense and coherent local strategy to tackle a countrywide lack of housing. The allocation of green belt land smacks of trigger happy planning with ill thought out consequences, which would have grave ramifications for future generations.
DOR02008	I feel this is not a good idea, how long have the council known they needed to fill their quota of 13000 homes. There is plenty of brown land owned by peel holdings that could be used. Once this land is used up what next parks and school play grounds.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02009	I think it's ridiculous to offer so much green belt land up for development. Once this green belt land is gone it is gone forever. I moved to Barnston so my children would grow up surrounded by fields away from a highly populated area for the good of their health. The proposals do not make sense due to the lack of public transport therefore encouraging car use and more pollution. Brown field sites with good access links are the best way to keep developing Wirral.
DOR02010	The sheer amount of green belt at risk with this development is disgraceful and has no concrete requirements document for the public to view. We are all very aware of the housing crisis, however these areas are not deemed to have a population increase on this scale and the wildlife impact must also be taken into account, what is being done to address this??
DOR02011	We should aim to preserve the environment as much as possible for future generations. Not destroying green belt land not only keeps the areas natural beauty intact, it also preserves the areas natural wildlife.
DOR02012	I understand that independent professionals have demonstrated there is no need to release any green belt land to provide in a timely fashion the housing need for the Wirral community. Please ensure our green belt is retained for future generations to come.
DOR02013	I live in Moreton or Moreton west as it is now ridiculous called! No part of Moreton needs anymore houses or flats or bungalows! It is already overrun with people and traffic without making things a million times worse! There isn't a single decent sized park in Moreton for people to go to, although our local council would charge to use it, if there was one! It's ok for politicians to rattle on about housing but they all live in places with big gardens and plenty of country side, whereas the countryside on the Wirral won't exist the way things are going, it will be one massive concrete jungle! The housing problem needs to be tackled by encouraging people not to have loads of kids, and stop all and sundry walking into our country and given houses etc! Please start using your common sense if you have any and do these things now, or the UK will do one enormous concrete mess!!!!!! And constant whinging about having no money is utter rubbish!!! Governments have always had plenty of money, they all just get into a habit of saying no money like a repeating stuck record! Intelligence and common sense are what's desperately needed not more houses and whinging about having no money. Stop giving in to greedy builders and insensitive people who only think of themselves and how much money they can make. Wish I could come back in a 100 years' time and see what a mess everything will be, we're already well on the way to disaster!!!!
DOR02014	From what I can gather the amount of Green Belt 'at risk' on Wirral is excessive and more than TEN TIMES greater than the average of ALL the councils who have produced Local Plans over the last 8 years; which includes councils in housing hungry areas of the South and other hotspots which don't have our (Wirral's) vast areas of undeveloped dockland and waterfront plus a huge amount of 'brownfield' Sites (previously developed Land) in Birkenhead, Wallasey, Rock Ferry, New Ferry and more, these are areas that could benefit most from redevelopment and provide the mix of housing that the Wirral DOES need, namely for those wanting to improve their lot and get on the property ladder and those wishing to downsize. Redraw the plan - focus on using what is currently available first without touching greenbelt land. Of course many developers don't like undertaking redevelopment as the profits are usually less but our greenbelt land should not be available for short term profiteers.
DOR02015	Protect our precious green belt from sprawling development.
DOR02016	I strongly object to the proposal to build on the greenbelt. I believe that. a) There is an over estimate of the number of new houses required on the Wirral. Has the council queried this with central government? b) There are sufficient brownfield sites available for Wirral's immediate housing needs, although it might not be as profitable for the developers to build on these sites.
DOR02017	If I understand the plan - it is the council's intention to build 12,000 homes on green-belt land, despite having entered a partnership with Peel Holdings years ago and on one of the largest brownfield sites in the north-west built precisely NO homes. Barely a job has been created there - the original plan for 13,000 homes, shops AND businesses - every year we get another artist's impression of a future thriving metropolis on the banks of the Mersey - every year Birkenhead falls deeper into a black hole of deprivation and food banks. So that was pie-in-the sky and now we're served up the future - the local plan surfacesa response of gross simplicity & greed to a statutory requirement that the council did not bother to address until pushed. Put simply, you'll pave over the greenbelt, build the executive homes as they'll recoup the most council tax whilst the borough needs more affordable homes & social housing. Result! You'll lose seats to Tory councillors - that's part of the government strategy I'm sure - hand them the brush, they'll tar you with it. Result! The Greens will deservedly take seats off you as well because they understand sustainability - you simply don't. Each home will generate 2-3 more cars, more pressures on roads, schools, health centres and all the infra-structure which is creaking at the seams already. You'll sell Wirral as a leisure peninsula - at least the outside investors will come at their leisure to house-hunt. Do we even need the houses? No, according to the ONS, 500 a year at most, but you can't even vocalise those obvious facts to government. Also with Vauxhall Motors all but broke (future brownfield opportunity), Clatterbridge Cancer Centre (where my household work) moving virtually wholesale to Liverpool (future brownfield opportunity) and Airbus likely to go if the Brexit deal is a no-deal, Wirral is hardly a jobs wonderland even for commuters! So the plan creates many new homes to commute from - the roads you'll need will help push the childhood asthma rates through the roof as the council fails to cut CO2 levels as hard as it hoped due to a failure to tackle vehicle emissions, childhood obesity going the same way as more kids get driven to the overcrowded schools. My final words on this plan? It resembles the same lazy attack on the green belt that is taking place with the unnecessary golf resort in Hoylake, the same tactic that took place in Saughall Massey with the fire-station relocation. The listening council remaining deaf. Listen up for a tip from me - the above border is green presumably because this area is - but only for now if your plan and it's lazy ideas are permitted to take shape. Save money in re-branding Wirral's future - simply say it's now the colour of the money you will be taking as you aim for profit maximisation. I and others will oppose you every step of the way - the alternatives are legion but require investment and imagination. This plan and this council lack both utterly.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02018	<p>I understand that the government imposed plan that Wirral should produce at least 12,000 new homes in the 15 years to 2035 was derived from work produced by the Office for National Statistics. However, I also understand that they have recently revealed that they now realise that their growth projections were seriously overstated and have reduced the national total target by almost 25%. If this reduction was applied to Wirral's figures it would give rise to a figure of 9,000 homes over 15 years. [the Council Leader's] letter dated August 2018, to all Wirral residents, made reference to disappointment with Peel Holdings regarding its promises to build homes on the Wirral Waters site - originally 13,000 but now reduced to 2,400 over the 15 year period. At the Local Plan Consultation event I attended at West Kirby Concourse, one of the attendees, who appeared to have first-hand knowledge of this particular issue, made the point that Peel Holdings were being deliberately misrepresented by [the Council Leader] as Peel Holdings projections of new home builds were much higher. What is clear to all is that the "housing crisis" has arisen because a significant proportion of the population (say, 30%) are not able to buy their own homes or rent decent accommodation from the private sector. The solution seems equally clear. The councils need to be able to borrow money at competitive interest rates and embark on a massive build of social housing - or as we used to say "council houses"! It would be helpful to understand the potential for new homes being built on brownfield sites on the Wirral, as well as the related potential for creating new homes from redundant commercial and industrial buildings - and bringing unoccupied houses back into use. In a Freedom of Information enquiry, I was advised an updated Strategic Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) would be available from 3 September 2018. Has this now been released? Can Wirral Council produce a summary of this document that shows the total number of homes that could be built over the subject 15 year period? The release of green belt land for new build housing would in part appear to be driven by house build contractors. Their preferred business model is to build on greenfield sites and sell upmarket houses to maximise profits. However Wirral doesn't need any more "5 bedroom executive homes"! Building homes in urban areas is a much more productive way of providing low cost housing. In most cases the utility infrastructure is already there, or close by. For the residents, all the facilities they need are also readily accessible - medical centres, schools, shops, transport, etc. This is clearly not the case with green field sites - where a burden will fall on the public purse to provide them. I note that Wirral Council regard the landscape of the Wirral to be a key attraction and have targeted the "tourism sector" as a future economic driver. Why would the council then seek to undermine the visitor attraction of the Wirral by dismantling its green belt? In summary, this plan to build on Wirral's green fields makes no sense at all!</p>
DOR02019	<p>We are directly affected by proposals for Settlement Area 7, principally, Barnston and Heswall. We endorse the view that there is no need for WBC to consider the redesign action of ANY green belt land for development purposes. Points have already been made about discrepancies in data and methodology used to establish the shortfall in housing pipeline. We have been resident in Heswall since 1980. During that period the Traffic generation in West Wirral, particularly along Telegraph Road and Barnston Road is now virtually at full capacity. Further development of the scale proposed for Settlement Area 7 would stretch infrastructure in terms of both transport, schooling and amenity support beyond acceptable limits. The Council are perceived to have been very slow over the last 10 years over identifying and processing residential development on semi derelict and brownfield sites. They now find themselves in a panic situation to achieve their perceived targets, when previously they would be better advised to ensure that delivery of consents granted was a pre requisite to that permission. Please revisit the validity of the research data; focus more on regeneration of the derelict sites; put pressure on delivery of consents granted (if the argument is non viability, that should have been established at the outset as part of the application process) o not put undue pressure on existing support infrastructure in west Wirral that cannot sustain the growth proposed by the Local Plan on Green Belt, which by its very nature was initiated to protect Communities!</p>
DOR02020	<p>Having kept a close eye on the Council's proposed way of meeting the demand for further housing in the borough. I am minded to put my concerns into writing. Firstly, it seems that there has been a knee-jerk reaction to the situation which appears to demand fewer new homes than previously claimed. Secondly, I can see no justification for building on the greenbelt when there is so much brown-field space within the borough. Specifically, as I live in Lower Heswall, I have concerns about more local plans. The requirement for new homes is that they be "affordable" and therefore attainable to first time buyers. Heswall is not a location that meets these criteria. The local infrastructure in and around the Lower Village would not be able to sustain significant new development - for example, the junction of Station Road and Village Road, and the top of Delavor Road are particularly unsuitable. I also have concerns that, as has happened elsewhere, intentions to build modest starter homes or flats soon end up with resubmitted plans to build executive homes at unaffordable prices to the supposed target market.</p>
DOR02021	<p>The Local Plan should carefully assess the housing needs of Wirral and where possible use brown fields sites. Affordable housing is very important. I believe that Central Government has reduced the number of houses to be built per year from 800 to 500. This should reduce the need to build on green belt. The Plan should take into account promoting the health of the community; school playing fields, parks, allotments, shops, clinics, community centres, cycling and walking ways and good public transport are important. If it is essential to build on green belt creating "garden villages" or expanding existing villages are the least desirable options.</p>
DOR02022	<p>Civic Centre Bromborough [SHLAA2024] I strongly disagree with any plans to redevelop this site. WE THE PEOPLE NEED A COMMUNITY CENTRE IN BROMBOROUGH.</p>
DOR02023	<p>I object vigorously to the plan as it stands.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Redevelopment of brownfield sites around disused dockland, in Rock Ferry and New Ferry, would improve the whole environment of Wirral and stimulate the local economy, rather than ruining the area with the loss of Green Belt land. 2. WBC calculations of area required are flawed and inflated and require updating to meet the latest ONS data. 3. Loss of Green Belt should be a last resort - this is not the case in Wirral as there are other options which have not been imaginatively or thoroughly enough explored.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02024	I understand that the Options Review is a consequence of the Government housing targets (based on ONS population projections) being "imposed" on the Council. The ONS target was originally for 12000 (now substantially reduced) new homes. This figure needs to be challenged ([a council officer] has advised that it will be!) as independent analysis on the Wirral's housing needs over the next 15 years suggests a much lower figure perhaps 4300. In that event green belt would not need to be released as the combination of the Peel developments and the release of brownfield sites would more than suffice. My particular concern is site reference SP013.....a piece of land that regularly attracts wildlife.....Canadian Geese feeding, bats and barn owls.....the local infrastructure would simply not accommodate a significant development on this land. The ONS targets must be challenged and when reduced green belt land will not need to be released.
DOR02025	I can see no need to build more houses than is necessary on our precious green belt when there is ample brown sites available. We already have congestion on our roads overstretched doctors surgeries and other public services unable to cope with additional workloads. We must fight to keep the Wirral green. Once this green belt has been built on the trees and grass never come back and we owe our families a future worth having in our pleasant environment.
DOR02026	Wirral is wonderfully diverse peninsula. It's balance of open countryside, villages and conurbation attracts high visitor numbers of year on year bringing valuable and much needed income. The health benefits of green spaces, in these times of poor air quality, are obvious. Wirral is fortunate to possess an embarrassment of brown field sites. More than adequate to meet its housing needs. Let us not sell off, cheaply, the spiritual, financial and health benefits of this beautiful asset.
DOR02027	Bromborough Village is still a relatively vibrant high street in Wirral with valued local independent businesses. These local businesses provide jobs and keep money in our local economy as well as providing services to local people and adding value to the area, encouraging people to want to live and work in the area. In addition the library and the classes held in the civic centre are at the heart of Bromborough. Please don't ruin all these positives by building on the parking and or library and civic centre.
DOR02028	An awful idea to build on our treasured green belt areas that make west Kirby and Hoylake the popular towns they are. There are plenty of properties that could be instead.
DOR02029	I am writing to object to Wirral Council's Green Belt Plan. I understand from independent sources that despite reduced growth projection data from the ONS and despite the high availability of undeveloped brownfield sites in many areas of Wirral, you have grossly overestimated the need for Green Belt land for new housing. Furthermore, the areas you have earmarked for development in the relatively affluent Heswall area will not be able to provide the type of affordable housing for which there is the greatest need. The Green Belt is an essential amenity and it's what makes Wirral an attractive place to live for incomers like myself. Building on it (which as I have stated already is quite unnecessary) will only serve to discourage many people from living here, to the detriment of the local economy. I have read the numerous arguments provided by local groups against your proposals and it is quite clear that you must have a political agenda that flies in the face of the facts. I will ensure that at the next local elections, the votes of myself and my family will go to whoever opposes your plan.
DOR02030	I wholeheartedly disagree with the proposed need to review greenbelt land with its plans to release such land for further building. This is because the supposed orders from Central Government for 12000 homes over the next 15 years do not take in to account the fact that Wirral's population is declining and it is well known that there has always been a very low number of people moving to the Wirral from outside the area; most of the moves between houses are by current residents. Who are you then proposing is going to fill all of these homes? I also refer specifically to the areas identified within Irby (SP019B, SP059E and SP060). If houses are built on these areas, they will be houses in keeping with the local area which will most likely be large houses with at least 3 bedrooms. These houses will not benefit Central Governments requirements for affordable housing for people with lower incomes or first time buyers, therefore the greenbelt land will have been lost for nothing. The council presentation refers to the five purposes of greenbelt. One of these is 'check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas'. If the greenbelt land in Irby, Pensby and Thingwall is built upon then there will be little to no green land left in that area therefore it will be completely unrestricted and sprawled built up land. This will have a hugely negative impact on the character and aesthetics of the area, not to mention residents' wellbeing and the value of their homes. Another purpose is to 'Prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. If the greenbelt land in Irby, Pensby and Thingwall is lost to housing then these villages will all merge together which contradicts the above purpose. I am aware that historic land recording does not recognise Pensby as a settlement in its own right therefore these areas were not exempt from the greenbelt review. However, this is completely outdated and ignores the fact that in the present day Pensby, Thingwall and Irby are all villages in their own right with their own different identities and characteristics and merging them would be devastating to each village's sense of identity not to mention its pleasant surrounding green areas. It was an irresponsible and negligent decision not to make these areas exempt from greenbelt review and I can only assume it was convenient to do so because of the interest from potential developers. I note that only housing is mentioned in the proposed development on greenbelt land. There is nothing mentioned about necessary infrastructure to cope with the increase in population. There would be inevitable and unmanageable pressure on schools, GP surgeries, roads that current services could not cope with. This plan appears to be driven by a combination of panic and rushed decisions, pressure from Central Government with no challenge by the Local Council, and greed of the developers who wish to buy the land. None of the above is in the interest of Wirral and its residents.
DOR02031	Wirral's Green belt should be saved at all costs. It is one main reason for the increasing numbers of visitors to the Wirral. But we do need housing. Please ensure that the waterfront development by Peel Holdings proceeds. And Please try and ensure that properties do not remain empty for prolonged periods. Owners should pay higher tax if they own more than one property and leave the other(s) empty for more than a short length of time. The council should compulsorily purchase properties left empty for more than a year without good reason. There are also still many brown field sites which need redevelopment
DOR02032	No building on green belt

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02033	<p>We object to the Council's plan to remove Green Belt status from the areas surrounding Poulton Hall, namely SP042, SP043 and S044. They fail the Council's tests because they are:</p> <p>Best agricultural land.</p> <p>Would produce urban sprawl and remove the separation of different towns.</p> <p>There is adequate brownfield land in the borough.</p> <p>There is not a proven need for more housing that cannot be met without losing Green Belt.</p> <p>This is Wirral's most important historic site and is of great archaeological importance, having the remains of the Norman or pre-Norman castle at its centre. Mounting evidence shows it to be the site of the ancient battle of Brunanburgh and it is expected to be listed by Historic England as an ancient battlefield site. Poulton Hall Estate is the only site in Wirral for traditional English Longbow shoots, bringing archers from throughout the country and from abroad.</p> <p>Once Green Belt status is lost and building takes place then it is gone forever. Short term greed by developers shouldn't take priority over the legacy we leave to future generations.</p>
DOR02034	<p>I do not agree with building on any green belt land. Our green belt is shrinking and we need to preserve it for future generations. There are many (thousands) of unoccupied properties on the Wirral which could be renovated to provide housing without the need to use green belt land. Many species of animal and plant would be affected by a further reduction in their habitat.</p> <p>For the environment, for future generations and for a better quality of life for all we must preserve our greenbelt land. The fire station at Saughall massie has already encroached onto greenbelt land. Use brown sites, renovate empty/derelict houses. Exhaust all avenues (even if they are more costly) before even considering the use of our vital greenbelt.</p>
DOR02035	<p>I wish to object to the Council's proposed plan to build on the green belt that surrounds Eastham from further housing or industrialisation as this will significantly alter the historic setting of the village, increase traffic and add more congestion and pollution to this beautiful village. Eastham is regularly threatened by proposals to industrialise and it is vital that the heart of the community is not ripped out further.</p>
DOR02036	<p>The proposal to allow building on extensive fields behind Barnston church (and other greenbelt land) is completely unacceptable. Not only would we lose this beautiful land, where many of us walk regularly enjoying the natural landscape and the wild birds and flowers that thrive here, but our village would be utterly blighted by the additional traffic pressure. The village already struggles with traffic volumes passing through the narrow lanes at the Barnston road/Storeton Lane intersection and through the dip by the Fox and Hounds public house; additional housing and the associated cars would bring the road system to gridlock. There are no reasonable public transport options here, the nearest school is a mile away and the nearest supermarket 2 miles, so road use would be essential for any new residents in the area. I do accept that more housing is needed for young people, but this area would not be an attractive option for young people - there is nothing going on here to attract them; inevitably, developers would instead build yet more large (and expensive) houses, which is where they make the most profit. There is little public benefit in such a course of action. Instead, build houses and flats on brownfield sites near the towns, where people can access facilities and commute to work easily. This would be the best outcome for the people of Wirral. Destroy the fields now and we can never get them back - and people will always remember who was responsible for such destruction. Is that how this administration wants to be remembered?</p>
DOR02037	<p>I find it disgraceful that with so many empty and derelict properties or spaces of land such as the north end of Birkenhead being unused that green belt land has to be considered for development. In addition to this there are many areas of Birkenhead that could be utilised more effectively such as the redundant town centre.</p>
DOR02038	<p>I want to raise my objections to the plans that you have for selling off the green belt land. I live in Bebington and we already have so much congestion on our roads around the M53 junction 4 and 5 and the Croft Retail Park in Bromborough that releasing the land along the M53 will only increase the amount of cars on the roads, add to the pollution and time spent sitting in traffic to get even just to local to shops and amenities. Spital Road in peak times is grid locked, this will increase if you build more houses in Spital. Add to that the fact that our children are already growing up anti-social because of a change in the way they are brought up, if we lose the green spaces we have now how is that going to affect them and future generations? We need to protect the Wirral from yet more housing developments and regenerate those areas that are in desperate need of funding such as Seacombe, Liscard and Birkenhead. Please do not destroy such a lovely part of England.</p>
DOR02039	<p>We feel extremely strongly that building of new houses should not be allowed on current farmland around Greasby Copse between Rigby Drive and Arrowse Brook Lane. Our reasons are as follows;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Greasby Copse is a 'Core Biodiversity Area', a home to much varied wildlife including foxes, owls, birds of prey and species of bats. Building houses on the area mentioned above would not only completely spoil but possibly be the end for these creatures. 2. Nearby the Copse is a Mesolithic site of national importance, if building is allowed then surely this will open the floodgates for precious historical sites nationwide to be ruined. 3. Having had a child attend Greasby Infant and Junior schools, we believe that building here could have catastrophic consequences! We walked up and down Rigby Drive twice a day to school for approximately 7 years the speed and carelessness of some motorists caused us to witness some near misses and a couple of accidents. This dangerous situation would increase massively should new houses be allowed. 4. We remember very clearly when Wirral council thankfully refused a Mobile phone mast in 1999. Stating the reason as 'disturbance and loss of important flora and fauna'. So why on earth would building over 500 houses be ok now?! 5. Finally, some years ago, I think in the 1980's there were proposed plans for Upton cricket club to relocate to this same area. The plans were refused point blank due to increased traffic at the top of Rigby Drive adjacent to Our Lady of Pity School. Again, I ask, why would development of any kind be ok now?

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02040	<p>Response to the Local Plan by Friends of Port Sunlight River Park. Background: Friends of Port Sunlight River Park The Friends of Port Sunlight River Park are a voluntary organisation who work to promote the Port Sunlight River Park – see below for our purpose</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Promote the Park and its events and activities to increase visitor numbers • Increase the enjoyment and involvement of the wider Community using the Park • Identify Park improvements through community engagement and research to enhance the park • Contribute to the site management and maintenance of the Park under the direction of the Park Ranger. • Support education, leisure/culture, environment and health opportunities within the Park for the benefit of the community. The following response has been agreed by the committee and shared and approved at the recent AGM of the River Park held on 18 October 2018. Response We welcome the following proposals for Housing Allocations • 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) 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>1 A larger permanent car park (Approx. 25 – 30 spaces)</p> <p>2 A potential area for overspill/additional parking for special events 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.
DOR02041	<p>In the interest of encouraging wellbeing and a healthy lifestyle I would hope local woodland areas, especially around the Spital area, which already has a high density of dwellings is protected. The Dibbinsdale woodland area is used daily by local residents and visitors from further afield of all ages. This area provides a haven for our wildlife and is a treasure within an already over populated area.</p>
DOR02042	<p>Site ref: SHLAA 2025 Allport lane car park. Are you trying to kill Bromborough Village? Without suitable parking the vast majority of people will not use the numerous shops, they will therefore go out of business, followed by the last remaining banks as they too will be affected. There is no other parking other than a few limited time spaces on the road by the shops - or side roads in the area, which would be a disaster for the residents and road safety in general. So many people could lose their jobs and community spirit will plummet. For some residents, frequently the elderly, going to the village is the only contact they have with other people. The cafes provide great places for local residents to meet. The car park, which is usually extremely busy, is a relatively small area but its value is priceless to the village. There must be other areas that could be used instead that wouldn't have such a catastrophic impact! This ridiculous plan must be stopped.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02043	<p>I am overwhelmingly sickened (as are many Wirral Residents), by the decadent manner in which its elected Council representatives continuously fail to act in the interests of the people they purport to represent. I therefore, add my name to this growing list. It is totally unacceptable to even consider developing on the Wirral green belt sites knowing that enough housing can be found to meet the national government target through re-occupation of existing houses and regeneration of the brownfield sites that have already been identified, offering a total well in excess of the 12,000 homes required by 2035. To build on Green Belt Parcels SP030 to SP055, in particular, I believe would be catastrophic for all residents of surrounding area and of Bebington. The development of Lever Causeway, would destroy this valued landmark and that of Storeton Village. In addition, such development would result in many disadvantages including inadequate land drainage noise pollution and inadequate traffic dispersal facilities (Thornton Road, Mount Road and Lever causeway are already grid-locked in rush hour). Wirral residents will not tolerate local government negligence and incompetence resulting in the loss of our precious green belt facilities within the Wirral peninsula. It is the duty of the local government to investigate and exhaust every possibility to reuse existing housing and assist in urban regeneration sites that have the local services already provisioned and will ensure we preserve our Wirral green belt for future generations. The proposed plans to build on our Wirral protected green belt will contravene the NPPF and lead to unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and merging of neighbouring towns. This will be detrimental to Wirral and our goal to preserve, maintain and protect places of interest and historic towns. It is paramount that we pay attention to the NPPF cautionary message in Paragraph 135 "Once Lost-Lost Forever." I would like all of these points to be addressed during the public consultation period and expect that common sense will prevail and local government will act in the interest of its Wirral constituents.</p>
DOR02044	<p>I wish to register my strong objection to the proposals announced by Wirral Borough Council for release of Green Belt land as part of the current Development Options Review. The Governments National Planning Policy Framework cites "five key purposes" for Green Belt:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas 2) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another 3) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment 4) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns 5) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land <p>Wirral Councils proposals would seem to run contrary to all of these. Many of the sites proposed for release would only hasten the type of urban sprawl that blights so much of our region and from which Wirral has thankfully been spared. Indeed, it's in large part the successful preservation of our green spaces that gives Wirral so much of its character - a character that would be severely compromised by these proposals. These proposals offer no benefit to the ordinary people of Wirral and would help only the landowners, the value of whose land stands to increase massively, and the property developers anxious to build premium developments on some of the more attractive sites in the borough. I have no doubt that the developers plans for these sites, if released, will feature none of the affordable homes where demand actually exists. These will be premium developments targeting maximum profit for the developers. Given the recent confirmation from the Office of National Statistics that the growth projections underpinning these proposals were over-stated I would have expected that there is more than adequate capacity on existing sites - particularly the "derelict and other urban land" referenced in Point 5 of the National Planning Policy Framework key purposes. There is absolutely no justification for such a sweeping release of our precious Green Belt into the hands of developers whose only interest is private profit. To do so would fundamentally change the character of our borough forever. I urge the council and its officers to rethink this flawed and misguided proposal and re-state their commitment to protecting our green spaces</p>
DOR02045	<p>I am opposed to any release of green belt land for development. The consultation is being carried out on the basis of outdated population projection figures; the latest statistics from the ONS indicate that housing demand over the next 15 years can be accommodated by developing brownfield sites and maximising the potential on Wirral waters. The correlation between the areas of green belt land earmarked for potential release and areas of prime agricultural land is particularly alarming. If Brexit goes ahead, we are likely to need as much farming capacity as we can sustain and this is the wrong time to consider losing such assets on Wirral. The green open spaces of Wirral are much valued and contribute to the desirability of living here.</p>
DOR02046	<p>I strongly object to any further development on our green belt land in Irby and surrounding areas. The roads are already at gridlock in all these areas now during the morning and evening traveling times to and from work. Also weekends are a joke with long traffic delays as it is now. Plans to extend housing stock will only add more road congestion and the fumes from cars that are already a big problem.</p>
DOR02047	<p>Regarding plans for building on all green belt areas Storeton. This area is used regularly by runners dog walkers, walkers horse riders. It is one of the few areas serving the local people that has been enjoyed by generations of people. To build on this area would deprive many of enjoying the great outdoors and countryside we are so privileged to have on the Wirral. Bebington is classed as one of the best places to live in the UK this green belt being a massive contributor for that. It is also one of our great areas that still maintains beautiful landscape and views to wales and beyond. Building on any of these sites will disturb wildlife, our beautiful countryside and will increase traffic congestion on Storeton road and beyond. It will increase pollution and will be dangerous with the increased traffic for people whom regular cycle walk run and ride horses along these narrow roads. Please consider alternatives rather than lining the fat profits of private builders. Be inventive there are plenty of derelict sites on the dock roads that could provide luxury and social housing.</p>
DOR02048	<p>Please leave our beautiful green belt alone. We have such a wonderful area of natural beauty. To build on would be to destroy this. Once built on gone forever. What about schools, doctors, etc which hundreds of people would need flooding the area with extra people. Let alone congestion. I am just one person and insignificant in the scheme of things. Councillors are NOT listening to the public, it's all about greed. When would it stop? I for one would leave this area if building begins.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02049	I am opposed to all building upon green belt land
DOR02050	<p>Wirral's Green Belt, with its splendid views, walks and recreational areas, and the very distinct identities of its various communities, were key reasons why we and many other residents chose to live on the Peninsula and raise a family. All this is now at risk, unnecessarily so and we need your help to change things around. 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. 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. I have lived here for 8 years, raise my daughter here together with my husband, and I'm expecting our second child imminently. If Greasby's beautiful green spaces are sold on for profit, our family will be affected hugely, amongst others. The Appleby's wonderful dairy farm at Greenhouse/Arrowe Brook Farm is an asset to both Greasby and the wider area and should not be put at risk due to these plans.</p>
DOR02051	<p>Land should remain greenbelt and not built on. There are plenty of other areas for Industrial use, out of immediate residential areas. Additional housing would restrict the view, Eastham is an historic village and leads to the Country Park. We should not develop the area further. Additional pollution/traffic is unwanted and unnecessary.</p>
DOR02052	<p>There will be more traffic, roads are not maintained as it is. Properties will be far too expensive. Green Land will become none existent.</p>
DOR02053	<p>If houses are proposed for Bebington what will be the knock on effect for the local facilities. The local GP's in Civic Way does have the capacity to cope with many more patients. Something should be built to create long term jobs. What about a residential home? Local facilities will be used and there will be jobs. Win Win situation.</p>
DOR02054	<p>SHLAA0683 The Rake/Park View. We oppose this element of the plan for the following reasons: There would be a serious impact on the natural light that our house and our neighbours currently get. The houses on the green will remove the view of the sky from our side of the road. There is also a loss of privacy, as the houses on our side of the road are lower than the land opposite, so any new houses would look directly into our house, and our neighbours' houses. The houses on the estate were designed with green spaces between blocks of houses. Building on the green would change the character of the area. The increased flood risk to our properties would be considerable. The land on our side of the road is lower than it is opposite. Currently the green acts as a sink for rain water. If it rains heavily then the green floods, but the rain soaks in over time. If houses were built on the land then the water would run off, over the road and into the properties on our side of the road. The increased demand on parking and the road width should be taken into account. An additional 18 houses will make the road extremely congested. The road is not very wide so it would not take many extra cars to cause congestion and risk to children crossing the road. The local area is already heavily populated with a high density of houses. There have also been several new developments recently, including 36 new affordable homes at the former Archers pub, and 217 houses in the college development nearby. No thought has been given to school provision, doctors, etc. for the increased population. In additional 18 homes would add to the demand in the local area. We do not think there is any demand or lack of affordable houses in the local area. As already stated, there are at least 253 homes being built in the local area.</p> <p>Looking on rightmove recently there were 10 properties under £150,000 for sale within 1/4 mile of the proposed site. SHLAA2025 Bromborough Car Park Building on the car park in Alport Lane, Bromborough for employment and residential purposes would be crazy. This car park is essential for the existing local businesses. It is always full during the day with people using the local shops, banks, cafes and other businesses. If this car park was built on then the current businesses would close down, more people would go to the Croft Retail Park, increasing congestion, and there would be fewer options for people living locally to actually walk to shops. The character of the village would be lost and Bromborough would just turn into a housing estate without any small local businesses. SHLAA2024 Bromborough Civic Centre The civic centre is the hub of the community. It is used for many purposes by many different community groups. If this was lost it would be gone from the community forever. Comments on the overall plan: Are the estimates for the need for 12,000 new homes accurate? There has been no thought about the impact of Brexit - many people could decide to leave the country after the UK leaves the EU, causing a decline in population. There doesn't appear to be a lack of affordable houses in Wirral as a whole. In our local area house prices have not increased significantly in the last 10 years. The green belt is there to stop urban sprawl and allow existing towns and villages to keep their boundaries and be close to countryside. The plan proposed by the council impacts all the existing towns and villages that border the green belt. The towns would spread, and villages merge with towns. This is exactly what the green belt is there to stop. IF 12000 houses really are needed (and I'm not sure they are) then planning a new town would work much better than squeezing more houses into current towns and allowing the green belt to edge outwards increasing urban sprawl. 12000 households is roughly double the size of Bromborough (6690 in the 2011 census). This has 3 primary schools, a doctors surgery, dentist, shops, etc. Spreading an extra 12000 homes across existing communities, and allowing them to spread into what is currently green belt, will increase pressure on schools, doctors and other services. Wirral Waters should be included in the long term plan. This is exactly what people think of as a brownfield site. It would be a new community that could be planned with the right services, have no impact on the green belt, and allow existing communities to keep their character. The full plan for Wirral Waters has enough new homes to cover the governments requirement for the next 15 years, without changing the character of all the towns, villages and countryside across Wirral that has been proposed by the council.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02055	I am totally 100% opposed to any development on greenbelt. It is unnecessary to build on green belt. The National Policy Planning Framework 2 (NPPF2) using Office For National Statistics (ONS) figures has shown that the shortfall in housing requirements for Wirral CAN be met by brownfield sites. The latest figures from the ONS has revised downwards the number of new dwellings required for Wirral from 2020 to 2035 - all can be produced from brownfield or maybe urban infill (not using green belt). Wirral has one of the lowest greenbelt percentages at 45%, compared with neighbouring Cheshire of around 90%. What greenbelt we have left must be maintained to retain the character of our area. Using brownfield sites particularly in central Birkenhead or Wirral Waters where infrastructure is already in place and is ideally suited for affordable accommodation, should be developed to meet targets. There are also many empty homes in Wirral which may be considered. Green belt development will not attract affordable housing as Developers will want profits from expensive properties. Agricultural land, greenbelt, and sites with special asset landscape value are there to be protected and to remain undeveloped.
DOR02056	As usual with this council, reactive and irresponsible due to individual and collective incompetence. Any building on Green belt land is against resident wishes, you've clearly demonstrating that you have no understanding of our feelings or opinions, as well as some brownfield sites. Our home villages, are just that, our homes, you're plans will further destroy our habitat, culture and way of life. Most notable areas that do not make sense are the fields at Grange Road, and the areas surrounding the War Memorial. Wirral has a special character, especially areas such as West Kirby that are prime, with a little TLC to build upon its beauty and potential. Instead of building more houses and destroying our way of life why not invest in the infrastructure of the area delivering a platform for business, visitors, employment and incremental income. It's time our Council built a vision and strategy for our people, our peninsular and our children that protects our culture and natural habitat not destroying our aspirations. This council bounces from mistake to mistake, perhaps working for its people rather than against us would be a first step
DOR02057	The council and its partners in this should be looking to develop the brownfield sites of dereliction in Birkenhead and Wallasey (and there are plenty of them!!) before even considering branching out into more rural areas of Wirral. The disruption this would cause is incalculable, has anyone actually considered infrastructure? New estates would require new roads, schools, access to shopping facilities and healthcare, these are already things that WBC has consistently demonstrated year upon year that they are unable to effectively manage, and maintain anyway, so how will they cope with this added pressure? My other concern is that there are residents of west Wirral who have worked hard to escape Birkenhead and Wallasey, and are perturbed about social housing and all the problems it brings coming to these more affluent areas. The plan is unrealistic and the borough is struggling in the current climate as it is.
DOR02058	Given that the assumptions used for this now seem completely out of date (and too high) the whole plan needs to be rethought - as well as doing more to use brown-field sites. Our green belt on Wirral is one of the key differentiators that bring people and businesses here, so using it for building will only damage the borough for everyone living in it.
DOR02059	The priority for Wirral's local plan must be affordable housing. This is clearly not what building and development companies will want as they will look purely at profit. With this in mind surely development must be prioritized where house prices will remain affordable which is predominantly along the East side of the peninsula. With all the sites in question being green belt land, another priority must be that of the people/ farmers that work the land. Food production should not be sacrificed.
DOR02060	<p>I write to express my absolute dismay and disgust, both with the council's proposals to redevelop parts of Wirral's greenbelt, and also that the council find themselves in this sorry mess at all. I understand that then Housing Secretary Sajid David wrote to the Council earlier this year, expressing the government's intention to intervene due to the Council's continued failure to produce a Local Plan of its own. According to his letter, the Council has consistently failed to produce a Local Plan since its last one EIGHTEEN years ago, and has failed to meet milestones at least six times since 2004. Clearly there is now pressure on Wirral Council to finally fulfil their obligations, but it is utterly scandalous that, as a result, the Council is now attempting to rush through an poorly-conceived, ill thought out and recklessly damaging response.</p> <p>The proposed release of green belt is based on the idea that Wirral would need to meet a target of 800 new houses per annum, or at least 12,000 over the plan period. It has since become apparent following the release of ONS statistics that the base figures on which these estimates were based are now out-dated. Instead, as the council leader has himself stated, the number of new homes required should be less than 500. Why on earth has the consultation not, as a result, been suspended and plans updated to reflect this new figure? Perhaps because the government is putting pressure on due to the consistent failing of the council to deliver a local plan? Or perhaps because councillors would like to ride in, knight in shining armour style, saving green belt that was never in any danger in the first place? The council leader has said he has lobbied the government to dispute the required figures and push for a total which better reflects our housing needs, but has only done so last month, after the consultation was live. He has been council leader for six years, so perhaps if he had delivered a Local Plan in the first place we wouldn't be in this position? One look at Wirral's actual population figures - up 0.11% between 2011 and 2014 - immediately tells you how ludicrous these suggested housing numbers have always been. I have lived on the Wirral my whole life - 37 years. It is patently obvious that there are vast areas of the peninsula where there are brownfield redevelopment opportunities that could easily cater for our housing requirements. Perhaps the council might like to drive through the 13,000 houses proposed through the Wirral Waters development - a development which has been on the cards for much of my adult life?!</p> <p>Some of the greenbelt areas proposed for possible redevelopment beggar belief. I now live in Prenton but grew up in Greasby. I note with dismay the possible loss of Appleby's farm, east of Rigby Drive. This is, I believe, a third generation farm that is at the absolute heart of the local community, the loss of which would be devastating. With Greasby copse close by, that site is a haven for wildlife. I then think about how on earth Greasby would cope with the influx of people? Places at the local schools are already in high demand. I know from my parents still living there that it is difficult to get a doctor's appointment. And that's without even talking about the pressure that would be placed on Arrowe Road, which simply wouldn't be equipped to carry the extra volume of traffic. There are many other parts of Wirral under threat that could say the same. Wirral is an absolutely beautiful place to live, and its green belt is absolutely integral to its community. The plans would utterly destroy it. Make no mistake, any attempt to blame the national government for this will be treated with the contempt it deserves. There's more than sufficient brownfield sites to meet our true demand, and it's time for this council to listen to, serve and stand up for the people who put it in power.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02061	It is unbelievable that any local authority would suggest or endorse building on any greenbelt land in Wirral and especially my home area of Eastham. The historic village would disappear and become blocked by the extra traffic created by more people and cars. It is a great shame this was not addressed fourteen years ago when first requested by the government then perhaps we would not now be in the position of just grabbing all the greenbelt possible, losing all the open spaces, affecting peoples' lives, losing wildlife and changing and spoiling the lovely Wirral Peninsular forever. Once we lose the greenbelt it has gone never to be returned. Please don't do it and find another way. There must be lots of brown sites still available and empty houses which can be used but of course this would not provide the same income as selling off our greenbelt to developers. Please THINK AGAIN!
DOR02062	I feel I must write to express my deep concern over the proposed plans to build thousands of new properties in Wirral's greenbelt. Wirral does not need thousands more properties, Wirral does not have the thousands of new jobs!! Building on greenbelt should not be an option. The damage this will do will be catastrophic and irreversible. Wirral is a beautiful green county with diverse wildlife and residents have decided to live on the Wirral because of this. Wirral is a peninsula and therefore traffic is restricted on how it leaves and enters the County. The M53 is at a standstill during peak hours during the daily commute to and from work. Queues to get off the M53 tail back onto the motorways at several junctions including Bebington which is extremely dangerous. The A41 and Chester High road are heavily congested along with both Mersey tunnels. Clatterbridge roundabout and surrounding areas, Clatterbridge Hospital, Brimstage Road and down towards the Croft retail park, are also very congested. Building houses on the greenbelt land around this area would result in gridlock. New developments around Clatterbridge/Storeton would be devastating for the area. The greenbelt and wildlife would disappear for ever and the chaos it would cause would be catastrophic. Building more houses would lead to more cars, more congestion, more standing traffic resulting in higher pollution levels that the government is trying to reduce!! Wirral does not have the capacity to provide jobs for thousands more residents therefore they would have to commute. Wirral does not have the road structure or public transport capacity to cope with this increase. It already struggles. Liverpool, Deeside, Chester and Manchester are all areas of major employment. Don't let Wirral become a commuter belt for these areas. Local hospitals are unable to cope at present with the numbers of patients building more houses would be irresponsible. Say no to all building on greenbelt and any new developments be affordable housing and on a much smaller scale be built on brownfield. Don't build on Wirral's Greenbelt
DOR02063	Use off green belt land will irreversibly destroy areas vital for wildlife, trees and vegetation that are not just part of the very essence of Wirral today but also our children's inheritance. It will be a further contribution to the bigger picture of global warming. It is also questionable that any housing developed will truly meet the desired objective of being "affordable".
DOR02064	Recent research including Office of National Statistics shows Wirral has a housing shortage or an under-occupation/distribution problem so why the need to develop on Green Belt? Not convinced that all brownfield options have been considered including Wirral Waters. In the fullness of time could the Council put hand on heart and say that the lack of progress was all fault? Building on Green Belt D62 provide the required types of housing. Green belt developments will all be executive housing with little or most probably no affordable housing provided. Any contribution from developers towards future council affordable developments will at best be at a ratio of 1 to 10 i.e. 10% B87 is a high price to pay to provide the housing required on the Wirral and would take years to develop and would further unbalance the borough. - The plans have a disproportionate volume of housing being met by just a few communities and these communities are in areas that are beyond affordability for affordable housing. - There is currently insufficient infrastructure (particularly highways and rail connectivity) within these communities which would make these plans undeliverable. High proportion of executive housing residents would commute daily out of the borough to work.
DOR02065	The proposals for new housing in the Caldys area including Stapleton Woods and the area down to the West Kirby/Heswall road should be opposed for a variety of reasons. Firstly, the woods are a thriving area for wildlife and greenery, having foxes, badgers and bats as residents, along with various birds, including woodpeckers. As Green Belt land, this flora and fauna would be at risk. Secondly on a more human level, the transport infrastructure has recently lost its remaining bus services with the failure of Avon buses, and has little easy linkage to the rail services. (Such links are far better for development in the Meols/Moreton area, with the long proposed new rail station at Carr lane, plus main road links for bus transport and access to the motorway system, all three links being good to other parts of Wirral and Liverpool) Finally, new housing in the Caldys area would require far deeper infrastructure investment in schools (particularly at primary level) and health, both difficult to access at present due to the poor access to the public transport system. I understand the Council needs a plan, but there are other, better options for development in other areas, many of which do not have deleterious effect on the Green Belt.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02066	<p>I am concerned about the impact on the transportation infrastructure.</p> <p>1) Daily commute employment options on the Wirral for me are limited and so I have to commute to Warrington. There are only 3 major route options by road for me, on and off the Wirral, all of which are congested at peak travel times.</p> <p>Option 1 - My preferred route makes use of the M53 but I have to start and finish work early to minimise travel time that results from the sheer volume of traffic that also leaves and returns to the Wirral at peak times. My route to the M53 is via Brimstage Road which is a narrow and winding road that passes through a 30 MPH at Brimstage. This road is bad enough at present with large vehicles appearing around a blind bend well over the central white line or those driving too fast through Brimstage. When an accident occurs or flooding or fallen tree block the road the alternatives route options are just as problematic. There is a nursery school in Brimstage village and I often see nursery staff and children crossing the road. The dangers to them crossing the road will increase with higher volumes of traffic. I dread to think what my journey to work will become if the scale of new development is realised and new residents cannot find work on the Wirral thus make road travel a nightmare. Therefore, in my opinion, the current road infrastructure is inadequate to cope with the proposed housing development.</p> <p>Option 2 - Alternative route via the A540. There are major bottle necks on this road as it passes through Neston/Little Neston and again through Heswall. The single lane sections in these areas, currently struggle to cope with the volume of traffic and will only get worse with the proposed housing development.</p> <p>Option 3 - Alternative route via the Mersey tunnels. A costly option when considering tunnel fees and extra mileage. When I've used the tunnel routes it has been very busy at peak times. I have tried using a combination of cycling and public transport as an alternative to driving. I attempted this for well over 6 months but in the end a 4 hours daily return commute was not sustainable. Public transport that crosses the green belt is very poor and so it is inevitable that the proposed development plan will put more cars on the road.</p> <p>2) General traffic around Heswall As mentioned earlier the route through Heswall town centre is slow during peak times and any proposed housing development that lies beyond Heswall towards Hoylake will only make this worse as they travel back and forth. As the A540 runs through Heswall town centre as a single carriageway road it is a bottle neck that causes congestion for those who need access to or through the town.</p>
DOR02067	Leave our green belt alone. Thank you!
DOR02068	<p>I object to the local plan. In particular I object to the greenbelt land being taken away. I think the local plan has many flaws in it, not least the number of houses required. Something that the council leader himself has admitted to being incorrect. I object to the local plan as how can one be consulted on something that has changing goalposts? It has not even considered the type of housing required or the area that needs housing. There is such poverty in many areas on the river Mersey side of the Wirral and yet the greenbelt was going to be taken from here. It is a very unfair plan that will not meet the needs of Wirral people. We need prime agricultural land to remain as such. We need houses for affordable first time buyers. Not huge houses built on greenbelt that only the few can afford. I reject the local plan and object to it. We need houses for the many not the few. Opposite the Charles Thompson mission which feeds 70-100 homeless people every day is a unite office. This office is in two former terraced houses. We do need more houses for we do have poverty and homelessness but the houses need to be in the right place and affordable. The council has made a right hash of the local plan I object to it.</p>
DOR02069	No need to build on green field sites more than enough brown field sites
DOR02070	<p>The infrastructure will not be able to cope with the number of houses planned. the land next to Grange Road in West Kirby is one example. That road is already very busy and the only exit from that land is on to Grange Road which would cause major traffic problems. Building on Land in grange Old Road would cause similar problems. As I see it the only land in West Kirby suitable for development is the site of the fire station. Why not build a multi storey car park there? Parking space is needed in West Kirby - more so than houses which would probably be out of reach of the people who do need housing. The derelict flats on Banks Road, West Kirby should have been either renovated or demolished a long time ago and the council should address the problem of empty houses before building in areas which would destroy the character of Wirral. Why are we leaving it to the government to decide how many houses we need? Is that not what the council is for?</p>
DOR02071	<p>Local Council appears to have ignored requests for any housing plan from Government for a number of years. You now seem to be opting for a quick and dirty, easy option of favouring the use of greenbelt land and the destruction of the very nature and landscape of Wirral. Brownfield sites, unoccupied houses and neglected areas must be considered before your apparent acceptance and preference for the convenience and profit of building developers. Surely as the current 'keepers' of Wirral you are better than this.</p>
DOR02072	<p>I am opposed to building on green belt land and believe it is possible to avoid this in a number of ways. According to research I have conducted based on the latest available online information, 4600 homes could be created using available brown belt land as well as the 2,211 long term empty houses in the region. There are currently 12 listed buildings in the region and while it may require more careful strategic negotiating with heritage bodies, it is possible to develop such buildings into beautiful homes. The remainder of the homes that have been predicted as being needed can, I believe be built on water since we are a peninsular. Using the same model as the house boats on the Thames for instance, this is entirely possible. The Thames house boats have proven to be very effective in terms of security also.</p>
DOR02073	<p>Ch63 has topped many polls for its quality of life. You are just about to destroy that! Many of these areas will be gridlocked with traffic. In Spital now and bearing in mind we are under the flight path to and from the airport at peak times it will be almost impossible to get emergency services through. What a legacy to be remembered as the Council that sold its soul!!!</p>
DOR02074	<p>Bromborough Civic Centre and car park are used by many people all week. The community are working hard to promote a sense of belonging and inclusivity for all. To lose these facilities would be counterproductive and leave an urban desert</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02075	In reply to your consultation about building on green belt, I wish to register my disagreement to this. Wirral is a peninsula and therefore surrounded on three sides by water so are restricted as to where to build this in its self has its problems with movement of traffic as a lot of residence work out side of the Wirral, it is a nightmare traveling any way out of Wirral at the peak times by adding any further housing it is going to increase what is already overcrowded roads. With the view of in fill villages as we have had a letter about as we live in Riverbank Road,CH60 4SG. This road has had flooding and Welsh water have been fined for polluting the River Dee, because of this they have had to put a second holding tank in the field to the left of the road, when we have heavy rain the lower village floods and we have river's down Riverbank road, any further building would add to what is an over stretched system. We should be protecting our green belt after all this is why most people live on the Wirral by not protecting this we are letting are children and grandchildren down. I have been informed that some of the agricultural land locally has been sold to a building company, does this mean that the council have already decided what should be a consultation process is actually going to take place. Farmers who have farmed land for years are going to lose their livelihood which will add to unemployment, in this uncertain times with Brexit we are going to need this land for our food supply, no overpriced housing that only a certain few can afford and building companies making massive profits. The numbers that this process has been based on are totally wrong as the councils own figures prove the population of the Wirral is declining. I hope the council will listen to the voters comments on this and stand by what each and every one of you have said about not wanting to build on green belt.
DOR02076	Wirral doesn't have to use green belt land to build houses on. It appears that the data the council is using is out of date. Social housing is needed not high end houses.
DOR02077	I was told about the green-belt plans by another Wirral resident last week. At no time have I received any information through the post, which I should have done, given the scale of the proposals. The amount of people who turned up to your meetings are not proportional to the amount of people who are now shocked and disgusted. There are so many places on the Wirral that need regeneration (Birkenhead, New Ferry, Rock Ferry etc) and far too little green belt for it to be touched. Pour money into these dilapidated sites, buy out and flatten the boarded up properties and start again, but do not leave us with no countryside at all. That enormous area around Storeton must be left to the wildlife, or what's left of it, It belongs to the future generations. You have no right to obliterate these places now that there is so little green-belt left, whilst leaving these dying towns abandoned. Once these fields are gone, they are gone. You must stand with the residents and challenge these plans.
DOR02078	I welcome more affordable housing in Wirral but I'm concerned about the current level of infrastructure. Large investment would be needed to bring roads up to standard for more traffic. And also bus services. As it stands, we have no bus service at all now (Avon buses gone bust) between Barnston/Heswall/Birkenhead. The road junction at Barnston Village/Storeton Lane is already a dangerous bottle neck with no footpath. As a main route between Birkenhead and Heswall, it backs up daily at peak times and when there is an incident on the M53 it becomes gridlocked. This will be a major problem to resolve before extra housing is built in Barnston and Gills lane areas. So I would like to see a robust and workable solution in place before land is released for housing.
DOR02079	There's no need for this ruination of our green belt. The government have already said it doesn't need to be done. And besides a lot of this won't have affordable homes built!
DOR02080	Bromborough Carpark. This carpark is vital to the community to use local amenities and specialist shops rather than the larger retail giants of the Croft. To take away this access will kill the village, the shops and the sense of community that we moved here for. I live directly opposite this proposed site and will be devastated if this goes ahead and will find every legal avenue to restrict / complain and affect / cost the council money if any changes are made. There are many brown zones fit for development within the Wirral that would not have such adverse effects and it boggles my mind why this is even a proposal absolutely mindless nonsense.
DOR02081	I completely object to the use of green belt land being used for any other reason than why it was originally chosen as Green belt in the Wirral. There are a huge number of places in Wirral which are currently empty, nearly 6000 and these could be used before more unnecessary building is done. Just in the small village of Irby the plan is to build nearly 1000. in the last few years a primary school was closed due to dwindling numbers. The current facilities of doctors surgery, school and roads in this very small area will not cope with this amount of building and no money is being offered to upgrade these facilities. The council has no money as it keeps saying so are the government going to step in and help? No as they are cutting all money to council in 2020! so none of this makes any sense. It doesn't make sense that when a gas explosion can ruin building in New Ferry money can't be given even by the government to help re build a small area but as soon as property developers and the money to be raised from selling thousands of house the Wirral Councillors are very happy to ruin Wirral by selling of its best assets, the green belt. The Wirral is such a lovely place to live and visit due to these areas. Visitors will not want to come and people won't want to live here when it is gone. i have lived in other areas of the country and Wirral land is unique and many other counties are a lot larger and could accommodate and probably have the need for more housing. Wirral does not!
DOR02082	I appreciate the need for more housing, but wonder if the local need is accurately assessed. Respecting the environment should be the main priority, particularly with global warming- I would ask that whatever the outcome, the council aims to cut down no trees or destroy hedgerows, by doing this it will help wildlife & enhance the environment of any new homes- if trees are destroyed- at least the same number should be replanted & protected
DOR02083	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Houses at lower end of the market rather than executive homes should be a priority as so many starter homes have been bought as rental properties. 2. Renovation of empty properties before any new builds. 3. All Brownfield sites to be used for New Builds before development of any proposed greenbelt sites. 4. Land that has been donated for use by the General Public should not be used. 5. The council should not acquire greenbelt land by compulsory purchase. 6. New housing should be planned so as not to cause congestion on roads and should be located in areas where schools are not already overcrowded.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	7. The council should not profit from the sale of greenbelt land in council ownership.
DOR02084	If you build on the car park in Bromborough Village then you will kill the village! If people have nowhere to park then they simply won't go! It is hard enough for small businesses to compete against the large business parks like the Croft with free parking outside the shops. But with no car park, the village businesses are doomed. There are plenty of other places to build, as our Councillor has already pointed out. Come on councillors, have some sense and understanding for goodness sake Plus the Civic Centre & library are valuable resources for locals, especially the older generation who meet there for important social interaction, bevit in the library, Women's Institute, U3A meetings etc.
DOR02085	We haven't got to funding to provide a level of service now so who are you going to provide funding for all the additional road improvement schemes, doctors, dentists, hospitals, schools, play groups, care homes, social services, refuse disposal and collection, police, fire, emergency services, that is required just to support an increase in population in the community. There's also a problem in as much as for every single home there at least one if not 3 vehicles most of our roads in and around our green belt are small bottle necks which are already congested, if there's an incident on the M53 the Wirral goes into shut down with little traffic movement. There's going to also be so much more upheaval due the fact that all utility services will have to be up graded to the remote areas where gas, electric, water, phone/internet, and new sewers will have to go in underground. These are the things most people have not considered before we tarmac over our green spaces, we are almost an island so why aren't we cleaning and improving the run down areas instead to make people's lives better there as this might just cure some of the divisions between those that have, and those that have not. It may well cure some of the antisocial behaviour of some our youngsters. If we had better care/ retirement homes some of the older members of this area may just move relinquishing property's for others to move up the ladder of the housing market!!!
DOR02086	I wish to express my fierce opposition to the proposals put forward to release huge swathes of precious Green Belt land on the Wirral for housing development. The Green Belt is a vital space for the wellbeing of every citizen on the Wirral that should be cherished and protected for future generations. We live in an increasingly stressful world – only last week it was reported that Wirral NHS has one of the largest waiting lists for access to mental health treatment in the UK (https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-45895541). There is significant and growing evidence on the mental health benefits of green spaces and yet Wirral Council is proposing that we build on yet more of our precious Green Belt space. What madness is this? (https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/357411/Review8_Green_spaces_health_inequalities.pdf) Wirral Council has a duty to all its citizens to protect and maintain our local green spaces. I cannot understand or accept why they are proposing to build on the Green Belt when there continues to be sufficient Brownfield site building opportunities elsewhere within the peninsula. Moreover, it is disgraceful that Wirral Council, its employees and elected representatives have taken so long to produce a new Local Plan, which appears to be based on questionable figures to satisfy unrealistic and overinflated targets. I chose to live on the Wirral and raise a young family here because of the beautiful green spaces that surround us. It makes me sad to know that this is now under threat and I am frustrated that the pleas of local residents to stop a new Local Plan being steam-rolled through seem to be being ignored. I implore that the substantial opposition of local residents is listened to and heard and that the current Local Plan process is altered to take into consideration the views of the people, in order to ensure that the Wirral Green Belt is retained for the continued benefit of residents and visitors, and more importantly for future generations to enjoy. It may be stating the obvious, but once the Green Belt has been built on, we can never get it back.
DOR02087	The proposed greenbelt boundary correction SP056B is supported but should be extended to also include rear garden to rear of houses at Croft Drive East to better match the existing situation on the ground.
DOR02088	I strongly object to the proposed plan to sell off and allow building on Wirral's Green Belt, particularly in and around Greasby Village. My reasons for this objection are as follows: - a) the Governments guidance state that the Council can challenge the Governments targets so why aren't they, on the basis that the councils have previously been advised in a report by [another respondent], mathematical modelling, statistics and operational research, that it does not require 800 houses per annum but 220 - 350 or approximately 4,300 houses in total and not 16,000 as reported. b) we currently do not have the infra structure, i.e., schools, medical facilities, local amenities, etc. c) these houses should be built where they are required, i.e., Bidston, Birkenhead, Tranmere, Rock Ferry where there are many Brown Field sites. d) putting farmers out of business by encouraging land owners, e.g., Levers, to sell off their land to private developers. e) destroying/ spoiling a village that is one of the earliest settlements in Britain c8500 BC f) I don't want my grandchildren to say that my generation allowed the Council to sell off their and their children's Green Belt land

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02089	<p>1. WBC insist that the number of units that need to be built in their draft local plan are driven by a Central Government formula. Whilst this may be true in part, the base information regarding projected population increases and economic growth etc that has been imputed to that formula have provide by WBC. They have been grossly over estimated and optimistically exaggerated thus distorting upwards the number of units required. From the WBC's own compendium of statistics I would suggest a figure of 300 a year rather 800 is closer to the mark for the period of the plan.</p> <p>2.WBC say they will adopt Brownfield site first policy. They have however failed to maintain the brownfield site register properly and have made scant effort to address the numerous brownfield sites available (other than Wirral Waters). No attention at all has been given to the major opportunities that exist in mixed use site such as Morton/Leasowe, New Ferry and Birkenhead. These are areas that desperately need innovative regeneration and WBC is failing them with this plan.</p> <p>3. WBC says it adopts a `settlement` approach grouping individual villages such as Irby, Pensby and Thingwall together. Surely this is not their call and is in direct contravention to Green belt guidelines. WBC in the past have refused individual applications for this very reason.</p> <p>4. In closing, I would like to say that I have found WBC very high handed and arrogant in this so called option review. They initially produced three lists of greenbelt sites for consideration in 5, 10, and 15 years. From those lists they then produced, in house a single list of 48 sites without any consultation with the residents.</p>
DOR02090	<p>This is an absolute travesty bourn from the minds of a corrupt and dammed right reckless Labour Council. There is absolutely not need nor appetite to release any of Wirral's Greenbelt for wholesale housing development. Vacant housing should be refurbished and made affordable, Brownbelt land must be considered, and ploughing money into those more deprived area's must also be priority. This has been a scandal from the off, and it must not be allow to continue. NO NO NO! to the release of any Greenbelt on the beautiful Wirral Peninsula and shame on Labour (the peoples party, I think not) for even considering this as an option.</p>
DOR02091	<p>Releasing Lever Causeway sites will create a sprawl from Prenton to Bebington to Storeton. Increasing traffic will cause major congestion. Current access to countryside provided by the causeway will disappear.</p>
DOR02092	<p>I am not happy about the proposed plans for building around Seabank Road, Lower Heswall as it will have an adverse environmental effect on the area and will fundamentally change the character of this greenbelt.</p>
DOR02093	<p>Don't ruin the greenbelt until you've used up the brown field land, greenbelt should not be sacrificed unnecessarily</p>
DOR02094	<p>I strongly object to the following green belt areas being explored for housing developments: SP030 - SP036 (inclusive of), these proposals will negatively impact on the physical environment, the wildlife, the traffic and in turn affect the mental and physical health of residents living in the area. We need to protect our green belt areas as these are what makes Wirral, Wirral the leisure peninsular. Wirral prides itself on having a great balance between housing, business and countryside. There are many brown belt areas in desperate need of regeneration, these should be the main focus.</p>
DOR02095	<p>I am disgusted that the proposals for so many houses to be built on land around Storeton in particular Lever Causeway will ruin our countryside, kill our wildlife and overcrowd our area. Our shops, health services and everything else will be overstretched even more than it is now. We do not want more people living in this area, how about building more houses on the other side of the M53, why has that area not been earmarked for new houses ? You are about to destroy the magnificent views across the countryside that have been there forever, who wants to live in a built up crowded area, we go to cities for that, not rural areas. Wrong, wrong, wrong, sad,sad,sad !</p>
DOR02096	<p>Green land should be protected for the health and freedom of the future</p>
DOR02097	<p>I urge you to reconsider any plans to build on the car park, civic centre, & library on Allport Lane Bromborough. Bromborough is a historic village & to build a housing development on the site would be out of character for the area, & would rip the heart out of Bromborough village. The car park is essential for the village & is always well used often being full to capacity. The civic centre & library is so important to the local community for the young, old, & for the many groups & societies that use it to meet up. We desperately need to preserve the facilities in Bromborough since other local towns like New Ferry got damaged so badly in the explosion, and recently in Church road Bebington the main supermarket has closed. Please protect Bromborough village.</p>
DOR02098	<p>Due to the inefficiency of the council the local plan,which should have been done years ago is a fiasco. The council can blame the government targets as much as they like but had they produced a plan with the correct and accurate info re population growth then the targets for new houses would not require the releasing of green belt. Also why are the council not challenging the government figures when Wirral population is falling. The council are also blaming Peel Holdings but have not worked with this company to facilitate building at Wirral waters. Allowing greedy investors and developers to builder expensive houses on our precious green belt is outrageous when it is affordable housing and the regeneration of poorer areas of the borough which is required. Does [the Council Leader] have an agenda he's not sharing with Wirral residents.</p>
DOR02099	<p>One word ridiculous. There planning to squeeze 18 houses on to the end of Bromborough Rake when there isn't enough room for all the cars which use the railway station. A small car park would be a better option. Where are the new residents going to park? Never mind the fact that open spaces are few and far between. Also planning to build in Dibbinsdale Nature reserve, what twerp thought that was a good idea. Building should only be done on brownfield sites and then there needs to be 1 and 2 bedroom properties for all the people that got hit by the bedroom tax and had to downsize. I don't hold out much hope that this will end well as the same idiots that brought in the bedroom tax are probably the same that have come up with this ridiculous proposition.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02100	Firstly its Wirral Council that have got us in this situation by not doing what they should have been doing over the last fifteen years, without an apology to any of its constituents. Secondly the Wirral is only a small piece of land, which needs to sustain its green belt at all costs. The Council needs to build on brown field sites before it considers any green field sites no matter the material cost as the cost of losing the greenfield sites is much more of a loss to all the residence that cannot be reclaimed.
DOR02101	I attended 1 of the public meetings and remain concerned about whether the council will make every effort to build on brown belt land before attacking the green belt. I live in Spital, roads here are already congested because of traffic 7 days a week going to the very successful Bromborough retail park and business park. Building on the green belt along the M53 corridor from Bromborough through Spital and Storeton will add to this traffic and roads will not be able to cope. Has the council considered why local landowners who own and farm the green belt are so ready to sell the land for building houses? Can anything be done to make the retention of their land more appealing? Does Wirral really need all this extra housing? It seems to me the greater problem is that our children grow up on the Wirral, benefit from the excellent schools and then move away for the best jobs. This means they are not buying houses here. What sort of houses are proposed? More housing for the older retired population will create its own problems with the burden of the cost of social care for an elderly retired population. There are office buildings in Birkenhead standing empty e.g. Municipal Building. Did I read that it's proposed this is converted to student accommodation? Would this count towards the targets? There was mention of the problems of cleaning the land for housing along the docks. This has already been done between Woodside and Birkenhead Priory apparently without any prolonged problems and there are office blocks and flats occupying the space now.
DOR02102	Developing brownfield sites with energy efficient modern affordable homes is great, but please ensure that the plans include adequate parking provision otherwise the developments will have a negative effect on not only local businesses but also our environment. Also consider asking developers to plant a tree wherever possible (doesn't need to be a large one that will threaten structures), as a green environment is not only important in the Green Belt but to all of us.
DOR02103	The fact is there has been a great deal of misinformation being published by the Council. First the Council came up with a need to build 12,000 homes over 15 years. If the Council used the ONC guidelines the housing needs would be considerably lower. Currently there are planning permission for about 16,000 properties on brownfield sites. This proves that no green belt needs to be touched. Why are the Council dragging their heels with providing planning permission for the Peel holding dock estate. The whole thing is an absolute con.
DOR02104	<p>We are against the use of any greenbelt land for housing /building development.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It will have a negative Impact on the natural beauty , public amenity , tourism and housing values on the Wirral. The wellbeing and quality of life of its citizens will be diminished. The council state they are against greenbelt use so we expect them to fight the governments overstated assessment of Wirral's housing needs with all means available to them. 2. The greenbelt use is apparently being decided by purely technical means. There is no measure of the immediate and long term social impact in the review process. There are measures for wildlife, agriculture, flooding wetland bird habitat, but absolutely no measure of the impact on the people who will be affected directly by development of greenbelt land in front of their homes. Loss of house value , traffic , noise, light pollution large estate social problems, the impact of these issues on existing residents should be measured and rated. 3. The planning department have been tasked with the Technical exercise of finding land for 800 homes per year for 15 years by the council / government. It is essential that the number of 800 homes is challenged by an independent assessment to get it reduced to the correct housing requirement for the Wirral 4. The 5 principals of greenbelt are still in force under current law but are being totally ignored in preference for the latest government instruction. The planners have a duty to obey all planning statutes and need to produce a plan on that basis. Housing on any greenbelt site does not meet the 5 greenbelt principals laid out in the law. The proposed plan is not fully compliant with current planning legislation and should be redrawn. A fully compliant plan should be drawn up and presented as a challenge to the Government. Regeneration should be at the heart of the plan. It should be the standpoint for additional funding for much needed urban redevelopment and housing targets. 5. The planning viability plan predicts the bleak future for the Wirral greenbelt. Logically the viable greenbelt sites are most attractive to developers and will be first to be built on. The difficult regeneration sites will remain difficult and at every 5 year review more green belt will alas be required to meet housing targets. Developers have shown they will wait for greenbelt land release . Urban regeneration will never happen if you release greenbelt land. We can look locally to Woodchurch and Noctorum estates as examples of the failure of this planning strategy. Areas of Birkenhead are still desolate from the population move to these estates 40 years ago. It has been shown nationally that releasing greenbelt for housing accelerates inner city decay and promotes social problems on inadequately served housing estates. Have we learnt nothing? 4 Wirral waters / Peel holdings has outline planning for 13500 homes. The focus on Wirral waters should be to prove viability over 10 -15 years not 5 years so increased numbers of homes can included in the plan. 6. We have found council background information on sites offered by developers not to be correct. Sites are described in more attractive detail by developers with omissions on current use , protected trees, biodiversity , watercourses and we have even found doubt as to who owns the land. Owners and developers who have offered sites need more thorough checking before being included in the plan. 7. Councillors need educating on the implications of passing the plan. Contrary to a councillors statement at the public meeting he will not be able to fight planning applications on greenbelt principals after the plan is passed for housing development. It will no longer be greenbelt.
DOR02105	As a result of the release of the recent ONS statistics surely this public consultation is redundant! The number of houses that (theoretically) need to be built has changed...massively! Please review the situation and give us a chance to comment on proper and genuine facts rather than on badly thought out and presented spurious rubbish!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02106	On behalf of mum, she objects to the plan for Eastham Thorn leigh Ave on the grounds of loss of habitat for local wildlife, bats, hedgehogs, foxes, hares, owls and swifts who rely on the field for food, access to the site issues, the lack of infrastructure, doctors school places, hospital provision and the loss of green space in the area as it will turn Eastham into a concrete jungle if all sites are released and built on.
DOR02107	As a resident of Greasby, I am extremely concerned by the proposed plans to potentially build on some of the designated areas. In particular, the release of the Greasby Copse is very worrying as this would cause irreversible damage to a key part of the Wirral. It would also cause great disruption to the current residents. Please look for suitable alternatives.
DOR02108	<p>I am strongly against the development of Greenbelt land and we should not be pushed into making a decision to build on Greenbelt if other viable options do exist, they must be considered first. One of the main reasons I returned to live on the Wirral is the exceptional countryside, walks and community lifestyle that are on offer here. These are under threat with the Greenbelt proposals threatening urban expanse and I find it hard to justify why we even need to consider Greenbelt development, when it has now been shown we can meet the reduced government requirement without building on ANY Greenbelt. Census data shows the Wirral population peaked in the late 1960s at around 343,000 the last census in 2011 showed the Wirral population had fallen to 319,000. With this overall decrease of more than 20,000 people, there simply cannot be the demand on housing to outstrip the 1960s peak supply, which had capacity to house 20,000+ more residents over 50 years ago? Given the population forecasts show it is in steady decline with an elderly, ageing demographic, it's easy to see over the next 5 to 10 years there will be a natural decline in this group of residents as the longer living baby boom generation moves on, this in itself releases many more properties to the next generation. The question of Wirral's population decline has resulted in the government reforecasting their required figures for Wirral down, but I don't believe it went far enough. In light of the above we are not even close to the previous peak population levels and with current brown field sites and unoccupied housing, we can use these to meet the forecast need, if it were even valid. Wirral council need to press developers such as Peel Holdings and others to deliver on projects like the Wirral Waters to answer the new housing supply. Instead of allowing them two bites of the cherry by land banking brown field sites and then also developing precious Greenbelt, unnecessarily. Any developers currently sitting on sites should be excluded from any future developments until they meet their brown field commitments. There is simply no justification to rip up the Greenbelt for future generations in return for a quick profit for developers which is against the Greenbelt interest of the people of the Wirral. The level of proposed sites in Irby where I live threaten to change both the natural environment and the community balance. Losing precious green space and important historically sites such as Viking archaeological sites important to Irby's identity. Along Irby Road and Thingwall Road there will be detrimental impact, which can never be undone once new housing estates are built on this Greenbelt. The fields and local areas in Irby contain roosting bats, migrating birds using these fields to access the RAMSAR wetlands protected Dee Estuary site, crested newts in the water courses of the fields and more and more threatened indigenous birds. The national trust woodlands border here and are all at risk from this development if due consideration is not given to protecting them and the impact to their natural population and habitat. Given the gratuitous move to build on the Greenbelt this is simply not acceptable. The proposal to build large numbers of houses on this site contravenes the council's own 5 point test for Greenbelt, by merging Pensby, Thingwall and Irby into one urban settlement. Erasing their own distinct characters and communities, the fact that they were technically slipped out of being separate settlements in 2012, does not remove this fact, these are three separate communities with very individual identities which will be lost into one sprawl by Greenbelt development. There is not enough infrastructure to cope with the influx of new homes into a small area such as Irby. The paving and covering of large greenbelt areas takes away the ability to drain the land without replacing it with adequate drainage, and increases flooding issues. Given the ongoing climate change we are seeing every year this presents a risk to the residents of Irby and the Wirral and helps nobody. There are not enough shops or amenities to be able to cope with such a large increase to the people living in this area, especially when areas are being squeezed by council budget cuts. How do you propose to provide amenities for these people, including health and education on the current infrastructure? I know from trying to get my son into school this April, Irby Primary, Thingwall and Dawpool were all over subscribed with the current population as it is!! Part of the appeal of living in Irby is being close to urban centres and the motorway but still retaining a rural environment which provides clean air, less pollution and congestion. The introduction of hundreds of homes around Thingwall Road and Pensby can only add congestion at key points in the village clogging up roads and impacting air quality and pollution. Adding these harmful emissions in a Greenbelt area at a time when its recognised people are dying from air pollution is bad for all residents of Wirral but especially to small communities like Irby</p> <p>When current housing and brown field sites are available as part of the local plan mix to meet the government housing requirements, there is no justification in building on ANY Greenbelt land which will destroy the legacy of our natural resources, merge small communities into larger towns and take away the essence of what the Wirral offers, please reconsider ANY Greenbelt development as the residents of Wirral have overwhelmingly requested. We have sent representations to the Development Options Review consultation as an attachment to an e-mail.</p>
DOR02109	There is no reason why any green belt land should be built on whilst there are brownfield sites left to develop and empty houses that can be filled. One of the best parts about living on the Wirral are the green spaces and they should be protected at all costs
DOR02110	Labour has so far failed its residents in its approach to ensuring our green belt is secure. Whilst there is an acceptance that affordable houses need to be built there has been a failure to ensure that brownfield options have been prioritised. Current figures suggest that there should be a revision of the current approach. It is short sighted to start releasing precious green belt space which is enjoyed by all our community. I protest very strongly about the council's strategy and urge them to listen and take account of the various resident groups who have provided detailed submissions regarding this.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02111	<p>My husband and I are outraged at the proposal to release for building the Green Belt fields either side of Lever Causeway and from Mount Road towards Claughton. - The population growth projection upon which the overall future demand is based is fundamentally flawed and overegged.</p> <p>- There is sufficient land already available in urban areas to meet future needs. In addition, there are many old buildings on the Wirral ripe for renovation to offer quality housing.</p> <p>- The area and views around Lever Causeway provide a relaxation area for many local residents.</p> <p>- People who visit us are frequently impressed when we drive them along Lever Causeway, especially by how quickly you arrive in a place with a rural feel. Building in this area will reduce the attraction of Wirral to tourists. Please do not ruin this beautiful part of our peninsula!</p>
DOR02112	<p>The Council did not explain why Green Belt is being deregulated when there is brownfield land available for development. Why is the Wirral Waters are being allowed to take many years to develop? The council only seem to have focused on land for new housing. There does not appear to be any consideration of whether existing facilities such as shops, schools, healthcare, council services and green spaces will cater for the extra population. Taking park spaces, such as Eastham Country Park, out of the Green Belt makes no sense. It calls into serious question the whole Local Plan process. The public consultation did not mention what housing would be planned. Will there be housing for young people starting out, or for older people who are living longer? The council have said more recently that the numbers of houses required will now be less. How do they know whether either figure will be accurate or valid? Taking away green spaces is squandering our generation's inheritance to the detriment of our children's and grandchildren's generations.</p>
DOR02113	<p>Wirral's green belt enhances this beautiful area for both inhabitants and visitors. The large urban development site, Wirral Waters, unused for years could be implemented first especially in the light of new housing figures revealed, before green belt development. I once studied woodland in Plymyard Dale for college dissertation and realised how special this ancient woodland is. Its importance to wildlife extends beyond the SBI designated site to adjacent farmland at Hargrave House Farm. Map-wise it appears easy for development - not wise thinking. Natural places are now known to be beneficial for our health and well-being. So please do not let money speak.</p>
DOR02114	<p>I live in Heswall by the shore. I am not opposed to new housing being built as the population increases but it has been proved that there are sufficient brown field sites and the amount of houses being pushed for is way over the requirement for the Wirral. The fact that green belt land anywhere near here is even being considered sickens me to the core.... Surely that is why the protection band was introduced.... TO PROTECT. NOT TO BUILD ON! How is it that this land is now open for these proposals. I feel that there is something underhand happening here! I completely and utterly object to these proposals. Firstly, yes I live here and not from a selfish point of view! The thought of all this land being built on is horrendous, this is such a special area for nature. The flora and fauna is amazing. We have badgers, foxes, weasels, stoats, hedgehogs, hares, rabbits, snakes, all sorts of different varieties of birds. There are many ponds on these sites where frogs, toads and newts breed. This land supports all mentioned but also many wild flowers, trees and insects, which again support the wildlife and birds, the migratory birds depend on these when they arrive to spend the summer here as do all the other creatures mentioned prior. Also I'm sure you'll agree that most of these will be protected whether flora or fauna. We have adverts on television etc advising to give nature a home! Your proposals are the complete opposite! And on what I thought to be protected land. My other concerns/objections are regarding the increase in traffic that the amount of houses will generate, as I'm sure they will be squeezed into every available space! The roads down here are narrow some of them with no scope for widening as buildings on either side. There just isn't the infrastructure for the amount of houses you're proposing. If these proposals go through, then the flood gates will open for many swathes of green belt land all over the country to be ripped apart and slowly disappear... and Wirral along with other areas will not be the beautiful place it once was!</p>
DOR02115	<p>If you take the car park at Bromborough village you will destroy the shops and the local economy and then take our library and community civic centre what's the point of houses and no community</p>
DOR02116	<p>I whole heartedly believe that Wirral need to submit a local plan and am disappointed that a comprehensive plan was not submitted when required by Government. Wirral is one of a small number of Councils not to have fulfilled its requirement and I feel strongly that a thorough consideration of what is needed for Wirral take place (with the views of Council tax payers considered) as opposed to a knee jerk reaction to comply. Wirral is unique. Most are astounded by its beauty, it's special villages, listed buildings and it's miles of wonderful coastline. This should be preserved at all costs. There are numerous acres of brownfield and ugly sites that could be transformed, with the added benefit of being next to Wirral waters, that are being ignored at the expense of our greenbelt. 43% of the Wirral peninsula is built upon as compared with 10% of Cheshire. 36% of the Wirral is farmland as opposed to 81% of Cheshire and yet we are being asked to consider extensive building at the same rate as much larger, and more well equipped Counties. I live in Thornton Hough - a village that is unique, of special historical interest, conservation land and with many listed buildings. Some would say it is the jewel in Wirral's crown and yet there are several large tranches of land that are earmarked to be built upon. As a village with no amenities I have no idea how this would add to the village or the pleasure that it brings. There are no buses from Thornton Hough other than one infrequent bus between Ness and Liverpool. There are no shops and only a tiny village school. When I view Wirral's UDP there are so many strategies and policies that are being breached by building in Thornton Hough that I do wonder what the point of the strategy was in the first place.</p> <p>I would be happy to write a document on this and have done so in my objection to the ECV planning application in Thornton Hough. There is no way of attaching this to my comments here so I would ask that this is considered (or I would be willing to submit separately if necessary) since I go through the entire UDP and consider the ECV planning application when compared to its rules. I believe that most of the arguments still stand in this case. I would also like to point out that many individuals would not know what to say or how to react to proposals such as this one. It is a complex matter which requires research and a considered opinion. Many of the villagers of Thornton Hough rent their properties from Leverhulme Estates. The publishing of their views means that they are fearful to speak out in case they lose their rental properties. This should also be considered when looking at the depth of public opinion in certain areas -- since Leverhulme Estates not only rent houses in Thornton Hough but all over the Wirral. I am very much in favour of Wirral creating a considered local plan but one which is favourable to our heritage and will be destroyed if</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	widespread building is implemented in areas of special value.
DOR02117	I am concerned about the proposals to build on brown and green belt land locally. We bought our house in November 2017 for several reasons but one was the open land and views opposite the property. I also worry about several other locations for proposed building on the Wirral. As the population has been falling why is there a need for all this building. We do not have the infrastructure for an increased population e.g. healthcare, utilities and retail provision. What is needed is provision of affordable properties for sale and rent. Downtown Birkenhead also needs development. Builders need incentives to provide what is needed not what gives them most profit. We need investment. Wirral is a lovely place to live but downtown Birkenhead is not. What happened to the "Leisure Peninsula " the proposed plan would reduce the green spaces and local areas would lose their identity, appeal and merge with surrounding areas. We will lose what makes Wirral great.
DOR02118	I would like to state my strong opposition to the proposed changes to the green belt boundary on the Wirral. The changes would have a huge impact on wildlife in the area; around Clatterbridge/Storeton Woods we have seen pheasants, buzzards, bats and rabbits and believe there are great crested newts that would all be affected by the loss of land to housing development. Although some areas such as the woods at Storeton and Dibbinsdale would not be lost the provision of residential properties immediately adjacent to the land would severely reduce the species thriving here. The amenity for the existing residents would be severely reduced and the footpaths from Storeton to Brimstage, along with others I'm sure, would be far less attractive and appealing than at present. There could therefore be a negative impact on resident's health and wellbeing both physically and mentally. I also have concerns about the traffic impact of the proposed housing developments and how they would be served from the existing highway network. The B5151 is a standard single carriageway road that could not be widened to accommodate additional traffic without encroaching into Storeton woods or into private land. The junctions on the existing road are narrow, with poor visibility onto the main road and there have been a number of accidents from the motorway junction to Lever Causeway. I hope that further assessment of the actual housing requirement on the Wirral and the availability of brownfield sites is undertaken before this land is lost forever.
DOR02119	I am in doubt re the figures for housing need released by WBC previously and would like to ask WBC to use the figures recently revised by the office for national statistics. I assume that all granted planning permissions would sufficiently contribute to the housing need target, and I would also urge WBC to use the thousands of empty properties on the Wirral. I also ask you to make use of all brownfield sites. I do not want green belt to be released for housing - especially not for luxury homes as it is planned re Hoylake golf resort.
DOR02120	I oppose completely any development on the current Wirral Green Belt areas. It's there for a reason. Once it's gone and everyone's made their money, its gone forever. Please DON'T DO IT!
DOR02121	Stop being a bunch of money-hungry and let the village keep that which makes it accessible to people coming in from other towns. The library; where I have borrowed many books, and the civic centre; a place where I have seen many people dancing and holding various social activities; these places are special. Special to me and special to a of back of a lot of people in Bromborough. And, Christ, getting rid of the car park, too?! It seems like you are trying to kill the shops of the town... perhaps again for your own selfish personal gain of then converting the abandoned shops into more housing that you greedy f***s can profit from? To cram us all in with even more housing is unnecessary and clearly just a money grab for you f*****s who profit from it: no consideration for the tax payers who cherish this beautiful town, that I am sure if you had any sense, you make enough money from already.
DOR02122	We wish to contribute to the consultation process regarding housing development in Wirral, particularly as it applies to green belt areas. Clearly the council should be planning to develop urban areas and brownfield sites before considering green belt development. The West Wirral coast is promoted as a leisure/sporting area and attracts numerous visitors which obviously benefits the local community. Development of the green belt areas in this locality could only detract from the amenity value of this area. We would also like to draw your attention to the likely transport problems should there be any building on so called infill sites in lower Heswall. In particular Davenport road (part of the Wirral way) can be busy with walkers, cyclists, horse riders and school parties so any increase in traffic would constitute an obvious hazard.
DOR02123	It is obvious that the initial submissions for building have been strategically selected to all further encroachment on what we know now as the green belt. The selection of sites to the north of the motorway meets the no encroachment part of the methodology but building on the other side would set up a new settlement which would have its own boundaries. To protect the Wirral why did you not do this. Little is available on employment growth and services expansion to deal with these additional people? I still fail to see how this strategy helps the existing homeless and disadvantaged. The Wirral looks full to me so why aren't you as a council representing this aspect? For future generations I grieve for the loss of green spaces which you are contributing massively apparently without a whimper.
DOR02124	Plan to use Bromborough Civic Centre for residential development is detrimental to the local residents. The Library and the Civic Hall are really valuable local assets. Although the Library is only open three days a week it is a lifeline for many residents, in particular elderly ones. My wife and I are very frequent users of the library and consider it an essential element of local events, source of information and we read a large number of books from there every week. I attend the library at least twice a week. The car park and the Civic Centre are very much used by the residents, in particular the car park is essential for the benefit of the local shops. As is the toilet facilities within the Civic Centre. Should the centre and the car park be built on, that part of Bromborough would die as the shops would close for lack of trade and residents would not have any reason to visit as there would be nothing to visit.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02125	<p>I am one amongst thousands of Wirral residents who is very concerned with the plans that the Council have to allow building on green belt land. There are several points I wish to make:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You have had a couple of years to make a decision on this point and get the information to government, but you have done nothing. 2. Peel Holdings submitted plans in April, I understand, to develop Wirral Waters which, with offices and other businesses, will provide hundreds of housing units, but they still await to hear from the planning department. 3. There is space for 18,000 houses on Brownfield sites on the Wirral, which is more than is required to meet the target, but obviously the developers don't want these areas as their profit margins would reduce. The Council needs to tell developers that if they want to build houses on the Wirral, then there will be restrictions - take it or leave it. 4. The areas you have suggested would only provide housing for the people who can afford these houses (i.e. already in work, well paid, middle-income or higher). Developers won't want to build cheap houses on this land as it wouldn't be to their advantage. 5. We need housing to be provided in areas of deprivation, in an attempt to bring these areas to a higher standard of living. If people have decent housing, they are more likely to look for suitable work and improve their standards of living. 6. Are Wirral Council challenging the government's targets? Does central government actually know what amount of housing is required in our particular area? 7. It is a known fact that the population of the Wirral is decreasing. An estate agent recently commented that most of the houses sold and purchased on the Wirral are by people already living here, either buying bigger houses to meet their family's needs, or down-sizing as their families leave home. You will end up with more housing stock than is required. 8. The Council should not allow the influence of large housing companies to put pressure on them; they are in it for profit; the Council is an elected body elected by the people, so should make decisions which are best for the area and the people of the area. 9. Further development of green belt land will add to congestion on already congested side roads, more children requiring schools which are over-subscribed already, and you can't get a GP appointment when you want it already without adding to the population even further, and the effect on A&E doesn't bear thinking about. 10. Further traffic will add to pollution and increase in accidents. 11. If you get rid of green belt land, not only will these areas be lost forever, but animals and insects, etc. will lose their habitat. Having these species on green belt land helps with the natural processes and green land assists with the chlorophyll process which in turn helps eliminate some of the pollution. Many children in built up cities already suffer with chest complaints purely due to pollution. Do we want this for our children, grandchildren and further children down the line? 12. Flooding is a large issue in this country because of general over-development. More concreted areas will only serve to increase flooding. Is the council prepared to cope with this? Is the council going to take measures to prevent flooding in the future? You only have to look at the Environment Agency's website to see how many areas on the Wirral are already a flood risk."
DOR02126	<p>I do not understand why you allow a Conservative Government to dictate to a Labour Council a countrywide review which may be applicable to the South East where I realise that there is an acute shortage of affordable housing but I do not believe that this is the case in the Wirral. The local population is forecast to decline by 2.9% which will be insignificant if Peugeot-Citroen choose to close the Vauxhall Plant in Ellesmere Port as they almost certainly will. This company hasn't hesitated to accept French Government subsidies and then transfer production from France to low cost countries. These are the people who closed Ryton in the Midlands which was a longstanding and world renowned car production facility in the UK, The closure of the Vauxhall Plant will cause a significant loss of employment locally. A cloud such as this hanging over the Wirral should automatically exclude it from inclusion in this Government's attack on the Greenbelt. Regardless of the above, I believe that Greenbelt was designated as Greenbelt for a good reason and once it is gone it will never be restored, As council planners you are employed to look after the Greenbelt on our behalf and not to plot to circumvent the rules which established it in the first place. Already 43% of the Wirral is built on which is a very high proportion when compared with all surrounding areas except Liverpool to the North. You have provided a significant list of planning applications which have been approved on brown field sites. These developments need to be built. Travelling around the Wirral, perhaps not in Heswall or West Kirby, there is a significant amount of empty if not derelict property e.g. Bedford Road in Rock Ferry very close to a railway station which need incentives for change of use. In my opinion there is no necessity to build on Greenbelt land in the Wirral - houses built on it will not be the affordable homes which are needed but larger houses of which an adequate supply is already available for sale at any given time.</p>
DOR02127	<p>Re Bromborough car park plans. Where is it proposed to have alternative car parking? This will kill the local businesses in the village. We will need even more parking when the development in Acre lane eventually takes place leading to more shopping area traffic.</p>
DOR02128	<p>I wish to object most strongly to the proposed release for development of Green Belt land in Wirral and particularly to the removal of green corridors between townships, creating an urban sprawl and spoiling the rural environment. The Green Belt is important for agricultural and leisure use. The plans would appear to me to be based on:-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Incompetence of Wirral Council in not creating the required Local Plan on a regular basis. • Poor analysis of the data for the need for development land for housing, based on an over-optimistic and unrealistic estimate of economic growth. • Under-utilisation of potential brownfield sites and lack of planned remediation of such sites for future development. Particularly those of previous industrial use and former residential areas cleared for future residential use. • The greed of the local council to grab high quality Green Belt land on the presumption that houses with a higher rateable value will provide more Council Tax at the expense of our Wirral environment. • I also strongly support the submissions provided by the Wirral Green Space Alliance and their detailed analysis by experts, who have been working on a knowledge based assessment, rather than on a short-term political agenda.
DOR02129	<p>I think it is a huge mistake to build on green Belt land. This is further destruction to the general environment. Surely we can make better use of Brown land sites.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02130	<p>1) Wirral was set a target of 12,000 homes by 2035 i.e. approx 800 per year. However, ONS have now revised the figure, which is more likely to be 7,5000 i.e. approx 500 per year.</p> <p>2) The big question is, would the WBC have requested ONS to review their figures if there had not been such a public outcry to use GREENBELT LAND.</p> <p>3) Has WBC taken into consideration the number of empty houses and buildings that could be used for affordable housing for first time buyers ? These sites are visible everywhere.</p> <p>4) Building affordable housing on GREENBELT LAND is not sufficiently profitable for large developers and would lead to more expensive homes being built instead. 5) Would any of this have been a "problem" in the first place if successive governments had not imposed year on year funding restrictions on the WBC? (and other Councils)</p> <p>6) Taking Irby as an example (which is where we live) the figure of 704 new housing accommodation has been submitted to the press. This is a worry in that the current infrastructures in place are already stretched to their limits and any further strain would cause massive problems to doctors, schools, dentists, care facilities and public roads and transport. We have already lost our main bus routes through Irby only recently.</p> <p>7) High priority on the Wirral should be to preserve the special area in which we live and which is unique to other parts of the country. Our future generations should be able to enjoy what we have now. There are plenty of areas of brown belt sites to cover the housing requirements. GREENBELT LAND is so precious and we cannot turn the clock back if it used to satisfy greedy contractors and Council members.</p>
DOR02131	I wish to object to housing development within the greenbelt of Wirral. I believe there is enough brown field sites to accommodate the housing needs for Wirral in the future.
DOR02132	<p>Wirral is a peninsula: we have water on three sides. We can therefore only build on the land that we have available. If we are forced into building on the Green Belt we destroy a significant part of the attraction of living here. Once built on, there is no going back. Why does this Council want to go down in history as the elected body that ruined the very landscape it claimed to protect? What's the End-Game here? We reduce the Green Belt every time there is pressure on housing, until Wirral is covered in concrete? But then nobody will want to live here. - The public consultation video states that the proposals will 'protect all our parks'. Does this include the Country Parks and woods? For how long? Do the decent thing and donate the woods and open spaces you claim to want to protect to a charity such as the National Trust or Woodland Trust. Not only would Wirral council lead the way in pragmatic and far-reaching ecological solutions, they would also attract plenty of positive reaction from within and outside the borough. Why include woods with public access and spaces already used such as golf courses in these Parcels, but then state these will be protected. This seems a deliberate attempt to inflame public opinion, and create stress and concern amongst the residents of Wirral. - The public consultation video states that you want developers to submit proposals that would 'enhance Wirral as a place to live'. In which imaginary dream world will that ever happen? I have counted over 60 documents on the consultation website. Who has the time to read all of these? How do the Council expect the lay-person to understand and comment on the methodology and scoring? You need to commission an independent review of all the workings and papers. Only then can the people of Wirral have confidence that the process is fair and correct. SP013 includes Stapledon Wood. The lower paths of this wood have lovely views over the fields and paddocks towards Thurstaston. There is even a dedicated bench so that walkers can sit and enjoy the view. To destroy this vista would be criminal. These fields are used by geese and birds particularly at high tide. D131 A lot of the Green Belt is used by the birdlife for which Wirral is renowned. If we take away these open spaces the birds will leave, which would in turn contribute to the decline of some species. For example, curlews are now on the Red List of endangered bird species. Yet they can be seen and heard near the fields below Stapledon Wood (SP013). Do Wirral council want to contribute to this iconic bird's disappearance from the British countryside?</p>
DOR02133	<p>I AM A LIFELONG WIRRAL RESIDENT. I WAS VERY SAD TO LEARN THAT SOME OF OUR GREENBELT IS UNDER THREAT. HOWEVER I DO UNDERSTAND NEW HOMES ARE NEEDED. WE ARE LUCKY TO LIVE IN SUCH A BEAUTIFUL AREA AND IT WOULD BE AWFUL TO SEE IT RUINED BY IT BECOMING A CONCRETE JUNGLE. I BELIEVE A LOT MORE TOURISTS HAVE BEEN VISITING WIRRAL OVER THE LAST FEW YEARS AND THIS CAN ONLY BE A GOOD THING FOR LOCAL BUSINESSES. HOWEVER IF THE PLACE GETS BUILT UP AND OVER CROWDED WILL IT STILL ATTRACT THE SAME NUMBER OF VISITORS? I THINK PEOPLE LIKE TO VISIT THE WIRRAL BECAUSE IT IS SUCH A UNIQUE PART OF ENGLAND. IT IS VERY DIVERSE FROM WOODED AREAS, COUNTRYSIDE, SEASIDE, SMALL VILLAGES AND NOT TOO FAR AWAY FROM BUSIER TOWNS/CITIES FOR PEOPLE TO VISIT AND EXPLORE. I TOTALLY UNDERSTAND WHY PEOPLE CHOOSE TO COME AND LIVE/WORK HERE. LOOKING AT THE LIST OF PROPOSED SITES FOR DEVELOPMENT I HOPE THAT ONLY A SMALL NUMBER OF THESE WILL BE USED AND NOT ALL OF THEM. I THINK MOST PEOPLE WOULD BE IN FAVOUR OF A FEW LARGER ESTATES BEING BUILT ON A FEW SITES RATHER THAN SMALL ESTATES BEING BUILT EVERYWHERE. MAYBE THAT COULD BE A COMPROMISE. THAT WAY LARGER AREAS COULD BE PROTECTED. IF THIS IDEA DID GO AHEAD MAYBE YOU COULD TRY TO GET THE REMAINING GREENBELT PROTECTED FOREVER OR FOR A VERY LONG TIME. I THOUGHT GREENBELT WAS SUPPOSED TO BE TOTALLY PROTECTED ANYWAY. AS FOR COUNCIL/SOCIAL HOUSING I THINK MAYBE ANY EXISTING ESTATES THAT ARE RUN DOWN COULD BE REBUILT.</p> <p>MAYBE THEY COULD BE BUILT MORE SYMPATHETICALLY THAN THE NORM. THIS COULD INCLUDE NICER GREEN AREAS. THIS MIGHT GIVE THE RESIDENTS MORE SELF RESPECT. I DO NOT BELIEVE IT IS FAIR TO BUILD ANY SOCIAL HOUSING IN AFFLUENT AREAS. THIS WOULD ONLY DRAG HOUSE PRICES DOWN AND IS REALLY NOT FAIR ON RESIDENTS WHO HAVE WORKED HARD ALL THEIR LIVES AND FINALLY BOUGHT THE HOUSE OF THEIR DREAMS IN A BEAUTIFUL PART OF WIRRAL. IF THAT SOUNDS QUITE SNOBBY I CAN ONLY APOLOGISE BUT I THINK MANY RESIDENTS WOULD AGREE. I KNOW MOST PEOPLE WOULD MOAN ABOUT THIS ISSUE AND SAY THEY DO NOT AGREE WITH ANY BUILDING OF NEW HOUSES BUT I REALISE THIS IS GOING TO HAPPEN WHATEVER WE SAY. PLEASE CONSIDER USING EXISTING PLOTS WHERE POSSIBLE INCLUDING COUNCIL OWNED LAND/BUILDINGS THAT ARE NO LONGER IN USE. PLEASE TRY NOT TO LET THEM RUIN THE WIRRAL.</p>
DOR02134	<p>It is my opinion that this plan only serves to acquiesce to an arbitrary dictate from central government. It takes no account of local needs or consideration for the communities it will impact upon.</p> <p>Wirral is a unique and wonderful place to live precisely as it has not succumbed as other areas have to intense urban sprawl. It is short sighted and will destroy the very nature of the area for generations to come.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02135	<p>Green Belt Sites 058C-E In response to the judgment that 'exceptional circumstances' have been identified for the revision of Green Belt boundaries, I have considerable concern over the proposal for further investigation of the above Green Belt Sites, and I note that all are caveated in your listing with the need to protect nature conservation interests, ponds and woodlands. All these sites are within, or immediately adjacent to, Strategic Land Parcels 058 and 096; the latter identified as unsuitable for release and classified as open countryside and undeveloped coastline. They also form part of separation areas between Settlement Area 7 and the coastline. From my own observations this fringe is an important habitat for migrant passerine birds. The sites surround the well-used pedestrian route via Pipers Lane and the footpath north-west of 105 Pipers Lane, giving access to the Wirral Way Country Park and onwards to NT Heswall Fields (SBI 78) and the Dee Cliffs SSI. The route also connects the Wirral Way and the Dales local conservation area via Redstone Drive and is used by walkers connecting with public transport (Merseyrail at West Kirby and Heswall Bus Station). Leaving aside considerations of increased motor traffic and pedestrian safety, the proposals would impact severely on a landscape which is highly valued by visitors and residents from across Wirral. The building of the unsympathetic property at 105 Pipers Lane and the mutilation of adjacent trees already attracts critical and angry comment from walkers from built up areas of the Wirral who prize this accessible countryside and do not wish to see it nibbled away. For them it is clear evidence that the houses which developers build on land released from Green Belt are unaffordable. I have similar concern over infill options infringing on SP 097, which like the proposed investigation of the sites would, if approved, eat into the areas adjacent to a coastline which you recognise in your listings is 'of national and international importance' and which forms part of the proposed English Coast Path. All in all, any proposals to permit development in these areas would result in severe impact to a much-loved and well-used area of recreational amenity for people of Wirral from all social and economic strata, not least those whose means limit their ability to travel to countryside further afield. Such proposals are inconsistent with the requirement on you under NPPF2, paragraph 141, that the beneficial use of Green Belts should be enhanced. Finally, I share the widespread concern that the shortfall of housing justifying the 'exceptional circumstances' has been overstated and find the figures circulated by the Heswall Society and the Wirral Green Spaces Alliance Group, and the projections of Wirral Waters, compelling evidence that no intrusion on Green Belt is required. I am unpersuaded that you have, in the words of a spokesman for the housing ministry 'exhausted all other reasonable options to meet development needs before even considering changes to the Green Belt' (Times 5 October 2018, p. 26). I also find it difficult to believe that projects approved in these Green Belt areas would result in high density housing addressing the real needs in the peninsula.</p>
DOR02136	<p>This is a terrible idea. If you get rid of all the green, we'll lose everywhere to take our children. Especially when you're hitting Bebington, somewhere that's supposed to be the nicest place in Britain to live, and you're literally taking that away. In poorer areas, you're just going to increase crime because now there's going to be bored kids with literally nowhere to go. This is a real joke, definitely suggested by someone who either doesn't live in these areas or don't have children / pets.</p>
DOR02137	<p>Please don't build on any green belt there is plenty enough brown field land peel holding promised to build enough housing on land they own , on the Wirral we have beautiful land still left for us to enjoy once it's built on never get it back our green belt is most important thing for me living on the Wirral please don't destroy it there are alternatives we've lost too much green land already as it is at what stage do we say is enough when it's concrete jungle.</p>
DOR02138	<p>I strongly object to the following green belt areas being explored for housing developments: SP030 - SP036 (inclusive of), these proposals will negatively impact on the physical environment, the wildlife, the traffic and in turn affect the mental and physical health of residents living in the area. We need to protect our green belt areas as these are what makes Wirral, Wirral the leisure peninsular. Wirral prides itself on having a great balance between housing, business and countryside. There are many brown belt areas in desperate need of regeneration, these are the areas the local plan should focus on.</p>
DOR02139	<p>It is our wish that Green Belt is maintained at ALL cost. The Borough is already highly populated & open spaces are essential for the wellbeing of those living here. How will the current road system cope with more traffic? How will our streets cope with more parking? We need to tell Central Government that Wirral is full up. How about suggesting another Milton Keynes if housing is so desperately needed. Where are all these people living now that there is a supposed shortage? Are we sure that "the so called homeless" want to live here? We may end up with 12,000 empty properties! What price properties do you intend to build? Surely the aim is to reduce the population. It is the only way to save the planet. We object to any changes to the current Green Belt boundaries.</p>
DOR02140	<p>I am appalled by the plan to build on our green belt land. I moved to Irby village to be able to enjoy that very land. I was brought up on a council estate and have worked hard for 30 years, trying to give my own children a better environment. You threaten to take our small village and develop on our countryside, so that our narrow roads become congested, local schools overwhelmed and our village becomes a town..... shame on you and your poor decision making.</p>
DOR02141	<p>I find this absolutely unacceptable. The land in Irby & Thingwall has been there for decades and decades. This is what makes Wirral what it is. It is most certainly WRONG to build on this land. Use land in the large towns to build affordable homes/cheap housing, NOT green belt land. An absolute disgrace !</p>
DOR02142	<p>Green belt is too precious to be built on. There are plenty of brown belt areas that could be utilised for the very good cause of providing homes for the needy.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02143	<p>I would like to raise my objections to any release of land from the greenbelt but especially east of the M53 , and with particular reference to greenbelt land around Spital and Raby Mere. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is sufficient brown field sites in existing urban areas to accommodate Wirral's, housing need, particularly so since the ONS revised its population growth figures for Wirral. A lot of the brownfield sites are in urban area where affordable housing could be built and where the people who need the affordable housing want to live. 2. If all of the greenbelt east of the M53 is released with the potential to be built on (which large house builders won't be rubbing their hands with glee at the thought of all that virgin land just waiting to be bought and developed). The whole character of the areas adjacent to the greenbelt (and of course the greenbelt land) will change. It will just be one huge concrete jungle from Wallasey all the way down to Eastham, Bromborough and Raby Mere. In the Spital/ Raby Mere are the current roads cannot take any more traffic from hundreds of new houses that have the potential to be built. The pollution east of the M53 with all the additional vehicles will be horrific. 3. There would be very little green space left east of the M53 for relaxation, recreation/exercise yet there would be many more people living in the area (don't actually know where all the people would come from to fill all the houses that could be built). For me, cycling would go as I only cycle on quiet lanes and there would be no quiet lanes left. I would have to use my car to get somewhere quieter first. Other people would do the same for walks etc, creating ever more pollution from all the extra car journeys. 4. The M53 corridor provides a habitat for lots of wildlife which would inevitably disappear once most of it was concreted over. 5. A lot of the greenbelt east of the M53 is prime agricultural land which in these uncertain times (Brexit), we should be holding on to as we may need to grow more of our own food. 6. The idea of greenbelt is to stop urban sprawl. How does this work, if each time somebody thinks more houses need to be built, land is released from the greenbelt? Big builders will always , given the choice, build on greenbelt rather than brownfield sites. 7. Once greenbelt land is released and built on, it is gone forever. Greenbelt land is already in very short supply east of the M53 and we cannot afford to lose any more. 8. Finally, the Local Plan is fundamentally a very lazy approach to deciding which greenbelt areas should be released. It appears it wasn't based on anything more substantial than someone looking at a map and deciding the M53 would be a handy and no thought needed boundary between urban sprawl and greenbelt. No thought given to the people already living east of the M53 either or where the prime agricultural land was. I can only presume those people who made the decision don't live east of the M53.
DOR02144	To build housing on green belt land adjacent to Rigby drive, Greasby
DOR02145	The government own housing consultation states that you as a local council can challenge their proposal regarding the total house numbers they state that are required on the Wirral. As an elective body representing the Wirral people I would like you to challenge their propose plan, as new finding have found their original findings regarding future housing is unfounded and we need less housing. The Wirral have plenty of brown sites for building which would meet the demand for required housing. As my elective council I would like you to ensure Peel Holdings meets the housing requirements they signed up to with yourselves and not be allowed to sit on empty land.
DOR02146	<p>Hi, I am writing to oppose the release of Wirral greenbelt for the development of housing. I would strongly urge the council to force developers to use the available brownfield sites, and to bring those homes which are currently vacant into use again. The proposal to develop any of this land would just add to the traffic congestion during rush hours. There are bottlenecks at A541 Barnston Road/Storeton Lane. Also a Clatterbridge Roundabout from all directions it takes 15 minutes to get onto the Roundabout at peak times. Trying to get from Heswall to Hinderton/Neston is just as bad. The M53 is often congested at peak times, and the rail network to the west of the Wirral is rubbish, forcing people to use their cars to jet to the east side to access better rail links. We appreciate that builders are trying to make money, but they must be urged/compelled to build some affordable homes, not just high value executive homes. I do not believe that the release of the greenbelt is the answer to the problem, it will just cause more, and once it's gone, its gone!</p>
DOR02147	Against any housing plans for Marsh Lane, Lever Causeway and Storeton woods area.
DOR02148	More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner.
DOR02149	<p>Please, please do Not release the Wirral' s precious Green belt land for housing development. I moved here with my family 15 years ago to escape the exhaust fume filled city of Chester to have open spaces for my children to grow up in. Greasby doesn't need to get bigger. The doctor's surgery struggles enough with the amount of people already in the village as it is, without building hundreds more houses and leaving us with less land to farm and appreciate in our leisure. There are plenty of brown sites that should be used first. The Green belt land was made that way to protect it. Please don't undo the work that was put in place to protect it.</p>
DOR02150	[SAME AS DOR02125]
DOR02151	<p>I've lived in higher Bebington my whole life and enjoyed walks around the green belt in our area for my 34 years. I am utterly devastated that will be losing such a beautiful area due to a complete lack of organisation and agreements over Wirral Waters development, and while there are so many brown belt areas to be developed and empty houses. It's detrimental to farming and wildlife, with land been taken from local farmers. To lose our beloved green area in this way is shameful, farcical and very upsetting.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02152	<p>I am writing to protest at WBC's proposals for release of Green Belt land for new home building and to the proposed change to Mixed Use Allocation for Bromborough Car Park and Bromborough Civic Centre. The Council has stated that "The Government has told Wirral to provide more land to build more homes", "We must provide enough land to build 12,000 homes over 15 years" and "about 7000 homes would need to be built on Green Belt". However, having researched Wirral's historical and current population growth, I cannot understand the need to build so many (and indeed any) new homes on Green Belt land. According to my research, from 1981 - to date, the population of Wirral actually fell quite considerably, from ca. 340,500 to ca. 321,500 (a decrease of ca. 9.4%). It is only since 2001 that a slight increase has occurred: from 2001 - 2011 the increase was 0.15% pa and from 2011 - 2014 this slowed to 0.11% pa. Even assuming that the higher rate of increase (0.15% pa) continues, this would only result in a population of ca. 331,500 by 2035 i.e. an increase of ca. 10,000. I cannot see how this justifies building 12,000 new homes, including 7000 on the Green Belt. I appreciate that it is possible that the population may grow at a greater rate, however, there appears to be no historical or current evidence that this will be the case (quite the contrary). My understanding is that there are 91 Brownfield sites identified by WBC across Wirral where 2,400 new homes could be built and this, plus the projected 13,000 homes proposed by Peel Holdings at Wirral Waters, is more housing than Wirral will require in the foreseeable future. Therefore, I see no reason to release Green Belt land. As a resident of Bromborough for the last 34 years, I was horrified to see that WBC are proposing to build on the village car park and to knock down the Civic Centre for building purposes. Both these amenities are used by the local community daily. Without a car park there would be nowhere to park and consequently the local businesses would die and with it the community centre of Bromborough. The current car park is always busy and would not even stand a reduction in capacity without affecting local businesses. I am appalled at WBC's lack of concern for local communities. Indeed you seem to have forgotten that your reason to exist as a governing body is to serve the Wirral's local communities! I am not a native of Wirral but I have loved living here for the last 42 years. Postcodes in Wirral regularly appear in the "Best Places in Britain to Live" and I wholeheartedly agree with this. It is the duty of WBC to maintain the separate and unique villages that contribute to the appeal of the Wirral peninsula and to safeguard the Green Belt now and for future generations.</p>
DOR02153	<p>1) Various claims have been made about who is responsible for the demand that Wirral build more than 12,000 new homes by 2035, but the latest ONS population projections suggest that by that time the population will have increased by a mere 11,000 approximately. This projection indicates that the figure of 12,000 new homes grossly exceeds all anticipated future demand.</p> <p>2) The ONS figures further suggest that the most significant population increase, within the very modest overall growth, will be in the post-65 age group. This has a bearing on the type of accommodation that will be required, in that people in this group generally down-size from the larger family home to a bungalow, apartment or care home. This would release larger properties, which could potentially be re-developed.</p> <p>3) It was stated at one of the local consultation meetings that the Local Plan was being developed without taking economic and employment factors into account. What is the point of building large numbers of new homes without clear evidence that there will be employment opportunities and adequate infrastructure for the residents? Some councillors and a large number of attendees at consultation meetings seem intent on criticising Peel Group, without recognising that, as a highly successful international company, they seize the opportunity to build new homes and business premises when they see viable economic opportunities. The fact that they have not already built the approximately 13,000 new homes at Wirral Waters, for which they were granted outline planning permission some years ago, suggests that they have yet to be convinced of the business case.</p> <p>4) Without firm evidence of significantly greater economic development within the Borough than has occurred in the past thirty years, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the majority of new homes will be occupied by people working outside Wirral. For various reasons, including consideration of the environment, transport, infrastructure, etc., it would make more sense for them to live where they work.</p> <p>5) It was also stated at the consultation meeting that neighbouring authorities had refused Wirral's request to help meet the house-building quota. Why should Wirral become a sprawling urban "dormitory" borough for Liverpool, Manchester and parts of Cheshire?</p> <p>6) Everyone recognises that it is easier and more lucrative for developers to build on large greenfield sites, so it is hardly surprising that some house-builders and landowners have already put forward expressions of interest. However, in a highly confined geographical area, which the Wirral peninsula patently is, there is an even stronger case than usual for ensuring that existing or previously developed sites are re-used. I cannot comment on claims that the Wirral BC Brownfield Register Consultation process was flawed, but it is obvious that there are many brownfield sites which could be redeveloped and go most, if not the whole, way to meeting the new homes target, especially if the Government revises that figure downwards. It must surely be a Council priority to work cooperatively with developers and the owners of these sites, possibly by helping to fund the environmental cleaning of the land, to ensure that they are re-developed, instead of being left as an eyesore?</p> <p>7) In granting Peel Group outline planning permission to build approximately 13,000 homes at Wirral Waters, Wirral BC must have considered it to be a viable project. Why has it ignored Peel's latest commitment to build 6,450 homes, including instead a mere 1,100 in the Draft Local Plan for the full 15 year period and none at all in the first five years? Its argument that detailed Planning Consent is necessary has been shown to be flawed by the 2017 Appeal Court Ruling, which made it clear to councils, etc., that developments only need to be "reasonably possible" to be included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>8) The Leader of the Council apparently told the Wirral Globe: "I'm not prepared to allow our greenbelt 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." On page 26 of the Background Report to the Initial Greenbelt Review for Wirral's Core Strategy Local Plan (September 2018) it states: "Appendix 3 shows that all the Green Belt Parcels identified, with the exception of some existing developed areas in the Green Belt, continue to meet one or a number of the Green Belt purposes set out in national policy. Development on any of these sites would therefore, by definition, continue to be harmful to the Green Belt." Nothing we have read in the Council's literature or heard at the various meetings has</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>indicated that there are any “exceptional circumstances” justifying changes to Green Belt boundaries.</p> <p>9) The investigation notes on the various identified parcels of greenbelt land prepared for the Council by its planning officers inevitably refer to a very limited set of criteria and exclude any consideration of important factors such as historical, archaeological and scientific features.</p> <p>10) We have deliberately refrained from commenting on the parcels of land closest to our home, because we are deeply concerned about the whole of the Wirral and the inevitable harm that release of any of the greenbelt would cause. Once this land is lost, it will be lost for ever, and the Wirral will become a less attractive place to residents and visitors alike.</p>
DOR02154	I believe greenbelt areas should be protected at all cost.
DOR02155	I do not believe there is any need to build on Green Belt land and as a long term resident and taxpayer I oppose this unequivocally,
DOR02156	<p>We have succeeded in getting St Helens council to rethink their greenbelt plans. We even had a table at our wedding in May named Rainford greenbelt to pay tribute to it. I grew up on the Wirral and my parents live there still. The Greenbelt is a crucial part of why we chose to live on semirural Wirral as opposed to Liverpool or Chester. Its Greenbelt is crucial for so many reasons. Firstly its importance for wildlife/ plants. It helps promote wellbeing by enabling people to connect more easily with nature. It prevents urban sprawl as alluded to previously. There are plenty of brownfield sites (land that has previously been used for housing or commercial industries) that can be used instead. Don't go for the easy option of building on our beautiful green belt land. Once it is gone we cannot get it back. It should be protected for future generations.</p>
DOR02157	<p>I wish to voice extreme concern with respect to the local plan Wirral is presenting. Fundamentally I do not believe that Green Belt should be used, given the circumstances presented. I do not see the growth in employment, nor population, justifying the plan, and the type of housing that would be placed on green belt are not the type required - developers want profit via the creation of high priced housing, not housing for first time buyers. Of specific concern is the potentially huge development that fills the fields between, Thingwall, Heswall, and Barnston. I do not believe that the existing infrastructure can cope with such a development. The road network already queues to unreasonable amounts at Barnston dip, Thingwall roundabout, and Arrowpark roundabout. This inhibits the flow of traffic to the hospital which is of major concern when emergencies occur. The schools in the area cannot cope with the demand at Primary Level; simply increasing the size of schools is not educationally valid. Extensions to gas, electric, etc will cause major disruptions, and the area is not effectively serviced by rail. The station at Barnston is not fit for growth given the change required at Bidston. Finally I would ask what is Wirral's plan with regard to agriculture? When green belt is gone, it is gone. I believe that with the countries uncertain future it is extremely foolish to remove effective farmland which lies close to centres of population. What would we plan to transport food large distances when they can be sourced nearby? Thank you for your chance to comment and I look forward to your response. I intend to continue to oppose this plan.</p>
DOR02158	<p>Having failed in its statutory duty to produce a Local Plan for 14 years, the council now proposes to concrete over huge swathes of Green Belt land on our beautiful peninsula. The plan is ill thought and fails to realistically consider the large amount of Brown Field land available in the Birkenhead and Docks areas. Of course developers will prefer undeveloped land as it is much cheaper to build there. It is not the Council's job to pander to their wishes over those of the residents. I object to the whole plan and, in particular, the proposal to build yet another golf course in Hoylake however much it will satisfy the needs of the wealthy and senior councillors.</p>
DOR02159	Compulsory purchase of Brown Field sites including those owned by Peel ports should be considered for Affordable Housing as well as other Housing
DOR02160	I'd rather green belt land stay under green belt. Anti-social behaviour runs throughout the Wirral and this is the plan?
DOR02161	<p>I strongly object to the proposed brown and green belt land being developed. I fear that many villages will lose their identity and the Wirral will end up being one big town. I worry how GP/ dental surgeries will be able to allocate so many new patients. Schools in the area are very oversubscribed already. Also the general infer structure, drainage, road traffic, pollution.</p>
DOR02162	<p>It is utterly disgusting that this proposed development creates settlement areas that merge distinct villages together, for e.g. Irby, Pensby, Greasby which are separate villages and should be treated as such. This is a cynical way of building on all the land in between these villages to create a large urban sprawl and will destroy the lovely character/nature of these villages in the future. These greenbelts need to be protected to preserve the wonderful character/nature of these village areas and not destroyed.</p>
DOR02163	<p>I do not believe any further housing should be permitted within the 'dales' in Eastham at all. Residents already have concerns regarding insufficient parking space (very few properties have drives, the parking bays are not adequate for the current properties, the council/magenta refuses to utilize the concrete squares surrounding properties for resident parking meaning the residents have to park on the roads which are narrow. if someone parks carelessly then it is impossible for traffic to pass until they move. On Saturday I was stuck for fifteen minutes coming out of Ribblesdale Close into Wharfdale Road due to an ambulance being parked in the road treating an emergency and god forbid if there was ever a fire as a fire engine would not get through at all. We have raised this issue with our councillors/Magenta but nothing ever gets done. Magenta only care about profit and refuse to do anything for the residents (not all of us are tenants) about antisocial behaviour (vandalism of cars), suspected drug dealing, fly tipping, weed control or put up CCTV. The council won't do anything as they say Magenta owns the land. We are fed up and any extra houses will only add to the problems- does someone have to die in a house fire before anyone does anything?</p>
DOR02164	<p>It seems green space is being looked at before e.g. brownfield sites, empty properties, and Peel Holdings land bank. All the latter should be fully explored and Peel Holdings should be compelled to honour their promised commitments.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02165	Given that we have circa 6,000 empty homes in Wirral and Peel Holdings have stated they can build circa 6,400 homes at Wirral Waters and with the ONS reducing the amount of need for homes in Wirral I see absolutely no need to build on green belt under any circumstances, and that includes the Council Leaders Hoylake Golf Resort folly
DOR02166	Completely opposed to these plans, plenty of brownfield sites about on the Wirral for re-use
DOR02167	Don't agree with any use of green belt land especially where there are large areas of brown belt and a lack of need. As a resident of Saughall Massie I find it disgusting that our opinions over the fire station where not considered in any way.
DOR02168	Whilst acknowledging that there is a growing need for new housing and that I live in a property that 70 years ago formed part of the development of what were open fields, I have some thoughts to share with regard to the proposed development of selected areas of Wirral's greenbelt for housing, and in particular, those areas which surround the village of Irby. There are disproportionately high quantities of Green Belt surrounding Irby which the current local infrastructure would be unable to support, notably schools, healthcare and access to M53 at peak times. This is applicable to a degree to many of the green belt areas currently identified but Irby's relatively low population could potentially result in a particularly high percentage population increase and resulting impact upon amenities and infrastructure. Any wholesale home building programme has to be hand in hand with infrastructure planning and upgrading rather than these elements being retrospective and corrective. Are the houses being planned in the areas people wish to live? Current green belt areas are in the main, geographically distant from areas of highest population density. Is there evidence to show there is a particular demand for the majority of Wirral's new housing quota to be concentrated in the west and have those who are currently unable to find housing within the borough been consulted on their preferred location? I am keen to see that the opportunity to develop Brownfield Sites, progress existing planning consents and the restore currently vacant properties to use be fully explored prior to any assumption that the development of Green Belt is the easiest or most feasible option. This will not only protect existing Green Belt but will geographically spread any new developments, making them accessible or desirable to a greater proportion of the population, and in many cases, leading to regeneration of those areas. In summary, I'm accepting of the need to develop across the borough but this needs to be planned and proportional.
DOR02169	I'm gutted that you would even consider destroying the green belt land. Wirral is one of the most beautiful places in the UK... mainly because of all the greenery. Friends who come and visit say how lucky we are where we live, and it's going to be ruined. Surely you can find other places to build, like derelict land, brown belts... or even think out of the box and build up and down, rather than sideways? Where there is a will, there's a way - please find the will before we are all living in a depressing grey urban sprawl.
DOR02170	I, like thousands of other Wirral residents have been devastated and outraged at the Council's recent proposals to release Green Belt land for development. Why, when the Council Leader is supposed to be so resolute in protecting our green belt is he so prepared to go against agreed Council policy and even consider it? Like many others, I am puzzled by the Governments' estimate that the tiny Wirral peninsula needs 12000 houses over the next 15 years, especially as the Government 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. At the first public consultation meeting, Wirral's an Assistant Planning Director admitted to spending thousands on consultants to provide population and economic growth projections which independent analysis, and even documents produced by the Council itself (e.g. Wirral Compendium of Statistics) have shown to be vastly overestimated and display a staggering lack of recognition of both local knowledge and historic trends. I therefore believe that it is vital to question the accuracy and validity of this figure. The "one size fits all" approach of the Government's national formula cannot be appropriate to determine the very different housing needs of a small area like the Wirral as well as those of a major city in the South! If a more realistic estimate of our future housing needs was considered it would remove the need to consider releasing Green Belt land for development. The majority of homes built on Green Belt are not "affordable" – releasing this land is merely an opportunity for greedy developers to make vast sums of money by building executive homes and in the process reduce many areas to vast housing estates. Huge pressure would be put on an inadequate infrastructure, increasing traffic, pollution and destroying the character and charm of individual villages as well as the valuable wildlife with which we share our lives. 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. The Council should be putting more effort into developing brownfields sites, bringing empty properties back into use and working with Peel Holdings to fulfil their promises for the Wirral Waters development rather than wasting massive sums of money on the costly Hoylake Golf Resort which no one wants! It is clear that Wirral residents are not just prepared to sit back and accept this assault on our Green Belt. This is a wholly unacceptable situation and the Council should get on with job of saving our Green Belt or they will find themselves replaced by those who will!
DOR02171	I have lived in Spital all my life, 47 years, and the reason I have stayed living here is the simple fact that it is a beautiful unspoiled place to live. I go out for a walk with my children and dog daily to get some exercise and fresh air...things that cost nothing but are essential for a healthy happy life and look around and smile at the beautiful area I live in. There is so much wild life to look at too. It will be devastating to build on the green belt land, not only for the reasons mentioned above but also the increase in congestion, the impact it will have on our health all the extra pollution. It will not bring anything good to our area just destroy it and the people living in it.
DOR02172	It is vitally important not to use up green belt land as this is irreplaceable for wildlife. There are plenty of brown belt sites that could be developed and not left to rot. For the physical and mental wellbeing of all residents there needs to be green space that is easily accessible and this will be lost if green belt disappears.
DOR02173	Wirral has a stagnant or slightly falling population so it cannot need as many houses as are included in you plan.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02174	<p>I am totally opposed to the release of land from the green belt for a number of reasons outlined below: I believe the Council's projection of the need for 12000 new homes is excessive. The ONS based projections recalculate the number of dwellings to 7320 over 15 years. This is significantly lower and as a consequence there should be no need to release green belt land for development. Part of what makes Wirral a pleasant place to work and live is the green belt environment and the Council and all future Councils should be working with local residents and friends groups to protect and preserve it. In the Council's local plan consultation presentation, reference was also made to Wirral Waters and Peel Holdings, with [the Council Leader] also writing to local residents advising that Peel Group Holdings were not honouring their commitments with respect to developments at Wirral Waters and that this, by implication, was affecting the Council's judgement that areas of the green belt had to be released for development. Why then did the Development Director of Wirral Waters, write to the Leader of the Council on September 10th 2018, requesting that the Council stop their campaign of misinformation to Wirral residents? To be aware of such variance between Peel Group Holdings and the Council does not inspire confidence in the accuracy of the Council's figures. In particular then, I am totally opposed to the Council's identification of potential infill opportunities on the land between the Wirral Way and the estuary. This land should remain undeveloped as it is a vital part of the Wirral Way experience, affording open vistas to the Welsh hills. As such it is enjoyed by thousands of Wirral Way visitors every year. Similarly I fear the Council's proposals to infill between different Wirral villages, such as Irby and Thingwall will destroy the character and appreciation of such villages, creating huge residential sprawls. With regards to specific sites for proposed developments, I am totally opposed to the development of land west of Column Road, West Kirby and opposed to any developments to the areas in front of and behind the War Memorial and Grange Hill fields off Grange Road, West Kirby. To build on these sites, which are enjoyed and used by many Wirral residents would completely destroy part of the character and distinctiveness of West Kirby, positioned as it is to afford open views to the estuary. It does however make sense to redevelop the site of the former Ashton Court in West Kirby, provided the development proposals create the sorts of housing Wirral residents need. Finally local residents were advised that the Council currently has 4600 properties empty, with 1992 of these being long term vacant. Surely it is imperative as well as financially sound to bring these on stream to help bridge any gap in current and future housing needs, before any consideration is given to releasing any green field sites, let alone green belt sites. Hopefully however all will be resolved and our green belt sites will be protected once the Council recalculates its projections in terms of housing needs.</p>
DOR02175	<p>Why do we need additional homes to be built on greenbelt, why can't we build on brownfield first. it seems to me that the council is trying to push the greenbelt sale to make money. sailing not just the current generation but future generations up the river.</p>
DOR02176	<p>It is now widely recognised that the figure of 12 000 news houses to be built by 2035 is inflated. Wirral's has experienced a virtual zero population growth since the last census nearly 10 years ago. There is no reason to expect a population growth requiring so much new house building. An average of 3 occupants per house would assume around 36 000 more inhabitants Wirral wide - a growth of over 10%. This is not likely to happen given the industrial and commercial decline of the peninsula not to mention its decreasing importance as a port. A greater effort should be made to bring long-term empty properties back into use. This project, which I am aware the council takes seriously, could probably provide up to half the new housing stock required over time.</p>
DOR02177	<p>One of the most appealing aspects of the Wirral for all of its residents is the open spaces that have been protected for many years by the green belt designation. The loss of such a large area of Green Belt for housing development is disproportionate to the actual needs of Wirral for green field housing development. To assign over 20% of the existing Green Belt for housing is vastly greater than any other Local authority that I am aware of. It is true that Wirral is restricted in land space available as it is surrounded on Three sides by water. That also restricts the ease with which residents can access open spaces other than on the Wirral. I would urge the council to reduce the amount of space to be allocated to development so that the balance between the open spaces of Wirral and the built up areas can be maintained to the benefit of all residents. Surely we should be thinking about reducing car journey distances for residents to access green spaces, not increasing them. A particular concern for me is the infill of certain areas with development where the spaces had originally been designated to allow for wild life corridors into the housing areas. By closing off the corridors it is bound to impact on the bio-diversity in these neighbourhoods. It is also not clear from the Presentation what the intended purpose of removing The Royal Liverpool Golf Club from the Green Belt is. In what way does this help to increase housing in the area? In light of the recent news that the number of new houses required to be built in Wirral was overestimated what will be the likely impact on the proposals that will go forward for the Local Plan? I look forward to receiving your responses to the above points.</p>
DOR02178	<p>I object to proposals to develop green belt sites throughout the borough. I believe the Council can deliver its allocation of new homes through projects including Wirral waters and using existing brown field sites. If the go ahead was given to develop green belt areas it is not realistic to believe the properties built will be affordable and will much more likely be executive homes. Green space is strategically important and supports the promotion of physical and mental wellbeing. It also plays an important role in mitigating the effects of climate change and tackling air pollution.</p>
DOR02179	<p>Removal of essentially all land east of M53 from green belt designation is disproportionate and unwarranted. The proposal to develop Bromborough village main car park (Allport Lane) for mixed commercial / residential building is insane - during the week this car park operates at 80-90% full capacity - if it were to be taken out of use for this purpose there would be nowhere else for cars to park which would have a severe and adverse effect on the shops in the village and could potentially cause nuisance and hazards from cars parking in local roads which are unsuitable in size for this. Similarly, plans to redevelop Bromborough Community Centre are unwelcome as this building is extensively used by the local community.</p>
DOR02180	<p>I am very unhappy that so much green belt land has been cited as possible development land. Thinking that developers will build Starter homes on green belt areas is delusionary - house builders only want to maximise their profits and so will build houses to attract more affluent clients and the new houses on green belt will be out of financial reach of the people that need them the most and all green open spaces will be lost as well. Brown field sites should be developed first and green belt left alone! Population growth may slow down anyway as people come to their senses about how the planet is struggling to support everyone. Please leave the green belt alone!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02181	<p>Having read much of the documentation concerning the proposed Local Plan and attended one of the consultation meeting, as well as a meeting addressed by local ward councillors, I wish to make the following points explaining my opposition to the Local Plan in its current form. 1) Various claims have been made about who is responsible for the demand that Wirral build more than 12,000 new homes by 2035, but the latest ONS population projections suggest that by that time the population will have increased by a mere 11,000 approximately. This projection indicates that the figure of 12,000 new homes grossly exceeds all anticipated future demand. 2) The ONS figures further suggest that the most significant population increase, within the very modest overall growth, will be in the post-65 age group. This has a bearing on the type of accommodation that will be required, in that people in this group generally down-size from the larger family home to a bungalow, apartment or care home. This would release larger properties, which could potentially be re-developed. 3) It was stated at the local consultation meeting which we attended that the Local Plan was being developed without taking economic and employment factors into account. What is the point of building large numbers of new homes without clear evidence that there will be employment opportunities and adequate infrastructure for the residents? Some councillors and a large number of attendees at consultation meetings seem intent on criticising Peel Group, without recognising that, as a highly successful international company, they seize the opportunity to build new homes and business premises when they see viable economic opportunities. The fact that they have not already built the approximately 13,000 new homes at Wirral Waters, for which they were granted outline planning permission some years ago, suggests that they have yet to be convinced of the business case. 4) Without firm evidence of significantly greater economic development within the Borough than has occurred in the past thirty years, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the majority of new homes will be occupied by people working outside Wirral. For various reasons, including consideration of the environment, transport, infrastructure, etc., it would make more sense for them to live where they work. 5) It was also stated at the consultation meeting that neighbouring authorities had refused Wirral's request to help meet the house-building quota. Why should Wirral become a sprawling urban "dormitory" borough for Liverpool, Manchester and parts of Cheshire? 6) Everyone recognises that it is easier and more lucrative for developers to build on large greenfield sites, so it is hardly surprising that some house-builders and landowners have already put forward expressions of interest. However, in a highly confined geographical area, which the Wirral peninsula patently is, there is an even stronger case than usual for ensuring that existing or previously developed sites are re-used. I cannot comment on claims that the Wirral BC Brownfield Register Consultation process was flawed, but it is obvious that there are many brownfield sites which could be redeveloped and go most, if not the whole, way to meeting the new homes target, especially if the Government revises that figure downwards.</p> <p>It must surely be a Council priority to work cooperatively with developers and the owners of these sites, possibly by helping to fund the environmental cleaning of the land, to ensure that they are re-developed, instead of being left as an eyesore? 7) In granting Peel Group outline planning permission to build approximately 13,000 homes at Wirral Waters, Wirral BC must have considered it to be a viable project. Why has it ignored Peel's latest commitment to build 6,450 homes, including instead a mere 1,100 in the Draft Local Plan for the full 15 year period and none at all in the first five years? Its argument that detailed Planning Consent is necessary has been shown to be flawed by the 2017 Appeal Court Ruling, which made it clear to councils, etc., that developments only need to be "reasonably possible" to be included in the Local Plan. 8) The Leader of the Council, apparently told the Wirral Globe: "I'm not prepared to allow our greenbelt 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." On page 26 of the Background Report to the Initial Greenbelt Review for Wirral's Core Strategy Local Plan (September 2018) it states: "Appendix 3 shows that all the Green Belt Parcels identified, with the exception of some existing developed areas in the Green Belt, continue to meet one or a number of the Green Belt purposes set out in national policy. Development on any of these sites would therefore, by definition, continue to be harmful to the Green Belt." Nothing we have read in the Council's literature or heard at the various meetings has indicated that there are any "exceptional circumstances" justifying changes to Green Belt boundaries. 9) The investigation notes on the various identified parcels of greenbelt land prepared for the Council by its planning officers inevitably refer to a very limited set of criteria and exclude any consideration of important factors such as historical, archaeological and scientific features. 10) We have deliberately refrained from commenting on the parcels of land closest to our home, because we are deeply concerned about the whole of the Wirral and the inevitable harm that release of any of the greenbelt would cause. Once this land is lost, it will be lost for ever, and the Wirral will become a less attractive place to residents and visitors alike.</p>
DOR02182	I was disgusted to discover that Wirral MBC is planning to release vast swathes of greenbelt land all over Wirral to greedy housing developers when there is absolutely no need. The population of Wirral is forecast to fall and any housing requirements can easily be met by development on brownfield sites. Stop the destruction of Wirral.
DOR02183	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02184	I fail to understand the justification for building on greenbelt land when there are numerous brownfield areas and vacant properties which could be used to increase housing in the area. I have two young children and fail to see how our current infrastructure could sustain this level of development. Hospitals, Schools, Children's Services and transport links simply not equipped to handle an influx of people to the area.
DOR02185	I am very concerned about the proposed release for development of the Green belt sites in West Wirral. I feel that the potential for the development of brownfield sites is not being maximised. The impact of developing the Green belt for housing will have an irrevocable effect on the unique beauty and quality of the villages and existing settlements around this part of the Wirral. From a personal perspective, my house backs on to a large area of greenbelt land between Arrowe Road and Arrowe Brook Lane in Greasby. This land is currently productive farmland and forms the boundary between Greasby and Irby. The land rises uphill at the rear of my property and so any proposed development would create significant visual intrusion and overlooking. It would also impact negatively on the traffic and local services and amenities in Greasby. In addition, the land provides a habitat for many wild animals and we regularly see foxes crossing the fields from Greasby Copse. I do not feel that such sites should be developed when there are alternative sites that would allow significant redevelopment of areas on Wirral that are currently in need of redevelopment and which would not have a negative impact on the environment or wildlife.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02186	I am writing to oppose the proposals to include greenbelt land around Bebington and Bromborough being developed for residential use under the local plan. There is already little open space preventing the urban sprawl of neighbouring towns merging and the local historic setting of the area will be lost forever. There are many areas of poor quality housing that need to be redeveloped first including delivery of plans for New Ferry following the explosion and opportunities for continued development in the Rock Ferry and Birkenhead areas of poor housing. Wirral is locked by sea boundaries and it is insane to continue to eat up the area with pointless expensive developments. The councillors for Bebington seem disinterested and there is no transparency around how the final decisions will be taken which I believe is already made for the interest of the councillors and staff themselves. Please explain why you are not actioning planning permission that has been submitted previously in respect of the Peel development. Is this because really the council are hoping to push up the value of greenbelt that they own themselves? What are you doing about the increased infrastructure that will be needed, why aren't you looking at NHS capacity. Is the fact that Higher Bebington Junior school already been extended a signal that you have already decided to develop the land around that catchment area?
DOR02187	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02188	I am completely opposed to development on the green belt in any party of the Wirral Birkenhead needs to be developed
DOR02189	A couple of general comments: 1. With the large swathes of brownfield site standing idle in Birkenhead (10 years into Wirral Waters so-called 30 year plan) it seems very wrong to be building on precious greenfield sites. 2. There is not enough sheltered accommodation in Wirral, with waiting lists for popular schemes. If more sheltered accommodation was encouraged that could free up many family properties which currently only have single occupancies
DOR02190	We strongly object to the proposed building on the Bromborough village carpark & possible demolition of Bromborough Civic Centre with building taken place on this site also. If these proposals went ahead it would basically ruined the village.
DOR02191	The Wirral desperately needs quality eco-friendly housing. It needs to be built in in fill sites which may be currently greenbelt. We do not have enough deliverable sites at present, especially around West Kirby, Caldy area.
DOR02192	With regards to the sites at Bromborough Civic Centre (SHLAA 2024) and Allport Lane car park (SHLAA 2025), both myself and my constituents feel strongly that these community assets are best left as they are. We are well aware there are areas of brown field across Birkenhead and Bromborough Pool and the docks that could be used, and building in areas that need their community centres and car parks in already built up areas would have a huge negative social impact upon the area. Myself and local residents urge the cabinet to leave these sites well alone.
DOR02193	Overdale Avenue, just off Storeton Lane/Station Road in Barnston. This road is the only traffic-bearing route that crosses the M53 between Clatterbridge and Arrowe Park, and at its other end is a broken junction - its connection with Barnston Road permits only one direction of traffic to flow at any one time. 30 years ago, when we moved here, the road was quiet. Now there are quarter mile tailbacks in both directions at every rush hour, and when the M53 is closed it backs up for over a mile. The Local plan has identified the land between Whitfield Lane and Barnston centre for development, and that around Gills Lane in Pensby. If built, this will add even more traffic and will only be workable if the broken junction problem is resolved. I believe there have been previous proposals to build a relief road from Barnston Halt around the back to connect into Barnston Road further towards Heswall. Can you please advise whether this plan will be included as part of the residential development? I recognise and support the need for housing development on the Wirral; my point is that it's crucial that the infrastructure is able to support the increase in population.
DOR02194	Apart from the fact it will totally spoil our Wirral countryside we haven't got the roads to take the extra traffic it's bad enough now. Croft Retail Park in Bromborough is a classic example and that's on an A road.
DOR02195	Whilst I understand the reasons why you have chosen to review the extent of the Greenbelt in Wirral and the rational for the proposed revised boundaries I must strongly object to the particular proposals that affect the area where I live in Dibbins Hey, Wirral. I understand that the Dibbinsdale LNR would continue to be protected even when taken out of the Greenbelt area SP043 but the area around Vineyard Farm would not. That would be a great loss as the stretch of Poulton Road that runs between Vineyard and Lancelyn Farms has the feel of being truly rural and open in complete contrast to the suburban development that adjoins it. It is working farmland that is used to grow valuable crops. The same applies to Poulton Hall Road between SP042 and SP044. To build houses on this land would put intolerable pressure on Spital crossroads by The Three Stags and on Dibbinsdale Road. These roads are already at capacity in the morning and evening peaks. I also object to the wider proposals to take the land around Claremont Farm (SP040 and SP042) out of the Greenbelt and therefore encouraging its development. The farm and its farm shop is an incredibly successful local business that employs local people and attracts visitors from across Wirral and beyond. One of its attractions is the sale of produce from the farm itself and also the beautiful rural outlook from the cafe. Both could be lost if these proposals go ahead. When the M53 was built it was designed to be as unobtrusive as possible and is mostly sunk in a cutting. From the road there is very little development visible until you reach Woodchurch. I think it would be a great loss to make it the edge of the Greenbelt and allow building up to its eastern boundary so changing the visitors view of Wirral forever. It is all the more important to resist these changes now that the Office for National Statistics has admitted that its targets for housing growth were wrong.
DOR02196	In relation to Barnston there is traffic congestion every morning and evening and the sewer capacity is inadequate. This has been outlined in more detail in a Letter to our MP and the local councillors who cover this area.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02197	Local plans would ruin the village image of Thornton Hough, it would be detrimental to all the visitors , and spoil the lovely and idyllic venue for weddings and other special occasions. I do not think Lord Leverhulme himself would have approved of this.
DOR02198	<p>I wish to object to Wirral Council's plan to build on Green Belt land on Wirral. I believe that Wirral Council should follow a "Brownfield first" policy For the following reasons: There are more than enough Brownfield sites to meet realistic targets without releasing Greenbelt land. This is especially the case now since the Office for National Statistics (ONS) has now released figures indicating a new Wirral target of around 500 rather than 800 homes per year will be needed. The homes needed are meant to be "affordable homes" which are needed more in the "Brownfield sites" in the existing urban areas of east Wirral. Wirral Council should be working more closely with Peel Holdings to allow and assist with the building of affordable homes on "Brownfield sites" at Wirral Waters. Moneys should be diverted from the loan to a Developer to build luxury homes for a Golf Resort on Greenbelt land in Hoylake, to purchase or redevelop Brownfield sites for affordable homes. The Council should not release Greenbelt until all Brownfield has been exhausted and the thousands of empty properties on Wirral have been brought back into use. Greenbelt was meant to stop urban sprawl. To group small settlements, at present within the Greenbelt together into so-called "Settlement Zones" and allow these to merge by allowing Developers to build " non-affordable" homes between them, would still be creating urban sprawl and against the spirit of Greenbelt. Just to justify this by calling these new urban areas "Garden Settlements" is an insult to the principle of Greenbelt. One proposed development area is the land on the north side of Thingwall Road, between Limbo Lane and Arrowe Park. This area is local to me and I am aware of woodland copses here that are homes to bats and owls which have been seen hunting over the fields where planned building may be taking place. There are also a number of ponds on the edges and in the fields where newts and toads are present.</p>
DOR02198	<p>The Egerton Park Residents Association is a not-for-profit limited company owned and managed by residents in Egerton Park. Our Road is un-adopted by the Local Authority and therefore responsibility for its upkeep and maintenance is undertaken by us. We represent about 200 households within the Park and its numerous cul-de-sacs. Further to the public consultation on the Area Plan the Egerton Park Residents Association Committee has met and discussed the proposals contained within the plan. We note that there are a number of proposals relating to sites within Egerton Park, most notably a number of derelict sites owned mostly, but not exclusively by Salisbury Developments Ltd. We have the following observations and suggestions to make: 1. We are unsure as to the status of the numerous sites and the Local Authority's proposals. As privately owned land it is not clear how or if the Council can insist that the sites are brought into use other than by a compulsory purchase order or some other lawful authority. 2. We have been in dialogue with elected members George Davies and Moira McLaughlin and also with the Assistant Director: Major Growth Projects and Housing Delivery on numerous occasions over several years to request that the Council initiates steps to force the owners of several derelict sites in Egerton Park into their use for residential properties. To date, after several years of trying we have made little progress. We therefore broadly welcome the Area plan. 3. For the avoidance of doubt we welcome any steps to bring brownfield sites in Egerton Park into use for residential property. 4. We have a number of concerns about developments in Egerton Park. In particular, the infrastructure is Victorian and privately-owned (by the Residents Association) including the entrance pillars and the un-adopted road surface and is maintained solely by us as property owners and residents. Large scale development, for example for commercial use, blocks of flats or apartments will put undue and unsustainable pressure on traffic flow and highway maintenance. 5. The Park is already home to several Houses in Multi Occupation and to several nursing and residential homes. Any continued growth of that type of development will further dilute the residential nature of our estate, increase the transient population who tend to take no interest in our community and who typically do not pay fees towards the upkeep of the road and other infrastructure, insisting that they are tenants not property owners. 6. There has been a Tree Preservation Order relating to the Park in force since the early 1970's but it is frequently flouted by developers and, although incidents are reported to the Council no enforcement action ever seems to follow. In any new proposed developments we would like to see the TPO upheld and specified within any planning approvals. 7. As the road is un-adopted any damage to the road surface caused by demolition or construction traffic will almost inevitably fall to the Residents Committee (with our limited funds).</p> <p>We would therefore request that any housing developments are conditional upon the developers making good the road surface upon completion and to a standard acceptable to the Council's highways department in consultation with ourselves. 8. We would further request that any new properties built in Egerton Park are made subject to a covenant that the owner or occupier must pay a service charge towards the upkeep of the road and infrastructure which is set annually at the AGM of the residents association (currently £5 per month). I reiterate that the residents and Committee of Egerton Park are fully supportive of a process of residential development of the derelict sites in Egerton Park and its surroundings. Indeed we have been campaigning for this for several years. However, this is an un-adopted, Victorian, enclosed "residential" estate in a suburb and, as such needs special consideration to ensure that any development is compatible with the current housing stock and is sustainable in the longer term. If you have any queries please do not hesitate to contact me.</p>
DOR02200	I am strongly opposed to the idea of building on the green belt and do not believe that such action is justified at this time.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02201	<p>I write to protest in the strongest possible terms about the Government target for Wirral Council to build 800 houses annually, totalling 12,000 by 2035. I also disagree with Wirral Council's interpretation of the Government paper. 1. The need for 12,000 homes has been calculated from NATIONAL Statistics for population projection, rather than LOCAL statistics. However, using the 'Compendium of Statistics' from the Council's 'Wirral Population Projection' the increase in population from 2018 to 2038 is projected to be 5,500 people. 2. The Council has identified 2 major 'employment sites' on the Wirral. They have not indicated any immediate plans to increase this number, it follows therefore that there is unlikely to be any large demands for more housing to meet any additional future employment needs. 3. The local population saw a fall in numbers between 1996 (the earliest year quoted on the Council website); 2009 of 4.6%. However, since then the population numbers have risen to similar numbers to 1996 (322,700 in 1996 & 322,800 in 2017). This increase cannot be guaranteed to continue as there is still a significant lack of employment opportunities for all age groups. 4. In 2010 Mersey Docks and Harbour Board sold a large area of land next to the West Float Dock in Birkenhead (now known as Wirral Waters) to Peel Holdings. This is a brown field site and outline planning permission was granted to build 13,000. To date no houses have been built. At a recent Open Public Meeting organized by the Council for local residents, we were told that discussions between the Council and Peel Holdings have indicated that only 2,600 houses will be built. If more are needed, I would suggest a Compulsory Purchase Order on some of the land allowing either the sale of the land to another builder, or the building of Council/Social housing funded by central government or the local Council. 5. Close to Wirral Waters are large areas of derelict land around the dock area. This provides an ideal opportunity for further development along the lines of Salford Quays and the London Docklands, so providing a much needed upgrade in the whole Birkenhead area. 6. There are also a number of derelict, run down, unused sites and buildings in central Birkenhead and again, re-development of these areas would provide significant improvement for everyone. 7. In the absence of any significant progress in the development of Wirral Waters, the Council has identified a large number of areas of local green belt as potential building sites, and they are justifying this by saying they must meet the Government target. 8. Of Wirral's 157 square kilometres, 46% is already covered in houses. Figures given at the Open Meeting show that 13,000 additional houses would raise this to 67% of our precious land. In contrast, Cheshire West has 10% of land built on and the UK as a whole 6% (Source: Alasdair Rae, University of Sheffield. A Land Cover Atlas of the UK). 9. The one area of opportunity of further development in Wirral is the tourist industry which is a major part of the local economy. We currently have a number of SSSI and SSI sites, a rich heritage and are blessed with beautiful scenery and stunning views around our coast. Turning the area into a huge urban sprawl would have major implications for visitor numbers and earnings. 10. The National Guidance on Green Belt NPPF2 states that "Once established Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans". The Council has not identified any 'exceptional circumstances', to justify use of our precious green belt. In short, we do not need 12,000 extra houses and even if future demand changes, we have enough brown field sites; the development of which would transform the area and benefit everyone.</p>
DOR02202	<p>Building on Green Belt land is wrong on many levels; environmentally (more emissions, impact on wildlife and humans for starters, more congestion, for example), human health (toxins, emissions, increase in household rubbish), the economy (less jobs and more demand in local areas). There are many brown field sites across the Wirral which could be used and the areas improved, attracting people to the area - e.g. waste sites and dockland areas, housing left to disintegrate, old hotels in New Brighton area. Make it cheaper for these to be built on rather than destroy our environment and leave nothing but little box houses for ours and your future generations.</p>
DOR02203	<p>SP 109. Boathouse Lane. This should not be developed due to; Loss of natural wildlife habitats and biodiversity. Land is habitat to protected trees, bats, newts, fish owls and much other wildlife. Site contains ponds and watercourses that naturally drain the area. Development would increase flooding problems currently experienced by nearby houses. Site is continuation of Cheshire green belt to SW, which is a designated wildlife site. Any development would be high cost housing of which there is a surplus on Wirral. SP71 Chester Road A540 Development on this land would create about 4 miles of continuous urban sprawl along the A540 from Boathouse lane to Mere Lane and drastically alter the character of the area. Access roads onto the A540, which already has a poor accident record, would make it even more hazardous. Again, developments on this land would also be high cost housing which is not needed. The additional demands of the new residents would further overload stretched local public services. Local schools are already oversubscribed, for example.</p>
DOR02204	<p>Losing the green belt in west Wirral is a stupid plan, it will not give any affordable housing as prices in west Wirral are very high. This is profiteering by the council.</p>
DOR02205	<p>I'm concerned that you will be building a small number of houses that will only be affordable by the very rich at the expense of large swathes of green belt that currently benefit everyone in the community. In particular, the proposed site on Grange Hill is of concern - this is a special area to remember the dead and preserve wildlife and shouldn't be used for luxury houses. It also seems impractical and expensive to build. Please reconsider.</p>
DOR02206	<p>No valid reason for building on greenbelt.</p>
DOR02207	<p>My response to the above consultation is detailed below. 1 - Wirral Local Plan Consultation Validity I believe that the current consultation process is critically flawed and therefore invalid. I consider that the Council's projected need to build 803 dwellings each year for the next 15 years is far too high. The entire consultation process and proposals put forward by the council at all the public meetings have been based on a national government "broad-brush" approach figure of 803 dwellings per annum being required each year for the next 15 years. Whilst this figure may be appropriate for some parts of the country, I believe this figure to be grossly in excess of what is required for the Wirral given its unique character as a peninsula and near static population and jobs forecast over the next 15 years (Wirral's population has fallen by around 20,000 since 1981, whereas the housing stock has increased). The figures have been challenged by [another respondent] as being wholly excessive, and none of the people attending the public meetings, or the local councillors who have spoken out on the issue, agree with the 803 dwellings a year requirement. Even the Council Leader Philip Jones has stated in</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>a public letter to Wirral Households that he does not agree that this figure is correct. Despite requests at the public meetings, I have yet to see the Council produce any written justification to support the figure of 803 dwellings per year as appropriate for Wirral's needs. Using the same broad-brush Government Standard Method calculation using the recently published Office of National Statistics (ONS) 2016 projections reduces the above housing requirement figure from 803 to 488 new dwellings per annum. This is nearly half the figure that the Council's Consultation Presentations have dogmatically adopted throughout the so called consultation process – and probably still on the high side. Strangely, although the Council's officers were apparently aware that these new figures were due for publication, no mention was made of this during the public consultation meeting presentation? When there is so much uncertainty/inaccuracy in the figure underpinning the very justification for the release of green belt (and the current consultation process), how can any individual evaluate the facts and form an accurate opinion when the foundation information that has been presented to them is so wrong? How can the Council rely on these figures? The answer to both questions is, of course, that they can't! In my view the public have been misinformed with the key information that lies at the crux of the consultation. This undermines the whole process and grossly over exaggerates the need to release green belt. In fact, I would go as far as to question the legal legitimacy of the current consultation. A new consultation process needs to be started when the Council has produced an accurate set of housing need projection figures based on the Wirral's genuine needs, and when the detailed calculations and assumptions have been published so that the public can scrutinise it and comment on it properly. This must happen before any green belt is considered for release.</p> <p>2 - Housing Land Availability I believe that adequate land to meet Wirral's housing requirements is already available. Even accepting the Government Standard Method for calculating housing requirements, and using the latest ONS 2016 figures above, the projected housing requirement for Wirral over the next 15 years is $488 \times 15 = 7,320$ new dwellings. The July 2018 Council Cabinet document (Page 9) has already identified land supply (non-green belt) for an estimated 7,635 dwellings. If this is added to the most pessimistic forecast of an additional 1,100 dwellings associated with Wirral Waters, this equates to a forecast availability of 8,735 new dwellings. This represents a surplus of 1,415 dwellings (almost 20%) over the projected government requirements. Clearly, there is no need or justification for the release of any green belt. Clearly, investors and developers will be keen to make a killing by making lucrative deals with green belt land owners and building far more profitable housing on green belt than on existing brown field sites that are crying out for development. No green belt should be even considered for release until all the available brown field sites have been developed, or are under development. To do otherwise will just disincentivise developers from building on brown field sites and undo the hard work and effort that the planners have put into trying to encourage brown field site development in the past. These are often in the most deprived areas of the Wirral where undoubtedly investment and affordable housing is needed most.</p> <p>3 - Green Belt Selection Method I believe that the method for Green Belt selection for consideration for release for housing is wrong/inappropriate. The primary role of the green belt is to prevent urban sprawl and prevent small settlements and villages (such as Irby, Pensby, Thingwall and Heswall) from losing their individual charm, character, and community by merging into one another to become one large continuous built up conglomerate. This approach has traditionally been applied by Wirral Council's Planning Department when determining individual planning applications for house building on green belt for many years and, as far as I am aware, this is still the case. However, this approach appears to have been abandoned by the Council when determining which areas of green belt should be selected/included for consideration for release under the current consultation exercise. Instead, the Council has chosen to adopt the much larger "Settlement Area" definition when applying the green belt test. This means that areas where development previously would have been classed as urban sprawl because they separated towns and villages (and therefore would never have been released for house building) are now being classed as in fill within the larger settlement area and are now up for potential release – despite the damage this will do to the local amenity. I strongly disagree with this approach. This was never what was intended when the green belt was initially established. It merely serves as a convenient means for the Council to justify in their minds why certain green belt areas could be released for house building now, whereas previously it would have been considered to fly in the face of the fundamental green belt principles.</p> <p>4 - Specific Land Parcels in Irby There are two parcels of land nearby to where I live in Irby that remain in the Council's plan for potential release for house building. I would like to comment on these specifically: SP059E – Rear of Irby Hall I object to the release of this parcel of land from the green belt on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The entire SP059 parcel of existing green belt land between Irby Road and Telegraph Road is highly sought after by housing developers. The release of any part of this land is likely to open the floodgates for more investors/developers to apply pressure to seek the release of further portions of the land on a bit-by-bit basis. As there is no clear boundary to the west of parcel SP059E it will be difficult to prevent/defend against further release under green belt rules. • The land is high quality arable land. • The land borders onto Irby Hall – a scheduled monument – the character of which would be damaged by the construction of a large housing estate backing onto its grounds. • The land borders onto Backford Road pond – a site of biological interest – which a recent survey has confirmed contains Great Crested Newts (protected species) and the SP059E parcel of land is directly within range of the newts foraging habitat. • There is no public transport, infrastructure, or employment opportunities in the vicinity to support up to 85 new dwellings at this location. • Properties at this location will not be of the type affordable to first time buyers. • Access is likely to be via Penrhyd/Backford Road, neither of which are substantial enough to withstand the additional daily traffic from up to 85 new dwellings. • The loss of this green belt land to housing would have a highly detrimental effect on the visual impact of the landscape. • There is no shortage of existing housing for sale in the area already.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>SP060 – South of Thingwall Road, Irby I object to the release of this parcel of land from the green belt on the following grounds:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This parcel of land currently separates the villages of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall. Release of all or part of this land would constitute urban sprawl and lead to further encroachment by housing between the villages, and reduce or even eliminate the open space separation altogether. This area of land is a prime example of the type of land that the green belt was established to protect. If it was not for the Council's adoption of the "Settlement Area Methodology" there is no way that this green belt area would be considered for large scale development under conventional green belt rules. Recently an adjacent parcel of land (SHLAA 1980) on the opposite side of Irby Road, to the south of Townshend Road, had a house building application rejected by both the Council Planning Officers (OUT/15/01635) and also on appeal to the Planning Inspectorate (APP/W4325/W/17/3167893). It was rejected on the grounds that it would represent inappropriate development; it would be harmful to the green belt; and it would cause considerable harm to the openness, character and appearance of the area. I see no reason why the SP060 land, on the opposite side of the road to the above application, should be treated any differently – particularly as it is much bigger in comparison and therefore its adverse effect would be even greater and more unjustifiable. • The land is high quality arable land. • There is no public transport, infrastructure, or employment opportunities in the vicinity to support up to 846 new dwellings at this location. • Properties at this location will not be of the type affordable to first time buyers. • The local road infrastructure is not substantial enough to withstand the additional daily traffic from up to 846 new dwellings. Existing roads around the area are already too busy. • The loss of this green belt land to housing would have a highly detrimental effect on the visual impact of the landscape. • This parcel of land contains Harrock Wood that would become an isolated thin wooded area amidst a busy housing estate that would destroy its character and natural habitat and undoubtedly result in it becoming over used and ruined. • There is no shortage of existing housing for sale in the area already. <p>5 - Summary It is my understanding that the figures for projected housing requirements for the Wirral for the next 15 years put forward by the Council during this consultation are grossly exaggerated and unsubstantiated. Sufficient land has already been identified for a more realistic figure with a 20% surplus. Therefore there is no justification to release any green belt land for housing. The Council needs to recalculate its estimated housing requirements and produce a local plan based on the use of existing identified brownfield sites and leave the green belt alone.</p>
DOR02208	<p>West of Barnston Village. Concern at potential development and change of planning law. It is of deep concern that I find the area aforementioned is an area of possible housing expansion on the Wirral and in particular the Heswall Pensby Barnston area. If we are to keep the character of an already over urbanised Wirral we need to keep these Green areas and lungs to suppress pollution and stop the Wirral becoming a totally urbanised area and eventual city. The Pensby conurbation already sprawls into Irby and Heswall and potential development means it will spill into Barnston spoiling this small Hamlet. We do not need another Grim cardboard box commuter belt style development which is out of character for this area and also a blot on the landscape in this location. The Wirral has ample brown field developments on the site of former Industrial areas from the 19th Century which have fallen into decline and are no longer utilized. These areas also need the regeneration that new houses will bring and the services such as shops and jobs which new developments will bring. It would ensure schools and services in these areas do not close. The development of these greenfield sites is a Government and Council led easy and cheap decision as the brown field sites needs greater preparation and clearing for human habitation. A quick fix for the Wirral is not needed. Jobs and development are needed on the Mersey coast and Dock areas of Wallasey and Birkenhead. Development of the West Barnston areas will only fill the pockets of already rich developers who will charge a premium price for these houses and in return give nothing back to the Wirral and reduce the quality of living for existing residents who will have to suffer increased congestion, pollution and potential threats to medical and school services which are already at a premium in the area. Any development would be against the interests of the Wirral, residents and future inhabitants of this beautiful green space.</p>
DOR02209	Please build more affordable family homes in Moreton
DOR02210	<p>1. I agree that as a nation we should be building new homes to combat homelessness and drive house prices down 2. I fundamentally disagree that any of Wirral's designated Greenbelt Area should be used for building 3. Proposed Methodology and Rationale is Flawed for the following reasons: a. Wirral already has 55% of its land mass given over to development. Further incursions on greenbelt land is an inappropriate reduction of arable, leisure and green landscape b. In view of the above, every effort should be made to build on brownbelt sites c. You advised at the meeting that potentially contaminated land is not under consideration. I would urge that we test all available land that is not greenbelt to see whether it is viable to be built on d. Every effort should be made to work with Peel Holdings and others to encourage a joint building plan in a joined-up manner e. Is 12k homes a fair request for Wirral? Wirral House prices are already relatively affordable and there are currently approximately 3k dwellings unoccupied f. The methodology unfairly protects the relatively sparsely populated West Wirral at the expense of the highly populated East Wirral in the following ways: i. There is extensive greenbelt land in West Wirral. However, very little of that is up for further consideration. However, the little bit of greenbelt land in East Wirral is ALL up for consideration ii. Proposed building towards the M53 would mean that the whole of the Wirral to the east of the M53 is available to be built on, whilst the west of Wirral has a relatively massive expanse of green belt 'untouched and untouchable' iii. You claim you are seeking to avoid joining settlements, which is clearly true of West Wirral. However, your proposals leave East Wirral as a single 'Greater Birkenhead Metropolis' and an urban sprawl. Good for the West; Bad for the East iv. The availability of green spaces is well known to encourage healthy lifestyle and reduce mental health issues. The potential for completely removing greenbelt land from East Wirral will certainly exacerbate the healthy lifestyle and life expectancy differential between West and East Wirral which is widening all the time. v. The natural and permanent boundary for East Wirral is Storeton Ridge, nominally represented by Mount Road, not the M53. East</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	Wirral is already therefore developed to capacity g. Areas such as Storeton Woods, Eastham Country Park, Brackenwood and Royal Liverpool Golf Clubs should never ever be taken out of greenbelt protected status h. Building in the land from Mount Road to the M53 would mean a massive infrastructure rebuild too. Schools are already over-subscribed. Roads are grid-locked through many hours of the day. New Rail links, necessary services, motorway junctions, etc. would all be required from your methodology and rationale. For all the above reasons, and no doubt many more highlighted by others, your plan must not be put into practice.
DOR02211	I have been a Wirral resident for 69 years. I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Green Belt land across Wirral. My reasons for this are as follows: As stated by your own councillors, the population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. Developing Green belt land will spoil the character of the area. Green Belt open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for many local residents. Green Belt land is home to a variety of natural habitats and therefore wildlife will be severely affected. Unrivalled views will be destroyed with irreparable damage across Wirral. Increased traffic will cause major congestion to areas. It is not only homes that will need building but think about the infrastructure that will be needed too! Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. Some of the sites are huge. Once released from Green Belt, building could cause unrestricted sprawl, with historic villages merging. Thank you for reading my concerns, I feel that, as an alternative, a more in-depth look at using existing space on brownfield sites for homes would be more beneficial. There are also a number of empty properties that can be used and redeveloped.
DOR02212	On what basis do we need so many houses? What is it about the need for Greenbelt local and national government don't understand?
DOR02213	Given that the proposed Local Plan makes a strong case to identify suitable land to build new houses it is unfortunate that the Local Authority has not identified suitable sites within its ownership. Whilst the release of land for building will always create differing points of view there would be mitigating circumstances which could offset the loss of open space. The Local Authority has produced two land use strategies, The Parks and Open Spaces Strategy and The Playing Pitch Strategy. Both contain a long list of recommendations with no clear way of achieving them because of ongoing financial limitations. This Local Plan would seem to present an opportunity for an audit of Local Authority sites with the potential of raising capital to fund some of the much needed recommendations within these two Approved Strategies and not to do so represents a lost opportunity. Given the Local Authorities apparent unwillingness to audit land within its ownership it is difficult to support the potential release of land within the Green Belt.
DOR02214	I understand that there the need to, both as a country and more locally, to provide sufficient housing to meet a growing need. However, I cannot agree with the approach of Wirral Council, and in particular its apparent enthusiasm for developing Green Belt sites. I, and many other residents I suspect, remain unconvinced regarding the Council's estimation of the number of new builds actually required and would be very interested to see the detailed rationale behind it and have it closely scrutinised by an independent body. The 'built-on' proportion of Wirral is now approaching 50%, a frightening statistic for an area that was once marketed as the 'Leisure Peninsula', and still sells itself on the basis of its rural attraction and beautiful countryside. The Council plan targeting a large number (practically every?) Green Belt location in Wirral for housing development is a disastrous proposal. Are we really happy to destroy for ever the beautiful open spaces, farmland, and natural environments so unnecessarily? I urge the Council to revisit the Local Plan with a far more realistic assessment of the number of houses actually needed, to look again more closely and with greater purpose at ALL other sites that do not involve the destruction of the Green Belt, and importantly, to make use of the hundreds of empty dwellings and properties in Wirral (acquiring them if necessary) to limit the number of new build required. Please listen to the concerns of your residents and act accordingly!
DOR02215	I am very concerned by the suggestion that greenbelt land adjacent to Storeton Woods and Lever Causeway could be released for development. Although some encroachment onto the greenbelt at the edges of current residential areas could be considered the proposed plans show potentially large scale areas for development that will significantly impact on the amenity value of the central Wirral rural area. Of particular concern for me is the impact on the views across mainly rural Wirral from Storeton Woods. This is a popular area for leisure activities and is readily accessible from the more deprived areas of Wirral including Rock Ferry and Tranmere. Equally I am concerned that development of the greenbelt will not be sustainable as little public transport facilities are available for many of these proposed areas thus increasing car use/pollution/global warming etc etc. Finally my understanding is that Peel Holdings have clear plans and expectations to build/develop circa 6000 residential units at Wirral waters over the next few years i.e. many more than the 1000 that have current planning applications in place. assuming this to be the case then there is little necessity to encroach on the precious greenbelt.
DOR02216	I see a need for some new development, but this should be restricted and only in very small numbers. Generally, the present green belt should be protected at all costs.. Where development is necessary to provide affordable housing for those starting out and suitable accommodation for older people to be able to downsize, this should be done on brownfield sites of which there are a lot around all areas of the Wirral and not just former dock areas. I fail to see the case for an additional golf course in Hoylake. As we know some golf clubs in Wirral are already struggling to attract members, so I can only presume there is a hidden agenda to build housing which are not necessary on green belt land. This would be irresponsible and a complete waste of tax payers money? The population of Wirral is set to slightly decline over the next 30 years, so clearly there is no need to build on green belt land. We need to make sure the development plan is relevant to the needs of the Wirral and does not damage it's character. Let's do more to bring back into use former dock areas etc. to enhance and raise the overall standard of our wonderful Wirral before we begin to sacrifice the green belt..

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02217	Green Belt should be protected and not used for housing thereby allowing Wirral to live up to its hard earned reputation in being the Leisure Peninsular, promoting the health benefits of accessing these areas to residents and visitors alike. Your focus as my elected representatives should be on the re-use of brownfield sites to re-establish them for mixed use including housing thereby creating a sense of community based around jobs, services and housing. I would also like Wirral Council to work proactively with PEEL Holdings to enable Wirral Waters to deliver this Local Plan through an already established strategic development route, rather than by further destroying our valuable local assets, reducing their scale and adding to Urban Sprawl, and thereby removing the earning potential from future tourism.....eventually it will not be a nice place to live if these resources are removed and people will choose not to locate or visit here!
DOR02218	We should be concentrating on regenerating the depressed inner urban areas rather than looking to build on green belt land. Inner city urban regeneration is the key to revitalising Birkenhead - building on green belt is a short term response which is detrimental to long term issues.
DOR02219	The destruction of Wirral's precious green belt would be an act of criminal vandalism on the part of the council. This is especially the case as long as acres of derelict dockland lie unused. To build houses on large parts of the green heart of Wirral along the motorway corridor would permanently ruin the amenity of the borough, rob residents of the beauty of the rural environment, devastate wild life and detract from the attraction of the borough as a place to live and raise a family. I support all legitimate efforts to prevent this from happening.
DOR02220	I object to this plan's use of green belt for housing - instead the council should act together with central government to impel local firms - e.g. Peel Ports - to develop brownfield land they own. They should engage publicly and directly with government to persuade the latter to change their targets. They should also insist that all future development be high density affordable housing or apartments not big executive style homes. I particularly object to the proposed taking of green belt land in Wallasey where I live, next to Stapledon woods which is an area I use regularly, around Pensby and along the M53 which will have a big visual impact. I suggest the council has been remiss in not working harder on this issue over many years - perhaps it should do its collective job and stop playing politics - i.e. all parties work together on this. If it had started earlier on this task it might be easier now.
DOR02221	<p>I object to the plan to build on greenbelt sites. My objection is based on several factors.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The need to reduce greenhouse gases. This should be a priority for all local authorities. The green spaces around Wirral absorb carbon dioxide. Buildings and roads, and the increased traffic they will generate, will add to emissions. 2) Loss of bio diversity. Many species of birds, for example, including those listed under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, require areas of suitable farmland in order to thrive. 3) Local amenities. Wirral promotes itself as a leisure area and a good place to retire to. Much of its attraction resides in the extensive network of peaceful green spaces and public footpaths. Developments such as those proposed can only detract from this. 4) Increased traffic. I have particular concerns about the proposed developments between Station Road and the M53 and the railway line, and along Gills Lane. Station Road is an extension of Storeton Lane and is heavily used by traffic heading to and from Birkenhead. There is a choke point in the narrow section at the junction with Barnston Road, which already results in long queues of cars at peak periods. It is well accepted that idling engines produce heavy concentrations of carbon dioxide, adding to global warming. Also, Barnston Road is hazardous where it goes through Barnston Dale, with a blind corner at the junction with Gills Lane. It is a major route for ambulances heading for the Emergency Department at Arrowe Park hospital. Usually they turn on their sirens as they approach the narrow end of Storeton Lane and then on through the dale showing that they are worried about delays. Any increase in traffic resulting from building along Gills Lane could produce a genuine danger to life. I appreciate that the Council is under pressure from the government to build more houses. I should like to see an in depth analysis of whether or not there really is a need for so many new houses, based on demographic predictions. If the need is proved, then every effort should be made to provide them on existing brownfield sites, before any consideration of development on the green belt. I understand there are now some sites which have building permission but for a considerable time nothing has been built on them. The owners of these sites should be forced to build on them or the permission withdrawn.
DOR02222	Any decision to build on the green belt around The Lever Causeway must be challenged. This is one of the beauty spots on The Wirral and must be protected. Stanley Ave is a quiet cul-de sac and must remain so.
DOR02223	The local council is accepting the ONS population projections blindly and appear to be complicit in the plans to develop the Green Belt. 12000 homes is an unrealistic target and I am sure if they bothered to look further into projections they would be able to lodge an objection against the government plans. I have no confidence in them and will vote against them come local elections. Nefarious relationships with developers is quite obvious and the conflict of interests is an abhorrent abuse of power. If the council used realistic population trends and forced through the development of brown field sites there would be no need to release green belt sites. The green belt sites would NOT be affordable housing in the areas identified but would be maximum profit and expensive. I cannot begin to tell you how upset and betrayed I feel.
DOR02224	The integrity of the green belt should be an absolute without the possibility of any violation and there should be a statute in place to protect all of the current green belt and also to set in stone that the green belt areas can only increase and never decrease.....this requirement is for the benefit of future generations rather than the short-term gain of our political Masters

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02225	I feel the quality of information provided in the West Kirby meeting was not strong in relation to how the manner in which land will be released, how the land requirement calculations are reached and considerations for protecting the environment. From the tone in the room this has had a chilling effect on the confidence of the public in the council's plans. A more open approach would be beneficial. Clearly developers will prefer to build on green belt ideally near to settlements with higher housing values. Conversely from the perspective of residents, the regeneration needs of the area, and the needs to protect our very special wild and semi-wild areas building on brownfield sites is clearly preferable. It was unclear how the council plans to prevent a push focusing on greenfield sites from developers. I would encourage the council to release land in tranches over the 15 year period starting with brownfield sites and only releasing greenfield sites towards the end of the period when it has been demonstrated this is essential. Moreover the council should make it clear to developers that those who may later wish to use green belt sites should demonstrate a good track record of building on brownfield in the earlier part of the period. In considering whether a brownfield site is viable a key question is surely if it is not viable now when will it be? and how can the council influence this. It cannot be appropriate to essentially accept a brownfield site will never be developed and to destroy more green belt land instead. If there is still a need for greenfield development after the central government has reviewed the figures for Wirral great consideration should be given to what is being destroyed. A field of farmland is of considerably less value to the natural environment than established wild land and hence farm land should be given up over wild spaces. Moreover the council should use the planning processes to require developers to provide features that support the environment (wild areas, wildlife corridors) and reduce transport related damage and enhancing sustainability for example by requiring cycle ways linking into the Wirral loop and on to the public transport system. On a specific local point, there was a general comment that infill of urban areas was preferred to building on their periphery. I am not convinced this is a valid absolute rule. For example the two fields on the A540 as one enters West Kirby give are in my view significant to the feeling of the local area in terms of giving a sense of space coming into in an area in which housing is relatively densely packed. I would suggest the value of this space to residents may be greater than land at the periphery of the urban area. Finally, the calculations provide at the consultation included a 20% contingency - it was unclear why this was necessary or how the figure was derived. Further information on the penalties to the council if the target is missed (particularly by a small margin) will help the public understand whether such a large contingency is valid. An overshoot would be a disaster for confidence in the council's judgement.
DOR02226	With so many unoccupied houses on the Wirral, 4000+, then this planning seems to be driven by Financial pressures. The massive upheaval caused will be remembered by the Voters of Wirral for generations.
DOR02227	I oppose the Plan, as I believe it is an unjustifiable and unnecessary attack on Wirral's Green Belt. The number of houses envisaged is massively more than that actually needed, and most if not all of the supposed demand could be supplied by use of brownfield sites and by utilising empty housing. And of course by getting developers to build on the land they already own (e.g. Peel Holdings). Do not destroy the very thing that makes Wirral such a pleasant place to live in the first place!
DOR02228	Don't build on green belt land as there are current sites without buildings on .you must source the correct type of houses required to accommodate 1st time renters or buyers
DOR02229	Wirral Council deliberately chose to ignore the legal requirement to produce a Local Plan some years ago. They will now argue that they are being 'forced' into producing one by National Government using a relatively short time scale and thus minimising the time available for both public consultation and a considered view being taken by the Council. Labour councillors are playing politics with our green belt land when they have a surplus of brown belt land available to meet the housing needs of the Borough. No surprise when planning officials do not know how much of the brown belt land is council owned! Please listen to local people and do not include any green belt land in your planning proposals.
DOR02230	I question the need for so many new houses and object to any being built on our green belt.
DOR02231	There is no need to make ANY greenbelt land available for residential development. There are currently 16,000 planning applications that have been granted on brown field sites and there are 6,000 empty properties that should be brought back into use in Wirral before greenbelt land is destroyed for ever.
DOR02232	I have been involved as a major owner of a housing development company for over 30 years. My experience tells me that the figures being proposed for residential development on the Wirral is completely incorrect. Properties that we as a company sold in 2008 are currently selling at a discount of 40% from the selling price. i.e. for a unit selling in 2008 for £150,000 is now selling for £90,000. This is after a time scale of 10 years showing even today the demand for cheap and first time houses is not there. I have also been involved with property up to £1m and these reduced prices, although not the same percent, applies through most properties. Wirral does not have the demand planned for and expected. Hence the numbers need to be greatly reduced and any developments proposed will certainly not require building on Green Field Sites as currently proposed. I wish you well in your offering to the Government showing that there is more than sufficient development opportunities wishing the present available areas of brown fields, approved planned for development and by making use of empty property and commercial areas including shop units that can no longer be justified should be changed into d residential development opportunities creating living accommodation to help regenerate and bring life into the areas that will deteriorate if allowed to just close and become derelict.
DOR02233	[SAME AS DOR00239]
DOR02234	There are more than enough Brownfield sites to meet housing targets without releasing Green Belt. Storeton is an area of high historical significance, losing it will be to the detriment of future generations. The ONS predicted figures need to be corrected before a consultation exercise can be carried out. Wirral has a decreasing and aging population, such volume of housing need is not realistic.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02235	<p>I think the proposals to develop the green belt (particularly to the west of Barnston Village) are nothing short of a disgrace. By developing this proposed area, it will have a significant impact on</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The volume of traffic, using an infrastructure that is not suited for the number of houses that are proposed; 2) Heswall and Barnston Primary Schools - It has been already and will be even more difficult to get allocated school places for this area given the extra number of houses that are proposed. Even by extending the schools they would not be fit for purpose to accommodate the number of extra children in the area. This will have a negative impact on the existing children's education; 3) The pollution from the extra traffic is a major concern; 4) Removing the volume of green belt proposed will have an adverse effect on the local wildlife and have an obvious detrimental effect on the local farmers; 5) Building 1800 houses will have a serious and worrying effect on the local economy as this will cause existing house prices to plunge and no doubt will leave many in the area facing the potential consequences of negative equity. I simply cannot see any positives to developing this area, when there are other brownfield sites and other green belt where the traffic would be less of a problem (such as around the Chester High Road).
DOR02236	<p>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.</p>
DOR02237	<p>Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Figures released by the Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be actively pursued. You cannot dismiss deforestation and wildlife displacement as negligible consequences of your cause. If the green belt is not preserved the Wirral will become the image of Ellesmere Port where you struggle to find an undeveloped parcel of land.</p>
DOR02238	<p>I have sent an email response to localplan@wirral.gov.uk but I have not yet received your receipt email, so I am anxious that you get it before the 5 p.m. deadline. I copied the response to CWAC ldf planning and they have acknowledged receipt!</p>
DOR02239	<p>I am a resident of Bromborough and shop in the village there is no other parking facilities if you build on the car park and civic centre.</p>
DOR02240	<p>The Green Belt should be protected and no building allowed. Wirral has need of cheap accessible housing which should be built on brownfield sites. New figures for housing need could be met without the need to release any Green Belt. The Council should stand by its commitment to protect the Green Belt - action not empty promises.</p>
DOR02241	<p>I feel our green belt areas should be left alone, as development will spoil our villages, local residents want to enjoy where they live, and will have a big impact on dog walkers, young families with children and those alike, it gets people out and about, for that to be taken away can affect people's health and wellbeing, I would much rather pay more council tax if government finances are under pressure. Please please think again</p>
DOR02242	<p>Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Figures released by the Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be actively pursued. You cannot dismiss deforestation and wildlife displacement as negligible consequences of your cause. If the green belt is not preserved the Wirral will become the image of Ellesmere Port where you struggle to find an undeveloped parcel of land.</p>
DOR02243	<p>I object to the plans to build on Bromborough car park and land the civic centre is on. These areas are essential for the business and local people. There is already not enough parking or places for meetings. Cars are already parking on roads and causing blockages. Shops in the village need to have parking for staff and for people to have ease of access to the village.</p>
DOR02244	<p>After moving to Irby in April 2018 I have been bombarded with letters and information of threats to release green belt for housing development. People like myself have chosen to live in areas like Irby to be able to live in pockets of countryside and green healthy areas. When there is so much land in and around the Wirral which has sat in derelict condition for many decades, why would the council agree to ruin areas of green belt for housing development. We all need housing and affordable at that so why not build in areas that young people and less well-off people can afford to live. It seems to me that more money can be made from developers in these green belt pockets. Sad thing is our green spaces are being sacrificed to fill the pockets of the already well off! It's very obvious to all that it is unnecessary to use green belt and under the guise of government guidelines. We can all see clearly who is being looked after here. In my eyes this is nothing to do with the government directive of the national building of more affordable homes.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02245	<p>I wish to share my objections to the potential building on Wirral Green Belt land for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I do not believe it is necessary to build on green belt areas, derelict urban sites in existing towns should be redeveloped 2) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. These projections are incorrect and the government needs to use the new ONS statistics 3) It will spoil the character of the area. 4) Wirral and its open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. It is recognised as a wildlife sanctuary 5) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6) Increased traffic and major congestion in an already busy area. As I drive around Wirral I constantly am stuck in traffic jams. The highways team cannot manage the level of traffic. 7) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost which will be needed after Brexit. 8) Once small areas are released from Green Belt, it allows for larger urban sprawl 9) Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes. 10) There is no infrastructure for these buildings, schools, shops, buses. It will be another no man's land with people having to drive everywhere which is not ecologically for. 11) These large urban sprawl lead to isolation and mental health which health services cannot support.
DOR02246	<p>The council should not release any of Wirral's precious and unique Green Belt for housing when there are Brownfield sites available. This would be a wholly unnecessary destruction of irreplaceable natural assets which are the heritage of generations to come. The council's housing figures are based on a flawed analysis of Wirral's housing needs. The council should adopt a more realistic and accurate 'Housing Demand' target which would not require the release of any of Wirral's Green Belt. The current assessment is based on wholly unrealistic projections of future economic and population growth. All new housing development should be on brownfield sites, starting with the 16,000 sites that have already been granted planning permission. The council should also bring the 6,000 unoccupied properties in Wirral back into use. The council should, as a matter of urgency, concentrate on providing affordable housing where it is most desperately needed in the run down and declining parts of Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry.</p>
DOR02247	<p>Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Figures released by the Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be actively pursued. You cannot dismiss deforestation and wildlife displacement as negligible consequences of your cause. If the green belt is not preserved the Wirral will become the image of Ellesmere Port where you struggle to find an undeveloped parcel of land.</p>
DOR02248	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02249	<p>I think everything should be done to protect Wirral's green belt. priority should be given to all brown belt developments and it should be accepted that this might cost more, but no green belt should be built on when there are derelict buildings, boarded up buildings and brown belt land available. We have areas like Beaufort Road in Birkenhead where hundreds of houses were purchased then knocked down, this should be built on first. Areas that are currently fields and woods should be protected for the future, once the green belt has been built on, that's it forever. We need green spaces.</p>
DOR02250	NO GREENBELT LAND SHOULD BE ALLOCATED FOR HOUSING DEVELOPMENT. I SUPPORT THE STATEMENTS MADE BY THE HESWALL AND WIRRAL SOCIETIES.
DOR02251	<p>I am horrified to find out by social media your plans for the land adjacent to the end of and in front of Pipers Lane, Lower Heswall. As all the houses on pipers Lane are directly affected I request urgently that you write to each house individually so they are aware and can register their objections. This would spoil the whole neighbourhood, it's feel, nature and trees would be destroyed that we have tried to maintain And conserve for years. The schools are already full to capacity in the area so would not be able to cope with the extra pupils. The traffic on Pipers lane already is shocking. There are no pavements as it is for children walking to schools and the traffic is already too heavy and fast for the building work that had been approved before in my opinion should not of. It is only a matter of time before A child is killed due to the speed and volume of traffic.</p>
DOR02252	<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. 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; i.e. full public participation when all options are open. 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. We totally oppose building on Wirral's urban greenspaces or the greenbelt.</p>
DOR02253	<p>I have lived in Greasby for 34 years and have seen a vast amount of building development in that time. Every effort must be made to save our green belt land. Once it is gone it is gone. We need this land for food and milk production. The 3 lane ends area has only minor roads and Hoylake and Greasby roads are already congested. As is the M53. I am sure if resources are put into the Wirral Water area. This could be made into a pleasant village with playing areas for children and for future investment. There is a waste area adjacent to Moreton library car park which I am sure could be used for housing. Please pursue obtaining empty buildings for housing. Our greenbelt not only provides a pleasant place to live but is a breathing space for the environment and the residents to enjoy as well as providing habitat for wildlife and food production. Please protect it. Thank you for listening to Wirral residents.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02254	<p>I am buying a house in Neston at this very moment and I am appalled at what I'm reading in various places like Claremont Farm, about using up Wirral green belt land for the construction of 12,000 houses by 2035 because the government demand it. I have read that indeed some brown belt land has been identified to help fulfil this ridiculous demand but I can't find anywhere about why this has been stipulated. I can't find information about the massive amount of new jobs being created to satisfy that many people. Or perhaps the M56 will treble in size to allow people to travel to work elsewhere? If that's the case, why get people to live away from that work? I am NOT moving to the Wirral because of the employment opportunities or because I want to live in a huge housing estate with no facilities such as a shop or community meeting place. Warrington has its fair share of those and that's why I want to leave it. I chose the Wirral because it is by the sea and also has beautiful countryside, as well as small towns to provide for my daily needs. The walks along the Wirral Way are a huge appeal to us. The Wirral has a calm about it, yet also has two hospitals to service the ill. This decision to take up green belt land horrifies me. Manchester, Liverpool, Birmingham are all close-by metropolitan cities who have masses of empty buildings where housing could be placed.</p> <p>I thought that housing was beyond the scope of most young professionals now because of their university debt (to the government!), so who do the government think will buy these houses? This whole matter has been poorly presented to us; Joe Public, with no associated means to make this new housing attractive to locals. If you plan on creating new jobs; where will those jobs be? Will those workplaces be built on even more green belt land? I won't get answers to these questions but whoever (if anyone) actually reads this has to take these opinions seriously. We're spending over half a million pounds to live on the Wirral in an old house; that is a massive investment to our new lives there. We have never paid that much for a house before. We will not stay if greenbelt vanishes. Use up old buildings; renovate them or knock them down and build new. Don't just go looking for fields and stick 1500 new brick boxes and expect communities to thrive. Surely to goodness, someone remembers the 60's where all those horrendous high rise flats were built throughout the country to satisfy population demands?! Look what disastrous community results those brought. Providing such a tiny box on the website for comments to this 'local plan' is pathetic too. It'll be because you're hoping to limit what people type but when people like me are passionate about maintaining a good quality of life around them, one little box won't stop us expressing our disgust and horror.</p>
DOR02255	<p>The requirement for 12000 new homes in Wirral is a national requirement so there seems little point in contesting it on the grounds of requirement for Wirral. I suggest this should be met by a major new settlement. North Wirral seems a good choice, where there is no greenfield land, there is good access to rail and motorway, and there is already a substantial development at Morton to which a new development would blend in.</p>
DOR02256	<p>I would like to know if the new housing development is going to be for private or council homes and details of proposed development, Proposed Housing Allocation- reference SHLAA 2005</p>
DOR02257	<p>I would like to object to the proposed mixed use Allocation of the car park and the civic buildings in Bromborough. Presently it is often difficult to park there; if the car park is removed, it will be impossible. This means that many people will have to go elsewhere to do business, e.g. use library, go to Orchard Surgery, use civic centre, shop, etc. The proposal will lead to yet another empty high street on the Wirral.</p>
DOR02258	<p>This is the worst idea ever not thought through it will have a devastating effect on business in the village and put pressure on school, doctors, dentists etc who are struggling to cope. No to this planning ...</p>
DOR02259	<p>I totally object to building on green belt land on the Wirral. The beauty of the area which makes it so special will be destroyed forever.</p>
DOR02260	<p>It would be detrimental to use green belt land for industry by a country park, conservation village and private housing.</p>
DOR02261	<p>The civic centre and car park are central to the life of Bromborough Village. As a mother, I recognise how valuable these services are to a thriving community. The classes held at this centre for children and adults, reduce social isolation and we should be proud that our village can still offer such a wide variety of services and support. Please please please re-consider the absurdity of these plans</p>
DOR02262	<p>I object to the proposed local plan. Specifically: The total housing numbers required MUST be accurate - they are not in this plan. The council MUST, prior to any further development include as priority in it's plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Optimising use of existing development to ensure numbers of affordable housing for example Peel Waters development which is currently estimated to produce far fewer units than originally planned. 2. Ensuring empty housing is used prior to any further developments 3. Redevelopment of areas is given priority over new development (specifically over any green belt development) <p>Furthermore I object to the open pre-judgement of the consultation by the council - presuming that green belt release is inevitable. Green belt can only be released in exceptional circumstances. Providing small numbers of high cost homes for developer's gains do not constitute exceptional circumstances. I specifically object to any release of land to the west of the Wirral way. It will reduce the benefit of our green spaces and specifically the coastline. It also threatens land adjacent to areas of special scientific interest, and also land which is currently habitat to bats, badgers and foxes amongst many other species. I specifically object that points of land have been included in the plan specifically because they have been acquired by developers wishing to make profit from the inclusion in the local plan. I object to the council entering discussions with developers about use of farmed, agricultural land within the green belt prior to completion of the consultation on its use. I object to the designations of infill villages within the plan as this is solely in order to adjust the planning regulations attached to those designations. I formally request that unless ALL other options are exhausted that the council does NOT release any green belt land. The impact for our borough in terms of loss of coastal zone protection, maintain habitat, and infrastructure support cannot support this. It cannot be allowed for private profit - as there are is no infill strategy which can claim affordable housing as its purpose.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02263	SP046. My garden includes a small part of the ancient woodland which runs along the east bank of the Dibbinsdale river which forms the western boundary of my garden. This woodland and this part of the Dibbin valley are a rich area of wildlife, which I and many of my neighbours have endeavoured over the years to help preserve. I am concerned that development on the opposite bank of the Dibbin would be highly detrimental to this wildlife. I therefore strongly feel that this area of green belt should be preserved.
DOR02264	My wife and I wish to strongly object to the Local Wirral Plan. We substantially agree with and support The Key Objections submitted on behalf of the Barnston Conservation Society which we believe make cogent arguments that are fatal to the current plan. We regard it as a gross dereliction of duty of care that the council proposes to decimate the Green Belt in a manner that clearly is destructive of the character and history of the Wirral and runs counter to national guidelines on green belt land. We feel that offering up green belt landform development shows a cynical disregard to the views of the residents of the West Wirral and the reasons behind this proposal merit close scrutiny as the only people likely to benefit are landowners and national developers. Over recent years the council has run down its planning department and is one of the few authorities to fail to produce a timely and properly consulted local plan. Such a situation allows unscrupulous developers and landowners, with local politicians possibly acting in collusion to put pressure on green belt land. The termination of the lease on Milner's farm has already led to the closure of a longstanding farm with a much valued farm shop. Subsequently an ancient and well maintained footpath from Barnston Church to Whitfield Lane was cynically ploughed over in violation of a public right of way. These consequences are a direct result of the failure of the council to make clear that green belt land was to be protected so encouraging land speculation. The plan was drawn up by external consultants the failings are so manifest that one must speculate whether there was any conflict of interest involved and to ask whose interest was being served the local community or national developers.
DOR02265	Has there been any consideration of the impact the proposed housing development would have on the Heswall .Pensby Barnston area? I have done some calculations for Barnston Village and Gills Lane, since they are adjacent. The total area amounts to approximately 160 hectares. Using a typical housing density of 20 houses per hectare, if all of it was used for housing, there would be 3,200 houses. For an average occupancy 3.5 persons per house, there would be 11,200 people. Taking 6% to be of primary school age, then provision would have to be made for 672 more school places. A similar provision of secondary school places would be needed. Has there been any consideration about medical facilities for these extra people, dentists, GPs and hospital? How would the existing roads, especially Barnston Road and particularly at Storeton Lane cope with the extra traffic, 4,000 cars or more. And what about the destruction of the character of the area?
DOR02266	The plans for Green Belt designation are a disgrace. The officers have taken the lazy approach and councillors have failed to challenge. This will leave around 2/3 of the residents of the Wirral hemmed in by the M53 and Wrexham-Bidston railway with no green spaces, as developers will surely pick off small areas. Indeed, in another example of officer laziness, we are presented with the scenario that the areas east of the M53 that will lose their Green Belt status are those that developers have already enquired about. Of course they would, that's what an unimaginative interpretation of the current rules says! So every tree east of the M53 is under threat and air pollution, noise, road safety, congestion and other negative impacts on our quality of life will be rife. What the council SHOULD have done is create a completely new development area out of the low-grade, featureless farmland south of Thornton Hough. Instead [a council officer] described it as "too difficult" at the first meeting at Hulme Hall. Shame on you all!
DOR02267	ELGC would be happy to consider the potential change of status of their land from greenbelt as suggested in the consultation on the Local Plan. We realise for this to happen all the greenbelt in close proximity, including Lever's playing fields and Eastham Country Park, would also need to change and we would support this providing there was protection for historical sites and essential green space.. Like all golf clubs ELGC is finding life difficult during this prolonged period of austerity and is looking to stabilise its future by ensuring financial sustainability in the long term. To achieve this aim the Club is considering a number of options all of which depend upon sale of land for development ranging from small areas to almost half the course. Any such development would, of course, contribute to the future housing needs of the local population and assist WBC in achieving its housing target. The purpose of any or all of the developments would not be purely for financial reasons but more so to move the Club into the 21st century and become less a members club and more a local community hub which focuses more clearly on the needs of the local community and can potentially provide for those needs. The opportunity for a local multisport facility . , for example, is an option and this would enhance the opportunities for families in south Wirral to enhance their sporting prowess and opportunities. Consultation with local communities on their requirements from such a local facility will enable the development of a facility fit for purpose. Please accept this submission as a formal request for further engagement and dialogue with regard to the development of the Local Plan in advance of its acceptance and prior to the consolidated plan being presented to central Government.
DOR02268	Having attended two public meetings on the local plan, I wish to express my anger and disappointment at the prospect of the Wirral losing greenbelt land. The granting of planning permission to the Peel group without any legally binding commitment, from them, to use the land for building adequate housing is naive, to put it mildly. In addition, the use of greenbelt for building (when brownfield is available) is an act of environmental vandalism - particularly when WBC is actively trying to project Wirral as a tourist destination. In addition, to include Eastham Country Park, for example, within the continuous strip of threatened greenbelt illustrates the flaws and limitations of the "model" used by the planning department. This "model" also attracted the largest amount of criticism at the last meeting I attended. I trust that WBC will think again re. the threatened greenbelt and produce alternative plans to include the derelict brownfield sites we already have - assuming that projected population increases require the suggested extra housing numbers.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02269	The proposed Local Plan is poorly conceived with little regard for the future of Wirral. To reduce our present Green Belt by such a significant amount will undermine the fabric of our community and is being proposed by short minded political vandals who are more concerned with their own gains both financially and politically. Wirral must maintain the present ratio of green to grey to stay beautiful individual region that it is.
DOR02270	The green belt of Wirral must be maintained at all costs. It is disgraceful that the council should even consider giving up one of the most significant benefits of living on the Wirral for housing. We moved to Barnston for the peaceful way of life, for the local environment and the greenery around us. It took all of our savings to get a foothold in the area. Why would you destroy that? Will the council be compensating existing residents for the drop in house values if development work starts. The housing numbers quoted have been disproved. The consultation is based on erroneous information. The council has had years to develop a reasonable Local Plan but has acted too slowly and has taken the option to scare its population causing grief, distress and upset throughout the borough. I live in Barnston and any development would have a disastrous impact on our community and lifestyle. Heswall and Barnston do not have the access routes, services or infrastructure to support medium to large scale developments. Nor do we, the existing residents want it. There is no need to housing of the scale you have quoted. Peel have offered you housing options. I personally believe this is all about gaining revenue for the council. The building of large dwellings command higher council taxes which would benefit the councils' struggling financial position. Be honest about this, and don't masquerade behind false reasons. Affordable housing is required in Birkenhead and surrounding areas, on the east side of the Wirral. You simply penalising Conservative voters. I suspect that if plans go ahead the voters will take quite a different view in the next elections. The residents of Wirral and more specifically Heswall and Barnston will not stand for this and you are provoking an almighty fight unless you throw out these ill thought out plans.
DOR02271	Very poor long term planning - once this land has gone to housing, we never get it back. Why not focus attention on housing that is currently empty and/or derelict etc. Greenfield sites should be untouchable. Forever. Future generations will suffer from these appalling decisions.
DOR02272	<p>I am very concerned re the following especially regarding the proposals for east of the M53.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I love the Wirral. it has been a fantastic place to live and to bring up children. It is known for its many green spaces and environment. The Wirral has been known as one of the best places to live in the country. The proposals for the Wirral could put all this at threat. 2. The statistics supporting the need for the changes are clearly flawed and there is no need to make the changes. 3. The proposed changes are heavily weighted in favour of developers! 4. Proposed releases of land next to and east of the M53 will put residents at risk from both fume and noise pollution. The added traffic in the area will also affect existing residents. 5. There will be added stress on schooling, healthcare and other services. 6. Developments will also need extra damaging road changes. 7. I strongly object to the idea put forward at the recent consultation meeting that the land east of the M53 fits with the qualification that it can be easily "boxed off" for planning and identification purposes in line with legislation! 8. I am concerned that other alternatives are not being properly followed up and that the long standing Peel Holdings Birkenhead Dock developments have been allowed to slide.
DOR02273	<p>I would like to register my views about Wirral's local plan. I do appreciate the Council's position in having to find land for 12,000 homes. However, I think that the wholesale destruction of Wirral's valuable greenbelt is totally the wrong way of going about this. Once our greenbelt is destroyed it can never be restored and one of the attractions of living on the Wirral is its countryside. Here is my feedback and suggestions:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If Peel Holdings won't redevelop the waste ground of Birkenhead docks, then why not compulsory purchase it and sell onto another developer who will develop that land? That land is one of Wirral's greatest assets with wonderful views over the Mersey but it is not being used. • Looking around, there seems to be quite a lot of derelict property in Birkenhead that could be either refurbished into flats or demolished to make way for new-build flats. Such as Central Hotel and other such places that have been empty long-term. There seems to be a lot of derelict industrial sites. • According to articles, about 25% of people live alone now, so rather than build houses with gardens which use a lot of land, why not concentrate on more suitable property for single people? Why not build more lower high-rises? Not huge 1960s tower blocks like Grenfell Tower but blocks about 5 or 6 storeys high? That would mean less land would need to be used to provide 12,000 homes. I don't know if anyone will take any note of these comments but I do not think concreting over our lovely countryside is the best solution.
DOR02274	<p>I'm opposed to the plans to build on the green belt but not necessarily from a 'save our fields and green space' perspective. My concern is around our commitments on climate change, energy and levels of car use on Wirral. Building homes in the areas proposed would force people to rely on cars as their primary method of transport - thousands of extra trips every day causing more pollution, costs related to accidents and wear and tear on our roads. There's also the issue of public health with people not using their body's to get around and the associated issues of poor health. I could in principle sign up to the plans as long as the houses and roads were built to completely prohibit or discourage car ownership (nearby shops would be need to be built and services for people to be able to walk/cycle to). What is far easier is to build nearer to our urban centre of Birkenhead and to invest in cycling links to nearby services, schools, train/bus stations, etc. Whatever happens we need to reduce the levels of driving on Wirral, so wherever we build new houses we need to make sure public transport, walking and cycling are built into the plans.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02275	I support the council in opposing the housing targets set by the Government, based on National averages and I'm not aware of large unsatisfied demand for housing on Wirral. I believe the plan should be drawn up locally, by those with local knowledge. I strongly support the policy of brownfield first and that it is important to maintain the green spaces which separate Wirral's historical villages which have their own sense of community identity. We should avoid at all costs, Wirral becoming one vast soul-less housing conurbation. I believe the proposed Hoylake Golf Course development, involving the building of high end housing on green belt land should be abandoned. I assume that the council is aware that the planned expansion of housing in Wirral requires an expansion in the provision of infrastructure e.g. schools- which has an increasing population, GP services - which are already woefully inadequate.
DOR02276	As someone who has worked tirelessly to raise understanding of Mental Health issues, I wish to register my grave concern for the Wirral Green Belt proposals. I have had direct experience of supporting young people with depression and other mental health issues. In the last 10 years the demand I have witnessed and the referrals to Child and Adult Mental Health Services have soared . One way that schools are trying to build resilience in young people is to encourage them to take up more sports and exercise. The Borough is proud of its green spaces and the opportunities for a healthy lifestyle for its residents; yet it is prepared to build over the very spaces that help all of its residents to have healthy minds and bodies. To deny our current and future generations of these valuable spaces is to directly and consciously contribute to the time bomb that is undermining the wellbeing of our residents. We spend time and energy educating our young people to care for their environment and to keep their minds healthy; it is now the responsibility of our elected representatives to reject the destruction of our Green Belt.
DOR02277	Do not support plans involving proposals to utilise green belt for housing in the Local Plan in the area from Clatterbridge roundabout, exit 4 on M53, bordering Brimstage Road to Old Clatterbridge Road. Brimstage Road and Spital Road are currently saturated with traffic and there are lengthy build ups of traffic occurring several times during the day with a heavy flow at other times creating difficulties in access from tributary roads in Spital. The proposal in the Local Plan for further housing development, in the area of Spital, needing access to the roads mentioned would create major safety issues in my opinion.
DOR02278	I would like to protest in the strongest possible terms over the proposed Wirral local plan for the release of green belt land for development. how was the figure for the number of houses needed reached? If this was imposed by central government why has Wirral council not challenged the figures in the strongest way possible? Why are you proposing land grab when your own stated policy is to protect the green belt? Why cannot the Council count land which has already been granted planning permission? What about the brownfield land earmarked for development by Peel holdings around Birkenhead docks? Why are you considering obliterating the character of villages such as Storeton, Barnston and Eastham. The plans will mean that urban sprawl will run from Birkenhead to Bebington to Prenton to Heswall without break or restriction. Neighbouring towns will merge and lose their current identities. There will be very little countryside left east of the M53. The special character and individuality of current villages will be lost. The need on Wirral is for regeneration of areas of need such as Birkenhead and New Ferry by recycling urban derelict land. Building on green belt land will be high priced housing and will not help first time buyers or contribute to the regeneration of those areas of the Wirral in desperate need such as Birkenhead and New Ferry. Much of the land earmarked for development is criss-crossed by footpaths, cycle ways and bridle paths. These are all very well used by residents of Birkenhead, Bebington and beyond. I am not against housing development and have personal experience of young relatives trying to buy their first homes but the location of these sites, in semi-rural areas will not provide affordable housing or assist in any way in the regeneration of those areas in desperate need of investment. Once these green lungs are gone, they are gone forever. Please look again at this plan and protect our beautiful peninsula for future generations. Instead look at how further investment using brownfield sites can be brought to those once thriving parts of our peninsula which are now so sadly run down.
DOR02279	PARCEL REF SP058E Proposed further investigation into the use of the land West and North of 85 - 105 Pipers Lane, Heswall, including the rear gardens falling within 93 - 105 Pipers Lane We write in connection with the above proposed further investigation into the green belt West and North of 85 - 105 Pipers Lane, Heswall, including the rear gardens of 93-105 Pipers Lane. We wish to object strongly to any further investigations into the land referenced here, and object to the intention to develop this land in future. Road issues, i.e. traffic generation, vehicle access and road safety The proposed development would significantly increase traffic volume at the far end of Pipers Lane. Pipers Lane is not capable of handling even a small increase in traffic due to numerous single carriageway sections, with road widening not possible along the length of the lane. The final section of the lane, beyond Redstone Drive, is in fact still only partly adopted, hence no lighting or maintenance of the road at this far end is provided, including during incremental weather. Furthermore, there is no pavement, and no opportunity to provide a pavement in many places. This further increases the road safety risk to pedestrians and the many recreational users, families, and dog walkers using Pipers Lane to access the Wirral way. The foot traffic, bicycle use and horse traffic along this lane make it extremely dangerous for traffic volume increase to occur, particularly along the partly adopted section of the lane. Traffic congestion is an existing issue on Pipers Lane with the current volume of traffic navigating the numerous narrow pinch points. Pipers Lane is the only access to Bush Way, Crossley Drive, Sandfield Park, Warren Way, Pipers Close, The Pipers and Redstone Drive. The quality of the road surface and infrastructure (many potholes, sinking road surface, minimal/limited street lighting) also do not support any increase in traffic. Considering the main access to Piper's Lane to be Delavor Road (the other option being Oldfield Drive, which is an un-adopted road in a bad state of repair), there are also road safety concerns at the junction of Delavor Road to Thurstaston Road and Dee View Road, which is a dangerous junction without clear right-of-way. We have witnessed numerous 'near-miss' incidents at this junction over the years as the number of dwellings it is servicing has increased without any significant work on the junction. The narrowing of Thurstaston Road where it meets Dee View Road due to the rebuilding of a garden wall has added to the problems at this junction.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>An increase in traffic volume would also increase noise and disturbance to wildlife. Pipers Lane is also not amenable to public transport to service the increased volume of residents.</p> <p>Impact on landscape The proposed development would be a negative impact to the local environment landscape which is open and supports biodiversity and wildlife in the form of badgers, bats, and birds. All type of animals exist on the proposed development sites.</p> <p>These statements refer to multiple objections made to developments proposed on Pipers Lane in the past by the Wirral Wildlife and Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service, specifically referring to bat roost potential, conditions to protect badgers, and conditions relating to breeding birds. Despite the protection being reviewed recently, those of us who live at this end of Pipers Lane still hear badger calls at night occasionally. Light pollution The proposed development would increase light pollution. Currently there are no street lights past 77 Pipers Lane to the west, and the area is therefore naturally dark.</p> <p>Developing the end of the lane would increase light pollution having a negative impact to wildlife. Layout and density of building and capacity of infrastructure SP058E indicates space for 62 dwellings (referring to option 58.4 detailed in the Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment September 2018). This density of dwelling is out of character with the surrounding area and will have a negative visual impact as viewed from Wirral Country Park. The proposed development would stretch capacity of infrastructure, such as road drainage systems, as currently the road floods in many places during heavy rain. The number of schools, especially high schools, of which Pipers Lane is in the catchment area is very limited and an increase in the volume of residents will put significant pressure on these resources. Finally, please note that our submission is in respect of the proposed further investigations. While we have taken every effort to present accurate information for your consideration, as we are not a decision maker or statutory consultee, we cannot accept any responsibility for unintentional errors or omissions and you should satisfy yourselves on any facts before reaching your decision.</p>
DOR02280	<p>Will the council ensure residents of Wellington Road have a say on planning proposals for the land on which the Grand Hotel used to stand in New Brighton. I would not personally want to see mixed use as parking and traffic is already very difficult on Wellington Road. Any residential housing would need to include the additional parking this would require. I would also not want to be facing a multi storey building.</p>
DOR02281	<p>Wirral under Wirral borough council has a landmass of 60 square miles with a population of approximately 322,000 people. So, although, we do have greenbelt Wirral is a pretty crowded place and it is becoming more and more frustrating to live in it. Many of the residential roads, mine included, have become rat runs and car parks. There is a greater ratio of older people than in the rest of England so projected numbers are not likely to rise in the next 20 or more years. My contention is that we do not need any more house building on green belt or brown belt. So what's the game? Is it the intention of the government or council to ship in more people from outside the area and, if so, where are the jobs coming from? Looking at the latest developments where as many dwelling as possible are crammed into an area and the locations of these new developments are in unsuitable locations which are causing parking and traffic problems I dread to envisage what a really big development will look like - mickey mouse houses in a field - with the ensuing traffic and infrastructure problems. People do need a fair bit of space for their wellbeing, more than they realize.</p>
DOR02282	<p>I feel very strongly that the green belt should not be used anywhere in the country unless there is no other land to be had. Wirral Waters is perfect for re-development and I would think Peel would build more apartment blocks and small houses that would lift that area right out of the doldrums and provide properties that might actually be wanted. Subsequent to this consultation I understand their figure has risen to 6,450 houses. That's quite an increase to the population. The green belt land on offer to developers will do nothing for first time buyers and couples or even young families - not around Storeton or Caldy/Thurstaston at any rate. The land is too valuable. Finally as I drive around the less affluent areas of the Wirral I see vacant and boarded up buildings aplenty. I'm sure New Ferry/ Oxtan Road et al are not as attractive to developers as Thurstaston. But who is the housing for?</p>
DOR02283	<p>Any development proposals should adopt a sequential approach, using Wirral Waters proposals and other Brownfield sites to meet the borough's housing needs avoiding encroachment on the green belt. Separation of communities and preserving open land is crucial to the future of a small peninsula.</p>
DOR02284	<p>Does Wirral need 12,000 houses and jobs to be created? Surely people will go to where jobs already exist. The latest Wirral View states the 20% of the housing to be built at Wirral Waters will be affordable. This is not enough. we need AFFORDABLE housing for young people and families. Chipping away at the greenbelt will lead eventually to Wirral becoming a vast housing estate. It has been proved that green spaces are vital for both physical and mental wellbeing so why propose to build on the green spaces between villages that all have their own character? You make great play on protecting certain sites but do consider that sites for wildlife need green corridors to connect them. Can you guarantee that amenities and reliable, affordable public transport will keep pace with the developments to ease the congestion on the roads? You must be mad to consider using the civic centre and village car park for "mixed use" development whatever that means. That car park is full every day. Where will shoppers and other visitors go. They will leave the village and it will die. The hall is also in constant use as you must know. Choirs, dancers, Bridge groups, WI, a conservation group to name but a few. Where are they going. It makes for a vibrant community. I could say more; just ask the shopkeepers and people of Bromborough.</p>
DOR02285	<p>I hope that the Council will maintain the position that it appears to have adopted that the Green Belt will not be available to development.</p>
DOR02286	<p>At the consultation the presentation was poor and the local plan was a hastily prepared document taking the simplest option. It was not a consultation, rather, the meeting was told what would happen. The speaker avoided answering challenging questions and talked down to the audience. The proposal will further emphasise the social divisions on the Wirral. There are plenty of brown field sites ripe for development.</p>
DOR02287	<p>I am appalled that the council is even considering "selling off the family silver" i.e. the possible use of green belt land for building purposes</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02288	The plans to build on Green Belt land are extremely worrying and set an awful precedent. There are ample Brown Field sites available which should be utilised first. The erosion of the Green Belt is a loss that can never be undone & will affect the landscape of the Wirral forever. We have a beautiful peninsular and destroying protected green spaces in order to fulfil government quotas which do not reflect the housing needs of our borough is madness. Not only this but I have been informed that the council has incorrectly interpreted and overestimated this quota and as such I would expect the plans to be amended before being resubmitted for public comment.
DOR02289	I am opposed to building on greenbelt. I do not think that the possibilities of brownfield sites on Wirral have been exhausted. If Wirral consists of housing coast to coast it will no longer be an attractive place to live. Small infill in the already urbanised areas may not be as attractive to those wanting to profit from house building but that is where our infrastructure, transport, schools are. I am concerned that profit and self-interest is driving this rather than genuine concern to improve housing provision.
DOR02290	With regards to proposed developments in Lower Heswall, given that the national requirement is for affordable housing, further development in the highlighted areas of Lower Heswall is in my opinion inappropriate. The local infrastructure would not be able to support such development; e.g. roads, schools etc
DOR02291	Wirral's diverse green spaces offer much vital habitat to a range of wildlife including some notable rare species of birds and mammals. Furthermore green space is vital to everyone especially families engaging with nature which has proven positive effects on mental wellbeing. In addition tourism in Wirral, especially west Wirral is undoubtedly created through its natural surroundings and green spaces. Take it away and there won't be anything worth visiting for both tourists and local people which will have a detrimental effect on local business and local people. With plenty of brownfield and undeveloped spaces ready to build on why waste valuable green space which is vital for people's enjoyment, business and ecological diversity. Wirral prides itself on its diversity of its surroundings from nature to urban, this diversity is crucial to people's lives. Build on the green belt and Wirral becomes just another suburban satellite of the cities.
DOR02292	I am writing to object the plans to build on Wirral green belt land. 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 peninsular 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 it to have permission to be built on I certainly will not be staying. 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, a longer waiting list to gain doctors and dentist appointments, more strain on our local NHS and hospital the list goes on! 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! 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 can't not 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.
DOR02293	Within the proposed local plan I believe that the natural and historic environment equal consideration to economic and social issues and the plan proposes a significant threat to green belt land. I believe that the proposed options would result in significant harm to either SSSIs and/or Local Wildlife Sites. Why has this plan been put forward when the government's National Planning Framework specifically states that sites of biodiversity should be 'protected and enhanced'? I am concerned about the possibility of building on large areas of land around Dibbinsdale SSSI, and around Local Wildlife Sites at Irby, Greasby, Prenton, Barnston and Storeton. Other areas under threat include those used by birds from the Dee estuary as roost grounds, and land supporting bats, great crested newts, hares and badgers. The cumulative effects of building on a large proportion of the proposed sites would be very damaging to Wirral's wildlife, and to the opportunities for local people and visitors to enjoy that wildlife. The proposed development options have failed to take into account the priority that should be given to supporting a network of habitats for wildlife. The National Planning Framework states that planning policies must take a 'strategic approach to maintaining and enhancing networks of habitats'. I believe the proposed plan fails to do this.
DOR02294	In no particular order my concerns are: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local plan figures should be recalculated following the revision of the stats for housing need, growth, local economy etc – and of course Wirral Waters estimates • I am not convinced that a thorough review of Brownfield devt options has taken place • Absolutely key to myself is that developing on greenbelt just simply won't meet the objective of providing suitable housing – at best developers will typically only provide 10% affordable housing or grant recyclable to the council which will then take years to generate the housing requirement • Obviously the loss of irreplaceable greenbelt land, surely I don't need to explain this - has anyone actually walk through the areas which would disappear? • The plans have a disproportionate volume of housing being met by one community – by far • Finally, and legally, there will be insufficient infrastructure to support the increased housing in the area– as well as utilities etc there will be an impact on the existing highway network (pressure

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	points re M53 esp Jn 4, Landican,) which will make the proposals non-viable
DOR02295	Absurd! Leave the green. Wirral is a beautiful picturesque place and will be ruined by more building work. Children need places to grow and play.
DOR02296	I have lived in Wirral, in Spital & Bebington, all of my life. I have noticed land being used for houses over the years but to see more being built on our Greenbelt would be wrong. Main reasons being the views, our health & for the influx of traffic in the local area.
DOR02297	More effort must be made to ensure that all available brownfield sites are used first before we destroy the remaining greenfield areas.
DOR02298	<p>I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Lever Causeway Green Belt land. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. 2.) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. 3.) It will spoil the character of the area. 4.) Lever Causeway and it's open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. 5.) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6.) Increased traffic and major congestion. 7.) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. 8.) Damage to Mountwood Conservation area. 9.) The sites either side of Lever Causeway are huge. Once released from Green Belt, building could extend to Storeton, causing unrestricted sprawl, with historic Storeton and Bebington Merging. 10.) Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes
DOR02299	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02300	I DO NOT agree with land being taken for housing this would be a travesty for the local and wider community
DOR02301	These sites shouldn't even be being looked at until all brown field sites are filled with houses. why haven't Peel been assisted to get Wirral waters started? The housing targets are already way to high without destroying Wirral with unwanted or unneeded houses. The land round Greasby to be developed are areas of natural beauty housing many species of animal. Bats which are protected round greenhouse farm, rare geese use these areas for rest during migration, the roman road which runs along the edge of greenhouse farm not to mention Greasby Cops an untouched area of scientific importance. Why is a farmer who runs and maintains a farm to the highest standard being forced to potentially lose his livelihood for unrealistic targets. Who has taken a back hander to allow these sites to be put forward when there are many other sites much more viable!
DOR02302	<p>I'm writing to express my concern at Wirral Borough Council's plans to develop the area behind Irby Road. During the numerous conversations I have been part of regarding this matter, a number of serious points (allegations in some cases) have been raised which need to be addressed as part of this initiative. From the information available, it appears that the council is violating due process by proposing development on land that has already been identified as being unsuitable for development due to a variety of factors. On a personal note, Irby has been my home for the majority of my life. This particular site is very close to my heart. I spent many an early morning and evening walking our dogs in this field, making use of the pond, looking at the birds and learning about the cows who grazed in this field. Seeing this land be consumed by housing would be a disaster. This land is well known and much used by local residents who appreciate having green belt land available for use as it is. A key part of the desirability of this area of the Wirral is the green belt land and scenery that is available. By building on this site, the quality of life of all residents of Irby will be significantly impacted. This development would potentially negatively impact on the price of housing in the area, increase traffic in the area and take away a well-used and much loved walking route. It would also impact the views of residents living on Irby Road and South Drive. The vast array of wildlife that lives in the area would be destroyed should this development take place. It is clear that there are many more suitable sites for Wirral development, such as the brownfield option of Saughall Massie Fire station. It is also known that Wirral Borough Council has failed to submit its 'Local Plan' since 2000 and is one of only 3 councils to be so far behind in submitting. Wirral Borough Council were informed that direction from the 'Liverpool City Region' may be forced upon them to aid the 'failing council'. Once this was proposed, Wirral Borough Council suddenly developed the ability to complete work that would normally require two years in only TWO MONTHS, having previously not completed the required work in almost 18 years. I find it hard to believe that due process is being followed here and that corners are not being cut. I also question whether the council has the required skills and experience to even create a realistic 'Local Plan' that takes all factors into account, considering the fact that it's clear that the required skills and experience to create the 'Local Plan' have been absent for the last 18 years resulting in no 'Local Plan'. A rushed process, due to years of neglect by the council, that results in development on land that is unsuitable would be a travesty for the residents of both Irby and the wider Wirral. Poor performance by a local governing body that leads to negative impact on that same council's residents is unforgivable. It has also been proven that Wirral Borough Council's Growth assumptions are far too high. The Local Plan process is required to keep this information up to date. This has not been the case and the inflated figures are still being used to justify the need to release green belt land for development. Additionally, there is evidence of a campaign of misinformation being distributed by Wirral Borough Council in an effort to get the required support. One such example of this is the council's response to the ITPAS group in April 2018 saying "it could only include 1,100 of the 13,500 homes planned at 'Wirral Waters' because it needed a detailed Planning Application." This information is incorrect and shows either a determination to drive through a flawed approach or a lack of in-depth knowledge of the Local Plan process, since during 2017 the Court of Appeal upheld the earlier High Court Ruling that such detail and certainty were NOT necessary. I</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	have also heard discussions questioning the council's motives in this case, citing prominent members' connections with development companies. It should not need reiterating that according to the Localism Act of 2011, "it will become a criminal offence for councillors to deliberately withhold or misrepresent a financial interest". And according to the 2010 Bribery Act, "Payments to a councillor to misuse or abuse their privileged position in their local authority to induce favours or advantage to one party in that council's planning process could entail 'improper performance', by virtue of being a breach of the expectation of good faith by holders of public office and a breach of their position of trust." I would hate for the council's integrity to be brought into question and further investigation required to obtain information that would indicate either of the above, or other laws, were being flouted. I appreciate the opportunity to input on this matter. I also appreciate you taking the time to consider this submission.
DOR02303	I wish to object to the proposals to allow building on the Green Belt in the Wirral. I am concerned such development will destroy the area irrevocably. It is our green spaces that make Wirral the pleasant place to live that it is and is vital for the well-being of its residents as well as providing barriers between distinct towns and villages. Also there isn't adequate capacity in local services, schools, doctors etc to support such development. Also to comment on my local area the roads around Greasby, Upton etc are already at capacity and cannot cope with additional developments. Previous poor decisions such as the large Sainsbury's in Upton show how easily roads can become gridlocked. The proximity of the east if Rigby Drive site to schools just adds to the dangers this will cause. I am not convinced that there is a need for this type of development and feel that the Council should concentrate on regenerating urban areas such as Birkenhead. The land owned by Peel Holdings would support more than enough housing and pressure must be put on Peel to ensure this happens
DOR02304	I am appalled by the decision to demolish the centre of Bromborough. You'll rip out the heart of a thriving and popular community. The shops and council facilities are integral to the whole local area. We travel to use the facilities despite the lack of public transport. Demolish the area and it will just be a black hole with no community or life.
DOR02305	I am very concerned regarding the proposal of building houses around Storeton and the Woods. The roads around there are quite small, traffic increasing constantly and building would increase the volume of traffic, making it very hard to walk in those areas as there are no pavements. We are eroding our green spaces which are essential for wellbeing, fresh air and wildlife would suffer too. I regularly walk around Storeton and for example each year I see fewer hares, we would be losing even more wildlife with additional building. We should be reducing our carbon footprint, not increasing it. There are plenty of brown field sites that should be considered instead. Once we lose our countryside, it is gone for good and future generations will be appalled at our vandalism
DOR02306	I am alarmed at the proposal to lose Bromborough civic centre and the car park. I use Bromborough library regularly, and I am aware that many groups use the facilities of the civic centre. It is a hub for the community and I feel it would be a sad loss for the Bromborough community, perhaps leading to social isolation. I feel that the loss of the car park would directly adversely affect the businesses in Bromborough village, diminishing their trade and reducing the amount of people visiting the area.
DOR02307	I object to the local plan as no consideration has been given to all the people who use Bromborough village. If we lose the civic centre there will be no meetings for older residents such as Bromborough U3A. Also there will be no parking so the village will not survive and there will be no local shops for the elderly to use. There are plenty brown field sites that can be used on the Wirral - an example is the Acre Lane site that has been left for a number of years when it could have been built on. Building more houses in this area will only make life more difficult as we already have too much traffic to cope with and also schools will not be able to cope with more children.
DOR02308	I think it is essential that we avoid development on greenbelt and green spaces in general. We need social housing. However, there is ample brownfield available.
DOR02309	I OBJECT STRONGLY TO THE BUILDING ON THE LAND NORTH OF 90 TO 92 GRANGE ROAD WEST KIRBY. AS IT STANDS THE SHEEP FIELD IS A BEAUTIFUL LANDMARK ON THE WAY IN TO WEST KIRBY. THE TOWN DEPENDS HEAVILY ON THE VISITOR ECONOMY AND DESTROYING THIS LANDMARK IS COMPLETELY MISGUIDED.
DOR02310	With a new large site in Acre lane about to be built, another in Lyndale Avenue and the Archers pub development, are you expecting a sudden population explosion.?
DOR02311	Do not ruin our Green Belt! It is there for a reason and needs to be kept for generations to come. To stop the urban sprawl but it also helps to keep land off the market! Yes, and that's actually the idea! We need these green spaces more than ever for our mental wellbeing in a 24/7 world, adding space, grace and tranquillity, farming purposes post Brexit, Sites of Special Scientific Interest, cycling and walking activities, and sequestering carbon and pollutants.
DOR02312	I would like to register my opposition to the building on green belt land for housing. My reasons are:- No clear figures on the actual numbers of homes needed New houses in the west Wirral area are going to be unaffordable for new homebuyers and merely a way to generate more council tax Infrastructure is not sufficient to support the extra homes i.e. roads, public transport, parking, schools, GP surgeries and hospital It would affect the biodiversity of the area and local wildlife, which is important to making Wirral a good place to live in No consultation has been done with the hospitals in connection to the increased pressure on an already struggling trust. No more beds are available at the hospital and no plans for any more doctor surgeries.4 Wirral waters is projected to build 13500 homes

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02313	I live in Spital. As I am a father to two very young children, I have not had the time to attend one of the local consultation sessions. However, I am concerned about the amount of green land that has been earmarked for potential development. I fully understand the need to build more houses. However, it seems that every bit of unoccupied land from Raby Mere to the far side of Storeton Woods has been listed as a potential sight of housing. If housing was built on all of this land, the green appeal of the area would be destroyed. I'm also not convinced there is infrastructure to cope with this number of new residents. The environmental impact of losing this much tree or plant life is also going to be significant. I would hope that when these sites are assigned, they are shared around the area rather than destroying the entire green belt in one area. Finally, I would be concerned particularly about any plans compromising either Storeton Woods or Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve (both of which are assets that we should preserve for future generations) or Claremont Farm - which is a true success story of local business.
DOR02314	I am against the proposed plans to build on green belt land
DOR02315	The proposal to release vast areas of greenbelt land is wrong. It will destroy the beautiful Wirral landscape. Demand for housing should be satisfied on brownfield sites. If the council does not protect or greenbelt then they should be voted out. If the government overrides them then they should also be voted out.
DOR02316	I do not believe that this plan is a true representative of housing needs as the average age of people on the Wirral is getting longer and the figures based on the year 2000 are outmoded and should take into account the large empty brownfield sites available such as those held by peel in north Birkenhead.
DOR02317	I am against local areas of natural area being spoilt for housing use. There is a limit to how many people can reside in Wirral which is governed by the road infrastructure, the bus and rail public transport and NHS services & schools within the borough. When people saturation has occurred/achieved within the borough it is wrong to just build on our natural beauty spots for either economic reasons or just to enable more people to live in the borough without any changes to the overall road, rail and bus infrastructure and without any regard or input of funding for NHS/school services within the borough. I support funding and bringing back to use empty properties and building on true brown field sites.
DOR02318	I have not read the whole plan as this is the first I've seen of it but I had a look at the proposed new housing, whilst it is great to have new housing options in my ward (rock ferry) how does this council plan to integrate these within the community, just on a quick browse within the rock ferry and Tranmere area there are at least 350 planned new homes this with the current new homes being built within the area probably tops 500 with the majority of these being family home that will have school going children residing in them as a parent in this area of Wirral we find it difficult to find schools for our children that don't have a massive commute as this council demolished the local co ed high school so our options are either traveling to another part of the borough so if this council builds more houses where will the children go to school because we're just polluting our air by having more cars on the road with school runs etc
DOR02319	It makes absolutely no sense at all to be submitting a plan until there has been an impact assessment carried out for each area. Following the impact assessments then the proposal can go forward. Until this is done all you have is a wish list. The danger is that as the council keeps doing solve problem a but create problem b. This is not a plan it is just a load of proposals to get the government off the councils back. Given what we are paying the senior officials in the council this is shockingly weak thinking. I could do better myself.
DOR02320	Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Figures released by the Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be actively pursued. You cannot dismiss deforestation and wildlife displacement as negligible consequences of your cause. I live close to an area identified for building on, which is currently a natural habitat for wildlife. Turning the land over to building would be of huge detriment to both people and wildlife alike. There are many examples of where the local government get thing wrong, don't let this be another one. Once it's done it can never be restored!
DOR02321	I don't feel that it is necessary to build on green belt land when there is plenty of brownfield land available (as I understood it, greenbelt is protected to conserve green spaces!). We already have oversubscribed schools in the area - 100's more children would mean more schools required. Other facilities would suffer and transport would become even worse. I do hope you reconsider these proposals. I appreciate that affordable housing is definitely needed, but not at the cost of our green spaces. Wirral is a place I am proud of because it does have a bit of everything in a relatively small are - busy towns, quiet parks, the fantastic Wirral way. Let's keep it a place that people want to visit and come back to.
DOR02322	I object to any plans to use up green space instead of focusing on the run down empty buildings on the Wirral, like Dominic house in Liscard, left abandoned when the council moved and merged more centres to cut costs.
DOR02323	[SAME AS DOR02050] except the last part e.g. on a personal note etc.
DOR02324	In view of Brexit surely we should be preserving working farms & farmland & not even considering building houses on them. Post Brexit we will need to be more self-sufficient regarding our food supplies. I also object to Lever Estates landowners & developers profiting at the expense of the loss of both greenbelt & farming businesses & related jobs. Existing roads are already congested & would not cope with further traffic produced by extensive house building. Local facilities such as doctors dentists & schools are already at capacity. Further pressure should be exerted on Peel Group to build the houses within their plans sooner rather than later. This alone would meet the Government's housing target for the next 15 years.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02325	I live next to a proposed development site (beautiful fields) sustaining a varied wildlife. I can't describe it in words, except that when I ever view it (which is every day!!) it reminds me of what the garden of Eden must be like. If you build this monstrous, urban sprawl; which will effectively join Greasby with Saughall Massie, this beauty, will be lost forever, and lose local identities along with it. Most of these developments, are unwarranted, not required, nor wanted!!!...AND, we will NOT be bullied by Local Councillors, in thinking that they are required...NO!!!
DOR02326	I am writing to express my concerns about your plans for building on the Wirral green belt. I believe your projections of need are based on out of date growth data which is inflating the number of dwellings required. There is ample room for the real future needs of Wirral in the underdeveloped Docklands/Waterfront. You should follow Liverpool's example and replicate the excellent developments across the water.
DOR02327	I am a Labour party member but will cancel if this council pursues its attack on our green belt, I feel that strongly. There are alternatives, other parties see them, they may be more costly but they are there. Don't take the easy option. When it's gone its gone. I along with many others do not want the Irby/Pensby border built on. You were elected to carry out the will of the people so please do so. If you don't then I will not vote for you again. Can the meeting scheduled for July next year be screened live so we can see exactly who is saying what?
DOR02328	I wish to object to the proposal to remove the Green Belt status of Parcel Reference SP062, as outlined in the document Proposed Green Belt Sites for Further Investigation in the Wirral Local Plan. This parcel of land is currently designated as Green Belt to protect Barnston Dale, which provides an important habitat for wildlife. In addition, this area of the Green Belt preserves the historic nature of Barnston Village and Dale, mentioned in the Domesday Book. The parcel of land met the criteria of Green Belt in 1983 under the Merseyside Green Belt Local Plan. The reasons for scheduling have not changed and legislation requires that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified. Such circumstances have not been evidenced or justified in the Plan. If residential development of Parcel Reference SP062 was to occur, there would be severe pressure on the already overloaded road network in the area. Local roads Pensby Road (B5138), Barnston Road (A551) and Brimstage Road (A5137) are already congested at peak times and, in particular, the roundabouts at Thingwall (junction of A551 and B5138) and Gayton (junction of A540, A551 and A5137), together with the road junction at Arrowe Park (junction of A551 and A552), are all at their limits. Further afield, Junctions 3 and 4 of the M53 motorway are already at capacity during peak hours. Significant improvement to the road network would need to be made, presumably at the developer's cost, to accommodate the extra traffic. In particular, the improvements required at the motorway junctions would be extensive and costly, allied with the works required to the local roads, which would be likely to involve widening, and hence property take. This, I suggest, would render the development of SP062 'undeliverable' in terms of the National Policy on planning, due to the costs of the road infrastructure improvements, rendering the development uneconomic.
DOR02329	The plan to build on the Bromborough village car park will totally devastate the services in this area, just by building in this area will increase the need for the shops etc that will be destroyed by this plan. Do we have to walk to the shops ? or are there plans for a free car park for Bromborough' s residents ?
DOR02330	Infrastructure cannot cope with the proposed building in these areas. Over estimated number of houses proposed, councils figures have been PROVEN to be wrong! Peel waters have significant number of dwellings already granted permission so no need to build on green belt at all for the government criteria. Wildlife would be destroyed along with beautiful countryside.....disgraceful !!! Clean air, with rise in cancer/dementia and other illnesses that are linked to health and wellbeing, creating more pollution that is totally unnecessary surely this is going to cause more ill health putting yet another strain on our health service! This local plan is totally unfounded and should be stopped!!
DOR02331	Meaning of CONSERVATION : 'the protection of plants/animals/natural areas - from the damaging effects of human activity' * the prevention of loss * to preserve and protect * to save the environment Why would anyone UNNECESSARILY choose to go against this ?! In Upton, we've already had large numbers of houses built within 'Upton Pines' and along Manor Drive. A fire station is being built on greenbelt land. Enough !! What relatively small greenbelt is left within this locality is precious to all. A 'small field' may not mean much to certain councillor's; but to the local resident's it can make a significant difference to their quality of life. We all know there are enough sites - brownfield & non conservational to meet demands. Please ease our mental stress in relation to these matters & concentrate on them.
DOR02332	We are just one generation and it's our responsibility to protect our greenbelt for or children and grandchildren. Do you want to be the people responsible for Wirral greenbelt destruction? I could wax lyrical about the decline in the population on the Wirral and the brown field capacity for 18000 houses. However, but for some unfathomable reason the council has decided that green belt is open for development on the Wirral. This poor decision making is surely not going to prevail. My vote says NO to any greenbelt development.
DOR02333	The number of houses to be built over the next fifteen years should be challenged to stop the release of Green Belt land in Wirral. This number stems from a wholly unrealistic projection of future economic and population growth. New development is desperately needed in Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry, not in urban areas where there is no infrastructure. By de-designating Green Belt land in and around the village of Storeton the Council will break all of the five purposes in the National Policy Framework 2018. It will increase urban sprawl and merge Bebington, Prenton and Storeton together. This action will result in the loss of a valuable pocket of countryside for many walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders. The history of Storeton, mentioned in the Doomesday Book 1085, the site of Storeton Hall and the Battle of Brunanburh are not insignificant. The Bowman field is so named as many bows and arrow heads were discovered following the battles in ancient times. Rest Hill and Red Hill roads were similarly named following these battles. If ongoing investigations into Storeton's historic significance are proven it would be foolish in the extreme to build on it. Storeton has no rail link, no shops, no schools an hourly bus service and the nearest doctor is in Higher Bebington. Surely all brownfield sites must be exhausted before allowing property developers to swoop in and buy up huge swathes of Green Belt land. There is no guarantee that they will build the type of housing required and they are more likely to frustrate the Council by building unaffordable homes to profit from the situation with no thought to the many people in need of social housing. I am already aware of representations made to a neighbouring land owner from Red Row Homes to buy from him the paddock opposite my house and we are only one week into the consultation period! By allowing this situation to continue the Council are

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	bleeding Wirral of its richest asset.
DOR02334	<p>1. Purposes of the Green Belt (NPPF Paragraph 136) My understanding is 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.</p> <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'? <p>2. Existing planning permissions There are currently 2,634 existing permissions (as at April 2018) not yet translated into development of housing.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is no mechanism to force developers to build on land with planning permission. In that case where is the evidence that any new permissions granted on released land 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. 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: <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.
DOR02335	You shouldn't encroach on the green belt, it benefits everyone and is vital to provide oxygen and take out pollutants naturally. In particular I'm sure Olaf Stapledon would be horrified if housing was to be built on the woods. If low-cost housing is put there, there is little public transport since Avon buses went out of business and we don't need more high cost housing.
DOR02336	I have lived on the Wirral since 1973 - to think that so much of our green belt land between M53 and the railway is being considered for household development before we exhaust our brownfield sites is appalling concept to all who enjoy those green spaces whether they just drive past them or walk their dogs within them on a daily basis. Much of this land is prime arable land which will be expensive so the affordable housing we need will not be available as property developers will need to profit from their not inconsiderable outlay. There has been talk that the number of houses we need, as identified by central government is much too high for a place like Wirral but what are we doing about it? I oppose any greenbelt development until we have exhausted our brownfield sites - just because they are brownfield sites does not mean the housing will be unattractive for example the Redrow development close to the Lever factory has achieved a very desirable/attractive/interesting living environment considering the density of the housing. We must preserve our green belt at all costs.
DOR02337	The Green belt proposal will not give the borough affordable housing , but housing in the top sphere of non-affordability. There are enough empty properties that you need to use your powers with

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	. Brown sites need to be converted. The council needs to be bold with Wirral waters ? Just one last comment, is this a pointless consultation, when you may have already decided to build ! ?
DOR02338	the proposed plan for SP062 would bring too much traffic on Barnston Rd as we have no chance of getting out of our houses at most of the day due to so much use & especially with ambulances , police cars etc, who use it as a direct route to Heswall & Chester etc.
DOR02339	<p>I object most strongly with the plan. It should be withdrawn now and a proper local plan produced. It is flawed on many levels :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The projected requirement is grossly exaggerated . The population of the Wirral is falling and even the office of National Statistic projects a Rise of only 4,200. How then can 12,000 homes be needed? The projections which the council have given are WRONG If the council did not realise this before they must do now given the analysis by [another respondent] which is irrefutable. To proceed with the planning proposal with this knowledge is irresponsible and grossly negligent. 2) Little attention has been given to Brownfield development, the council report shows little rigour or detail and contains errors I.e. a large underestimate of Brownfield potential. 3) Green belt projection has been developer led rather than a serious review. Developers are only interested in maximum profit and least cost. Not what is best for the community. The volume of green belt land in the plan is enormous and gives no thought to the current much higher densities of build. 4) Urban sprawl - the lack of thought to the green belt proposal will result in Urban sprawl which is directly against government guidelines. One area in particular around Lever Causeway and the village of Storeton, if built on, would connect this village - the most important ancient settlement on the Wirral - to Birkenhead. 5) Development on green belt land is comprehensively shown not to deliver affordable homes. Homes are needed on the Brownfield sites of Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry where least effort has been spent on the plan 6) The assessment of both the conversion of existing planning applications into builds and the conversion of empty property is downgraded. Why? For example empty houses are converted currently at 200 per year (which surely could be improved on greatly) whereas the plan shows a much lower conversion of 60 p.a. Given there are 6,000 empty properties this is significant. 7) Wirral Waters - the council seems determined to downplay the level of houses available here citing the government guidelines and burden of proof required by inspectors. However the High Court ruling of 2017 shows that high burden of proof is not required. Furthermore - this is the area where houses are needed and the 6,500 estimate from Peel Holdings should be used in the plan. 8) Given the points above there should be NO green belt included within the plan to fulfil the housing needs of Wirral. It may be that this fiasco was started by central government but - speaking as a lifelong labour supporter - the council are equally culpable in their incompetent response. Instead of the green belt being used as - I quote - 'last resort' this plan puts it first in the firing line.
DOR02340	<p>I wish to voice my opposition to the release of green belt in west Wirral, specifically "Strategic Parcel 062" I am concerned about a number of factors these are: Increased traffic:- Downham Road North is narrow. Traffic struggles to flow now with the current population and volume of traffic and rush hour at Barnston dip and the junction of Storeton lane is terrible. Both narrow lanes, not capable of handling so much traffic. There is limited alternatives to commuters using their cars. We have a train station that goes no-where, well Bidston - Wrexham, and two bus services to Liverpool, taking 45mins to get there. Local services: - Unless you are wealthy and enjoy restaurants, there is not much in Heswall with regards leisure facilities. Our nearest leisure centre is West Kirby unless you want to play 5 a side which in that case you can go to Pensby School. Our only Leisure asset is the beautiful countryside and green belt for which we can walk, but this is being taken away due to green belt development of Strategic parcel 062. My family and i enjoy walking across the fields from the side of Heswall primary school over to Barnston Church and the fox and hounds (less dog poo than the streets of Downham Road North) Schools and Dr's, already stretched takes 3 or more days to get a dr's appointment and that's if you are lucky to get one. I also object to the seemingly easy option of using virgin greenbelt to build houses on rather than utilizing existing brownbelt sites. Heswall and the Wirral is a Beautiful place to live, building on these greenbelt sites is going to turn us into just another urban sprawl with no identity or a place to be proud to live and come from. It will be a mistake to agree to release this land for building. We advertise ourselves as a Beautiful place to visit and live, but are destroying the very thing that attracts people to live here.</p>
DOR02341	<p>There are many empty properties which could be refurbished, peel holdings needs to move on and get their development at the docks built. With so many services being closed, we need to keep our greenbelt for people to enjoy, also there is a risk to the wildlife, fauna and flora, the destruction of habitats. There is so much development happening in Wirral why do we need extra homes. Wirral community NHS trust want to close the local walk in centres and have a central urgent care centre, how will the NHS cope with the extra influx of residents? Arrowe park hospital already struggles to achieve the 4 hrs A&E targets, parking at the hospital is already an issue. There are many brownfield sites which could be used for building homes. Is the new homes built in Upton, before Sainsbury's included in the plan? What happens to the boundaries of towns, such as Pensby, Thingwall and Heswall? I have already contacted the National Trust and they have said no development will be allowed on their land in Thingwall / Irby.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02342	<p>I have attended Green Belt meetings at the Wirral Town Hall, Pensby School and various church halls and I am not going to regurgitate all the alleged facts and figures yet again. Even before I did so my own research had proven to me satisfactorily that all the statistics from the central government down were completely unfounded in reality and not supported by the ONS. It would seem self-evident to all but the most greedy or incompetent that the alleged housing requirement figures nationally and locally on the Wirral are wildly over-exaggerated. It also seems extraordinary that people who supposedly represent the residents of Wirral and live in the area themselves are prepared to destroy what is a local and national beauty, recreational and educational asset. The Council should really be lobbying the Government to make the Wirral Peninsula a National Park like Snowdonia or the Lake District and stop the developers in their tracks.</p> <p>Already only 46% of Wirral is still green. It is obvious that there is plenty of brown-belt land and unused housing where housing development could take place. Arguing that doing so would “be expensive” is sickening beyond belief and underlines the greed behind this whole program. Developers of brown belt would still make money, just a little less, and in resolving the contamination issues would be cleansing the peninsula and making it yet more picturesque, as well as providing employment. It is an old axiom that when cutting a piece of wood you can always take a bit more off, but you can’t put it back if the calculations prove wrong. That is exactly the case with Wirral, or any British green belt. I urge the council as a body, irrespective of party politics, to urgently reconsider and come up with a more realistic plan and further, to make a written commitment not to further erode any green space on this lovely peninsula. I, along with many thousands of other residents, am willing to put both time and money into opposing green belt development. I would suggest that property developers turn their considerable talents to more laudable projects restoring city centres and defunct mills, factories, MOD sites and dockyards like, amongst others, Urban Splash.</p>
DOR02343	Green belt land should not be sequestered for house building, Wirral’s population is diminishing and social housing on b/field sites must be prioritised.
DOR02344	Saughall Massie and Garden Hey road are the last country lanes and green belt in Wallasey. Garden Hey road is used by many dog walkers to enjoy a quiet time surrounded by fields. These fields provide a green lung around Saughall Massie village which is a conservation area. There are many other pieces of land which can be used for development rather than designating green belt .
DOR02345	Thank you for the opportunity for MWDA to comment upon the Local Plan allocations. Given the requirements of the Waste Local Plan, I believe that the allocation of green belt land for this Clatterbridge HWRC (Mount Road, CH63 6JE) site may, be better suited to an industrial (B1, B2, B8) use to fit with the current operation of the site.
DOR02346	Do not want any Greenbelt released before brownfield sites have been used. The empty property situation needs addressing as well as the new housing figures. Please put in place something to protect Wirral’s Greenbelt. This cannot be allowed to happen again.
DOR02347	It is totally wrong, totally unacceptable and unforgivable to build on green belt land, any building should be on brown field land only The Wirral is only a small area and contains some beautiful landscapes, which the Council wishes to allow to be destroyed once and for all. The Government has recently confirmed that the housing requirement is not as great as first thought.
DOR02348	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02349	<p>Having attended local presentations and W Wirral Constituency meeting it is evident that there is much debate and uncertainty surrounding the accuracy of the projected housing needs given to WBC by ONS. the need for release of any greenbelt land is very much questionable. The plans seen indicate that if greenbelt were released to the full extent then Irby, Pensby, Thingwall would become one vast urban conurbation merging with Heswall and the quality of life and the environment in this part of Wirral would be destroyed. Local infrastructure such as drainage, roads, school provision, shops etc would seem inadequate to support housebuilding on such a scale, The need for affordable housing is not in dispute but the demographics of Wirral population show it is fairly stable thus again questioning the need for housebuilding on greenbelt to the scale threatened, the population of Irby for example has not changed significantly in the 30 years we have lived here and the local housing market seems to be pretty slow. I appreciate all is subject to planning permissions but again, there are existing permissions being “sat on”. There must be action to stop this and to enforce not just a (realistic) start date but also a completion date on permissions which are granted. there must be better ways to fix the housing issues without wholesale release of greenbelt. The first priority must be use of all existing brownfield sites and known vacant sites and to work alongside Peel to hasten the housing provision within Wirral Waters project. there are already incursions into greenbelt with the new Fire Station, whose need is much disputed, and the Hoylake Golf project whose success is very much in question and which is bitterly opposed by many including our own MP. I cannot understand why a labour controlled council would be pushing that project rather than championing the needs of the many deprived areas of the borough however as it is central Government’s aim to scrap all central funding to Local Government this perhaps explains everything.</p>
DOR02350	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Sanity is not statistical. You have used government figures based on an ONS forecast guess which is wrong. Do your own calculations based on factual evidence not guesses. 800 dwellings a year? Even just by looking at ONS guessed stats the maximum is nearer 200. Back to school and do your maths. What is Wirral's current housing shortage - Check out the homeless register to find out. 2. Twelve thousand dwellings ! Do me favour. Wirral infrastructure is already a nightmare because of lousy planning. Where are the roads, schools, health centres, dentists and other supporting infrastructure coming from? Not commented upon in plan! Existing infrastructure is not adequate - Some plan! Wirral is struggling now with its population, how's it supposed to cope with another 12000 dwellings. 3. Destruction of green belt land will devastate local wildlife havens which are not only ecologically important but of economic importance as well. Tourists you dummies. They don't come to look at wind farms and housing estates. Not commented upon in plan! 4. By announcing green belt destruction and developing on the land, you have, overnight, reduced the value of existing dwellings. Who is responsible for compensation? 5. The plan does not show an exceptional need to develop the green belt. You (the Council) are supposed to be the protectors of the green belt. Check out the green belt inception and the duties

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>imposed on you. (1992 Public Enquiry). You are not fulfilling them!</p> <p>6. WBC holding two contradictory beliefs, one of green belt protection and another of green belt development. Hoylake golf resort and Saughall Massie fire station have both taken green belt. It is therefore obvious, despite Council protestations, that the overriding priority is to develop green belt.</p> <p>7. This is not a plan, it's a political game by the lunatics who have been let out of the asylum. The Council will dramatically reduce the scope of development and claim victory over the Government as saviour's of the green belt.</p> <p>8. Developed green belt land can never be reinstated. Get your figures right. State categorically that the green belt will not be developed.</p> <p>I am totally against the plan! Appeal the Government's calculations and start again.</p>
DOR02351	SP051 it would be a great shame for this area to be considered for building. It is all that remains of the former RAF Hooton Park runway and houses the hangar used by 610 Squadron before its disbandment in 1957 and the closure of the airfield.
DOR02352	Ludicrous idea when there is so much wasteland that can be built on. Also the amount of derelict buildings that could be redeveloped makes this plan a non-starter.
DOR02353	I don't understand why so many greenbelt areas are being pushed forward when statistically, there is little if any population growth in the area. Also there is so much brownfield to be redeveloped to help people make the first step onto the property ladder which is more likely needed.
DOR02354	Wirral Labour needs to get its act together and start building on green belt not plan on building on greenbelt. Certainly DO NOT twist the word of Peel!
DOR02355	I object to the proposal to build on greenbelt land and feel that the Council should be putting pressure onto Peel Holdings who are stock piling brownfield land that could be built on instead. I am especially concerned about Lever's causeway as some of that land is arable and surely that cannot be built on. I find the proposals anti-environmental in an age when many are aware of what we are losing for future generations. Wirral should maintain that heritage and keep the underdeveloped, wild or agricultural land ensuring a healthy environment, allowing wildlife to be encouraged and preserved and certain crops to grow.
DOR02356	<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. I live in Barnston and my children attend Heswall Primary school. I would like to raise my objections to the proposed development of the green belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The roads around the school are already beyond their capacity during school drop off and pick up times - they are narrow roads, not designed for the volume of traffic that they are presently experiencing and on occasions the safety of our children has been compromised with cars parking on the pavements and on corners in order to allow the traffic to continue to flow. • The presence of construction traffic during the recent small development of 3 dwellings near the school on Downham Road North contributed to the compromised safety of our children - large construction vehicles were often present and had to pass across the pavement on a common route to school for many of the children. Construction vans were consistently lined up in rows of 4 or 5, all parked up on the pavement so that our children, parents and grandparents, especially those with pushchairs, were required to step into the road and therefore risk their safety • In today's fast paced society it is becoming increasingly evident that time outdoors is not just beneficial but crucial for the health and well-being for our children. The school benefits from playing fields which are extremely well used by the school and local clubs on a regular basis. The children love the fields and woods and it would be a detriment to their health and wellbeing if they were to lose their playing fields and green outdoor space. • In its present state, Heswall Primary school, being the closest school to the proposed development, is already at capacity. What plans are in place to provide schooling for the extra children which the proposed development on Barnston Dale would inevitably bring. Are there plans in place to provide extra amenities such as doctors surgeries and hospitals too - last winter, routine operations were frozen at both Arrowe Park and Clatterbridge for an extensive period of time due to inability to keep up with emergency requirements - what would happen if there were even more families in the area requiring these services. Do we have the policing resources to cope with a population increase in the local area? • It has been suggested that the dwelling requirements in Wirral for the next 15 years should be downgraded due to the recent figures released by the Office of National Statistics and in light of this new information can the council give an undertaking that green belt boundaries will not be redrawn. • The development at Wirral Waters, which has planning permission for 13000homes, along with Brownfield site availability and the 6000 empty dwellings that exist that could be brought back into habitable use will more than suffice the requirement of 12000 new homes by 2035. There is space for 18000 homes on Brownfield sites. • The current council plan fails to reflect the true housing needs in the borough and is fraught with misinformation and inconsistency. Again this renders the need to build on Barnston Dale and other local green belt sites null and void. • The current council plan fails to meet the urgent need to regenerate and direct investment into the urban areas away from green belt. The current council plan fails to meet the urgent need to regenerate and direct investment into the urban areas away from green belt.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The current council plan diminishes our green belt. Greenbelt is in place to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another, safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and assisting urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Once established, green belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified - this is simply not the case in the Wirral! • Metro Mayor Steve Rotherham has pledged a Brownfield First approach to new housing developments across the city region, which includes Wirral. I urge Wirral Council and Steve Rotherham to significantly increase their efforts to work with Developers such as Peel Holdings (who own Wirral Waters) and to use all the powers that they have at their disposal to ensure that such Brownfield sites are brought forward for development. With the availability of Brownfield sites on Wirral there is no need to move the Green Belt boundaries and build on the very land that makes the Wirral what it is. Your current plan is so unnecessary with the resources already available within the Wirral. It's unnecessary to make Wirral into a sprawl of concrete, while other neighbouring counties are still enjoying a much higher percentage of land at green space and countryside.
DOR02357	I strongly object to use of Green Belt land for additional housing in Wirral. Housing should be built on the many brownfield sites which lie underused and are an eyesore in the area. The Mersey river frontage is an excellent area to develop and can provide attractive low-cost housing for young people and new families. It is wrong to build on Green belt, which is a precious resource for our community and future generations.
DOR02358	<p>I do not agree with the Local Plan and I am opposed to development on Wirral's green belt land for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Prime Minister has repeatedly stated in Parliament that "the Government is very clear that the green belt must be protected". 2. The population of the Wirral does not change from year to year so the demand for more houses is marginal. 3. The Government's housing targets and those of Wirral Borough Council are completely unrealistic. 4. There are sufficient brownfield sites to meet housing needs for some time to come. 5. There are approximately six thousand unoccupied properties in existence. 6. Development would result in an increase in traffic and pollution and put a further strain on health and social services. 7. The Wirral does not cover a large area and it is already overpopulated. Britain is actually twice as crowded as Germany and has a population four times more dense than France. People need large green open spaces for the good of their health. Green open spaces are also a defining feature of our national heritage. 8. Some of the land could be used for agriculture. The UK unnecessarily imports vast amounts of food from overseas. 9. Development would have an impact on tourism. 10. In time development would irrevocably change the face of the Wirral. The housing shortage is the fault of successive governments because they have allowed the population to grow to unsustainable levels. The general public and the media voiced their concerns about the growth in the population years ago but were ignored.
DOR02359	I object in the strongest terms to ANY building plans to Bromborough car park and the civic centre site. I can't imagine a more idiotic scheme, who thinks these proposals up, he/she/they should be relieved of their position on incompetence/short sightedness grounds, I and my family will resist this to the hilt along with many many others.
DOR02360	<p>I am very much against the release of ANY Green Belt Land on Wirral for building purposes, but specifically I have the following objections in the area in which I live. Firstly, I understand that one of the 5 reasons for preserving Green Belt land is to prevent the amalgamation of settlements, and while I believe that this argument cannot be used to prevent amalgamation of the Pensby/Thingwall/Barnston area as the entire area is only seen officially as one settlement, this ignores the fact that the patches of open countryside within this one area are much valued by local residents and are indeed one of the reasons we chose to live here in the first place. This countryside deserves to be protected and this is indeed one of the 5 reasons for preserving Green Belt land. It needs protecting to retain the character of the area, for local residents to continue to enjoy walking in and to enjoy the views, not to mention the various species of wildlife that rely on this countryside to live. The areas of Green Belt proposed to be released here- SP019B, SP060, SP061 and SP062 are not small pockets of land but ENORMOUS and if not protected, you would eradicate vast swathes of open land. If one of the reasons Green Belt exists is to protect open countryside, you really need to think twice before taking away any piece of the countryside, let alone such huge sections all in one area. Secondly, I am very much against any large scale building of housing at all in the Pensby/Thingwall/Irby/Heswall area-on Green Belt land or not..I work in the office of one of the primary schools in this area so know from first-hand experience how great the demand is for primary school places at the local schools, all of which have excellent reputations. We already have parents who have had their children placed in two or more local schools as one school has not been able to accommodate siblings- this causes them great logistical difficulties and is far from ideal for the children who are unable to enjoy their primary school years with their brothers and sisters. The simple truth is that there are just not enough places as the situation stands and if large scale building was allowed, this problem would be enormously exacerbated. Families in the area may have to travel some distance to get their children to schools out of the area. Surely this can't be acceptable? Thirdly, I am against some of the developments due to the traffic problems that would result. If development at site SPO60 was allowed and access was from Cornelius Drive in Pensby, this would be disastrous as Cornelius Drive is a long narrow residential road which already has issues with speeding cars and limited width due to parked cars. If developments SP061 and SP062 were allowed, the junction at the end of Gills Lane and Barnston Road, already an accident blackspot due to restricted views, would cause a major problem with more accidents undoubtedly occurring. I urge you to give these matters serious consideration.</p>
DOR02361	[SAME AS DOR02050] except the last part e.g. on a personal note etc.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02362	I disagree with the process of the Local Plan consultation. Having attended various meetings, conflicting figures/requirements have been presented at each and I would suggest that the whole process is flawed/requires review and re-consultation to qualify as adequate and informed public consultation. The release of Green Belt is a fundamental move which will affect the Wirral for years and is not a move that should be taken lightly without more robust figures and an informed view on housing typology and density (rather than blanket density calculation to the release of large areas of land). Any further review should better define the protection of historic villages such as Storeton and landscape features such as Storeton Woods, whilst also proving the adequate provision of school places and gp services in the chosen locations. The motorway should not be seen as the boundary for new development, with the Eastern side of Wirral losing all amenity space, when it could be argued that the existing more dense areas of Wirral require this easy access to amenity more than those of lower density to the West. The motorway should indeed form the centre of retained Green Belt, maintaining a green buffer of countryside to housing as originally planned. Environmentally this will create higher quality communities with houses built at adequate and regulatory distance to polluted settings. Release of land for commercial house builder 'estates' should not be considered the only viable solution to the creation of new homes without more thorough review of existing consents, brownfield sites and empty properties. With recent release of new figures, the whole process requires repeat and more professional analysis to prevent mistakes that will last generations or indeed result in further public challenge.
DOR02363	I am extremely concerned about the severe encroachment on the local countryside in Eastham with the proposed loss of farmland, woodland and green spaces and the impact this will have on our wildlife. Also, especially in this age of technology, green spaces and trees are beneficial for the physical and mental health of young people and adults. This loss together with increased traffic will also damage the setting of historic, medieval Eastham Village.
DOR02364	I have some serious concerns about the proposed building development of 12,000 houses in the Wirral area over the next 15 years. I am an NHS employee. Currently services are under a lot of strain with services being cancelled or merged with other services and caseloads getting bigger. With the introduction of increasing communities this will have a dire effect on GP Practices, District Nurse Teams and other community services.
DOR02365	I have recently been contacted by Wirral Borough Council regarding the plans to open up the greenbelt for development. Specially area SP043 which directly effects my area. However I am aware that this is just part of a wider campaign by the Council to open up greenbelt across Wirral for housing development. I am extremely concerned and object in the strongest terms to this happening. I understand that I am one among thousands of people in Wirral who are objecting to these plans. I have followed the consultation process and the information provided by Wirral MBC consultation, the leader of the Council, information from the Development Director for Peel Group Holdings Ltd and other local interest groups, as well as information produced by Wirral MBC and the NHS, along with the up to date population projections from the Office of National Statistics. Firstly, I object to the timescale that the Council has set. It is well documented that the Council has for many years failed to come up with a plan. However it now seems intent to rush into a plan with a limited 8 week period of consultation with the public and pushing the Greenbelt as being the only realistic and viable option available. Which is completely false. The Council website states: The Government has produced a standard method for calculating the minimum number of homes needed in a local authority area. This is based on nationally-published population and household projections. This calculation shows an overall minimum need for new housing of 12,045 new dwellings over 15 years, equal to 803 dwellings per year" Furthermore the Wirral View July 2018 stated 'As part of a national housebuilding target, Government has told Wirral we must identify enough land to allow for 12,000 new homes to be built in Wirral by 2035'. On the 19th September 2018 Council Leader appeared on the radio show and made several statements; He stated that the Council had been working on the local plan for some time. He also stated he had "challenged the Standard Calculation Figure" and had written to the Secretary of State James Brokenshire on the 7th September. Radio host also put to Council Leader that the population is due to drop by 2.59%, a statement which he did not deny or challenge. I believe there is a concerted effort by the Council Leader and the Council to try to push the blame onto the Government for the figure of 12000. There is clear evidence that the figure of 12000 homes is vastly over calculated. There is also clearly a gateway for challenging this figure. Much has been made of S44 Planning for the Right Homes for the Rights Places, which provides a gateway for deviation from the Standard Calculation. However, I would draw your attention to the National Policy Framework July 2018 which provides; Para 31 - The preparation and review of all policies should be underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence. This should be adequate and proportionate, focused tightly on supporting and justifying the policies concerned, and take into account relevant market signals. Para 60 - To determine the minimum number of homes needed, strategic policies should be informed by a local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance – unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach which also reflects current and future demographic trends and market signals. In addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring areas should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. environments" Air pollution is a key environmental risk to health, poor air quality can contribute to ill health, shortening life expectancy and increasing mortality. The Authority monitors various pollutants in various locations in order to build a picture of air quality in the area. Specifically, the report mentions that there are 31 Nitrogen Dioxide monitoring points in Wirral. 27 of these monitoring stations are located on the bank of land running from New Brighton up to Eastham, the same bank of land which has a life expectancy. "Inequalities in life expectancy in Wirral are apparent at birth and at older ages (65, 75 and 85), with life expectancy lower in Wirral's 20% most deprived areas, compared to both the more affluent areas of Wirral" (Wirral Intelligence Service). As I am sure you are aware the deprived areas of the Wirral are predominantly situated in the bank of land from New Brighton up through to Eastham. A Study in The Lancet in January 2017 stated 'living close to heavy traffic was associated with a higher incidence of dementia'. I would highlight that the Three Stags Crossing is heavily congested especially around the rush hours of schools mornings and workers returning home in the evening. For Wirral MBC to put out a consultation based on incorrect and unchallenged figures of 12000 homes, shows complete disrespect and contempt for the people that it serves and makes a mockery of what should be a well-informed consultation. On the 20th September 2018, the Office of National Statistics (ONS) released household forecasts, which predict

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>household growth in Wirral over the next 25 years (2016 – 2041) to be 9871.</p> <p>The impact on the housing requirement will be 5923 homes per year, a requirement of 395 new homes per year over this period. The ONS figures are comparable with Wirral Council's own figures as provided in the Wirral Compendium of Statistics 2018 Table 1i provides projections of population by Age MID – 2018 TO MID – 2038 https://www.wirralintelligenceservice.org/media/2541/wirral-compedium-2018-final.pdf 2018 = 322.8 (thousand) 2023 = 325.2 2028 = 326.9 2033 = 327.8 2038 = 328.3 This is a Wirral Council Document and it gives an estimated increase of 5.5 thousand residents on Wirral, over a 20 year period 2018 and 2038. An increase of 1.7%. This would be proportionate with the population trend of Wirral over the last few decades. Without doubt the population projection by Wirral MBC and the ONS is clearly an exception circumstance to justify an alternative calculation and allow Wirral to deviate from the standard method of calculation which is giving a figure of 800 homes per year. Why the Council has not used this figure as a headline figure with a worst case scenario of 12000 is highly questionable and if the Council fails to challenge the Standard Calculation, it will be failing its duty to serve the people of Wirral. During the Public meeting on the 10th September a Council Officer stated that there were currently 4600 empty homes on Wirral and that there were concerted efforts to bring empty properties back into use. It really seems that Wirral MBC are paying lip service to this instead of treating it as the priority it should be. If the Council is serious about regeneration and improving people's lives, having properties lay uninhabitable and abandoned, is likely to increase crime in and around these properties and has a negative impact on the immediate neighbours and the surrounding community. There are areas in Wirral which desperately need investment and support. Diverting investment and support away from these areas is an abandonment of families and communities most in need. I understand the Council has already spent £1 million pounds on the Hoylake Golf Resort which now includes plans to build 160 luxury homes on Greenbelt Land. With additional plans to borrow and then lend the £26 million to the Developer. If the Council was serious about regenerating empty properties and regenerating existing areas of Wirral why is this money not being used where its most needed. Imagine the difference taking £27 million and investing it in these empty properties and the surrounding communities would make to the people who live in and around these areas. I know the Council will claim the £26 million is a loan and will be repaid, however based on the financial ineptitude that Wirral MBC has shown over the last decade (cost of freelance consultants and payoffs for failed Chief Executive) I have grave concerns that the Council will be unable to recover this money and instead it will be another gift to big business at the expense of the people of Wirral. The Council itself should have grave concerns over a venture group's past trading history. What's truly sad is that this all seems to come down to money. If the Council says it's not then this is a blatant lie. During the meeting with Planning Officer he described sites with less than 50 units as being 'challenging'. As in it was difficult to get developers interested as there wasn't as much profit in them. Ideally they wanted sites of 100 units plus. This was also the stance with brown field sites. It costs too much to prepare these sites which reduces the profitability for the developers. Quite frankly the Council should hang its head in shame, that it is pushing £27 million towards a luxury golf resort, when it could spend this money working with smaller developers and regenerating brownfield sites which as a result would require no greenbelt to be re-designated and developed. Engaging and supporting local builders/business to do this would actually bring jobs into the area. In relation to land designated as brown field sites, I understand there is the potential to build up to 18000 homes. The council puts forward the argument that it is too expensive, and it takes too long to develop these sites i.e. the average compulsory purchase being 18 months to complete. This is surely a moot point on the basis that the Local Plan should have been developed 14 years ago and when the plan is completed and implemented it lasts for 15 years. Wirral Waters have the potential to fulfil the housing needs. Without getting into the mismanagement of this site by Wirral Council, namely the failure to put timescales on the project, there is enough space to build the required housing for the projected population increase (ONS & Wirral MBC data above). I understand the Development Director of Wirral Waters Peel Group Holdings Ltd, has written directly to Council Leader. The letter specifically states that the Council are making references to the Wirral Waters Project which are 'misleading and inaccurate'. However other than highlighting the fake information being distributed by the Council leader, the important thrust of the letter is that it is clear there are sufficient development opportunities over the Peel Group Holdings land.</p> <p>Specifically, the Development Director states the minimum number of units they anticipate are "2900". The letter goes on to say "With the support and co-operation, we could build up to 6450 in the next 15 years to reach our ultimate goal of 13000 homes. Council Leader and various Councillors continually state that opening up the Greenbelt is a last resort and their preferred option is brown field sites. If this was truly the case, then based on the figures provided by Peel Group, empty homes and additional brown field sites, there is absolutely no need to consider redefining the greenbelt and removing the protection from development. Specifically in relation to opening up the bank of Greenbelt running from Storeton Woods through to Eastham Country Park. Using the M53 motorway as a dividing line between the West side and Birkenhead through to South Wirral, it is clear there are major discrepancies in the life expectancy and health inequalities. It is starkly clear to see that Birkenhead through to South Wirral has been heavily developed compared to the West side of Wirral, bringing increased pollution and the associated health issues that comes with population. I would direct you to Wirral Council's 2018 Air Quality Annual Status Report (ASR). Page 3 of the report states: "Working to reduce levels of inequality, particularly in relation to health, remains of paramount importance to this Council. We want all of our residents to have a good quality of life and live healthy lifestyles clean and safe environments" Air pollution is a key environmental risk to health, poor air quality can contribute to ill health, shortening life expectancy and increasing mortality. The Authority monitors various pollutants in various locations in order to build a picture of air quality in the area. Specifically, the report mentions that there are 31 Nitrogen Dioxide monitoring points in Wirral. 27 of these monitoring stations are located on the bank of land running from New Brighton up to Eastham, the same bank of land which has a life expectancy. "Inequalities in life expectancy in Wirral are apparent at birth and at older ages (65, 75 and 85), with life expectancy lower in Wirral's 20% most deprived areas, compared to both the more affluent areas of Wirral" (Wirral Intelligence Service). As I am sure you are aware the deprived areas of the Wirral are predominantly situated in the bank of land from New Brighton up through to Eastham. A Study in The Lancet in January 2017 stated 'living close to heavy traffic was associated with a higher incidence of dementia'. I would highlight that the Three Stags Crossing is heavily congested especially around the rush hours of schools mornings and workers returning home in the evening. To add further traffic to these roads would be untenable and cause significant health issues for the surrounding areas with the increase in traffic in this area. Removing the</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>greenbelt protection from the Storeton Woods area through to Eastham Woods and opening this up for development is only going to be detrimental to the health inequalities already being suffered by people on that side of the borough. I would also object to the Greenbelt which is prime agricultural farm land being dug up for development. Reducing agricultural land availability completely ignores the issues the UK is facing with the imminent exit from the European Union. While a few fields in Wirral may seem miniscule in the grand scheme of the food chain, they are a vital resource and are surely now more important than ever, with the uncertainty around food supplies. Producing local food whether it to Wirral or to the UK will be a must in the future, whether this is due to exiting the EU or to help reduce climate change. In addition the greenbelt is providing a natural sponge for heavy rains and changing weather patterns in the UK. I'm not against change or improving the Wirral for future generations. What I am against is the opening up of the Greenbelt simply because it's the easiest solution for the Council to bow to the pressure from housing developers instead of listening to the voice of residents. I attended the Council meeting on the 15 October and was heartened to see 2 of the 3 motions in relation to the Greenbelt and the ONS figures being passed; Motion 3 Keeping the Builders Hands Off Our Farmland, was carried with 58 votes. Motion 5 New ONS Housing Projections, was carried with 59 votes. However it is now more important that the actions of the Council take into account the views and feelings of Wirral residents and this will only be seen by all Councillors voting in favour of protecting ALL Greenbelt land. I strongly object when there is clear evidence that there is NO need to release ANY of Wirral's Greenbelt for development; 1) The housing target is hugely overstated; 12000 stated, 5923 based on ONS figures 2018 2) 4600 empty homes which can be brought back into use 3) At least 2900 units on Peel Holdings land, with the potential to build up to 6450 in the next 15 years and an ultimate goal of 13000 homes 4) Existing brownfield sites which can, with investment and support, fulfil sufficient housing needs.</p>
DOR02366	<p>We object to the proposals being put forward for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We all need areas of nature to refresh ourselves during increasingly busy and stressful lives – the current national discussions on the loss of park land highlighting this issue. We have a duty to ensure that we maintain areas of green belt for future generations – to act as the custodians of our environment; once land has disappeared under concrete and brick it is lost forever. 2. Around Barnston/Heswall residents are already reducing the amount of greenery by ripping out boundary hedges and replacing them with swathes of brown fencing as well as selling off gardens for additional houses. 3. The statistics provided by Wirral Council on the numbers of additional housing stock have been confusing and, at times, contradictory. Such an important issue which will have a dramatic and long-term impact to residents also seems to have been rushed due to the delays in producing an appropriate Local Plan over many years. 4. Losing the identity of the different settlements of the Wirral if they merge into each other with the possibility of an urban sprawl from the River Mersey to the Dee. 5. More immediate to us personally is the potential loss of the farm land next to Whitehouse Lane and Barnston Road. Over the years we have been fortunate to see hares, foxes, and pheasants on the field (and sometimes cows when used as grazing by the farmer) and barn owls, buzzards, great spotted woodpeckers, jays, swallows, plus the usual wild birds flying around. 6. The roads around us, particularly Barnston Road, already gets congested at peak times throughout the day with the restrictions at the T-junction of Storeton Lane, especially an issue. Adding the inevitable additional cars for any planned housing development (most households have at least one, if not two) will significantly add to this.
DOR02367	<p>I feel strongly that Greenbelt land was designated as such to protect future generations from over exploitation of generations before them. Using Greenbelt for housing in Wirral's Local Plan is exactly this scenario and alternative options such as exhausting all brownfield sites and bringing empty buildings back into use need to be the priority for creating affordable housing.</p>
DOR02368	<p>Please scrap the plans to develop on our beautiful Green Belt. The lovely surroundings and nature on the peninsula are the reason we live here. (Bearing in mind that just since my childhood including family and school friends there are over 10 people who have emigrated and now have residency in another country). Why threaten our beautiful green spaces when there is plenty of room for approximately 18,000 houses on brownfield sites? The only answer I can think of is GREED. With between 2,000 and 6,000 empty properties on the Wirral, along with the brownfield sites available, there is plenty of room for regeneration and development where it is needed leaving the very important Green Belt preserved for the local people and our future generations. Preservation of local nature and green spaces is so important for our wellbeing and the wellbeing of the wildlife living on the peninsula. Scientifically our green spaces help remove pollutants from the air. The plans to build on our Green Belt threaten the water table and the natural drainage of rainwater on the peninsula. The plans need to address the fact that there is no such thing as urban sprawl on a peninsula as there is nowhere to sprawl to. We are surrounded three side by water and there would be unnecessary strain on the already very busy villages, busy roads and the already oversubscribed school in the area. In reality 7,000 more homes mean there will be higher demand for schools so need for new schools, the need for new shops/villages to be created and roads to be developed. Is all of this considered in the plans? I feel so sad that greed is threatening our peninsula. Statistics show that Wirral population has been stable for 20years, although it has FALLEN between 1996-2016 by 1,500, With homelessness below average. The population projection to 2030 shows a FALL of 6,544, and we already have between 2,000 and 6,000 empty properties on the peninsula. I actually feel embarrassed that to the government and council development and money is more important than the wellbeing of the local people, nature and our surroundings.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02369	<p>We understand that consideration needs to be given to greenbelt development, however please no, not the Wirral. As greenbelt land, once developed, rarely if ever returns to greenbelt. We have recently moved the whole family to Hoylake from Liverpool, specifically as we were looking for a quieter, more rural location. Although I feel that the new fire station in Saughall Massie for example is a sensible choice for centrality of location, green fields have already been lost from that site, please no more. We love the green fields between there and West Kirby and we frequently walk our dogs at the Column, in and around Reynolds park, all around the wild moorland stretching across Irby and Thurstaston from Caldby rugby club , including the lower field, over to Hilbark Hotel and Royden park. we love the view from Church farm, and to do countryside activities such as PYO strawberries and the bushcraft activities for kids in the woods at Claremont farm. The fields surrounding are so peaceful. There is one field on Column road West Kirby that could perhaps be lost, in order to continue the row of houses on the right of the hill leaving West Kirby behind you. However otherwise, let's leave the Wirral alone. We love to walk down the Wirral way to Parkgate. We enjoy the feeling of fresh air and open space after living in the city. Our son's asthma inhaler use has decreased since we moved to the Wirral. Regarding the site West of Meols drive this is the Royal Liverpool Golf Course and is a highly regarded and profitable yet manageable i.e. appropriate tourist attraction for Hoylake. We would very strongly oppose development on this site. There is plenty of scope for building upwards in city sites and on dockland in Liverpool that are already built on, and this would be our strong preference. West Wirral has many sites of Special Scientific Interest, including rare grasses at Thurstaston Wirral Country Park, and water birds at the old nature reserve Gilmore area between West Kirby and Hoylake. We welcome Hoylake Visions ideas for a wetland centre in this area, keeping residential development minimal and of good quality. The reasons why we love the Wirral are because of the greenness and countryside feel. So any development at all needs to be appropriate and be mindful that the particular peace and beauty for which we have re-located, and are really lucky to have, is not ruined.</p>
DOR02370	<p>I am opposed to any reduction in the area of Green Belt Land on Wirral. The Local plan still states 12000 houses are needed even though the government has updated the national and local population and household projections for the next 25 years (ONS website Sept 21st 2018). Wirral's population growth and the household numbers growth have halved so that only 6000 houses may be needed based on the 2106 data. It's more likely that less than 6000 dwellings will be needed, given Wirral's steady long-term population decline and declining economic importance. As the new number of 6000 dwellings has now been accepted by the Council and representations made to Government to use the reduced figure, it's clear that any necessary development can occur on brownfield sites. These developments could be stunningly attractive, ideal for all ranges of need and based where transport links are already in place and additional infrastructure easy to put in place. Work on these sites could enhance the environment of Wirral as a whole, creating a modern forward looking development, rather than leaving them as derelict eyesores that continue to give the borough a down at heel look. Current Greenbelt boundaries should be kept and if ever any development passes the 'exceptional circumstances' test e.g. a fire station then a new area of land of equivalent size should be designated as Greenbelt. There is an opportunity here for Wirral Council to show itself as forward thinking not only in the national sphere but internationally too. The Greenbelt is the green lung that helps protect the physical and mental health of all Merseyside people, providing fresh air and green spaces within reasonably easy travel distance for everyone. Much of the Greenbelt is an important supportive habitat for the nationally and internationally designated and protected coastal areas, vital, for example, for overwintering waders, in sharp decline nationally and internationally exactly because of the kinds of habitat removal and degrading that will occur if housing is built on areas outlined in the current consultation document. Why isn't Wirral becoming a national focus of good practice, inviting national and international celebrities and research establishments to visit, publicise and support work on our Wirral bird and wildlife population? Much of the Greenbelt is farmland, some sites on the plan are on flood plains. My view is that it shows poor judgement and no understanding of our need for food security or hydro-geology to suggest building on these areas. In summary: Wirral's housing need can be met by using brownfield sites. There is no need to build on Greenbelt.</p>
DOR02371	<p>I believe that the local plan is based on unsound assumptions regarding the forecasted demand for future housing. The demand forecasts are significantly overstated. Evidence has been presented to the council to support this view. In addition the local plan does not make maximum use of the brownfield sites available (e.g. large cleared sites were created as a result of the now expired HMRI that are available). The proposed sites will not increase the supply of affordable housing and it is unclear how the local plan addresses this need. The council has around 6000 empty homes and is not directing sufficient resources to ensure that these properties are removed from void and re-let or improved for sale. More effort needs to be focused on working closely with Peel Holdings to develop out their sites and enable Wirral Waters to become a reality. Why is the council failing to process existing planning permission applications from Peel Holdings when there is so much economic as well as regeneration potential for Wirral</p>
DOR02372	<p>I strongly disagree with building new houses on the 'lungs' of Wirral. The peninsula is already heavily populated and more houses = more people vying for the existing stretched resources. Build on brown sites if you must, there is plenty of space around the old Corporation road area</p>
DOR02373	<p>Building houses on the car park in Bromborough will kill off the small businesses in the Village and cause terrible congestion on the surrounding roads and streets. Also the civic centre is vital to the local community. A very ill thought out plan just for the sake of a few houses!!</p>
DOR02374	<p>Now that the ONS has downgraded its predictions of population growth for the Wirral, we have been made aware that supposed housing needs have been drastically reduced if not halved....hence an approximate 5-6000 houses to be created by 2035. I have also read that Peel homes are still promising 13000 homes in that period at Wirral waters not to mention other brownfield sites still available for development. I therefore fail to see why ANY green belt needs to be developed on our precious Wirral - unless of course there is some monetary gain for WBC. Not sure how councillors voting on these proposals could live with the responsibility of taking away this beautiful green space forever - removing the distinction between historic villages such as Irby, Thingwall & Pensby to name but a few & taking away the very essence of the peninsular - a tourist attraction for that very reason. PLEASE THINK BEFORE YOU ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN PLEASE.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02375	In the context of the requirement to produce a local plan and acknowledging parameters set by Central Government, I would like to make the following points: I strongly oppose the use of green belt land and feel the proposals are not fully justified. 1. The value of Wirral's green belt cannot be underestimated, Wirral has always been a tourist area, tourism brings income. The revival of Liverpool in recent years has added to visitor numbers. People come here to visit parks and coastal areas, not dense housing. 2. People need space. It has both psychological and social importance. Once green land is built on, it never returns to open pasture. 3. My local area, West Kirby, is already a magnet for building. In recent years, every piece of land has been seized on for development – Bridge Road flats, Aldi supermarket and space on the promenade. The town centre is congested, there are traffic problems and increasing difficulty in parking. These factors all impact on visitors. In the plan there are proposals for possible further development. 4. The impact of Brexit cannot be accurately known at this point, yet this has been factored into population figures. 5. The future demographic is weighted towards the over 65s, not families needing schools, etc. With that in mind, should the plan not incorporate more appropriate accommodation? Flats would meet the need and make more economic use of existing land. 6. Wirral is not simply an urban sprawl on the edge of a city. It has its own identity and character, and its appeal lies in the contrast that it offers. Sacrifice this and we will lose much more than green fields.
DOR02376	Wirral is a beautiful place to live and visit but all this would be spoiled by using Green Belt sites for building, especially when there are plenty of other options - Brownfield sites, Wirral Waters Development, empty houses. I urge you to use the other options and leave our Green Belt alone.
DOR02377	I totally believe there is enough brown sites to use instead of using any of our wonderful green spaces. I cannot believe 3 farms have been given notice to quit by the Landlord. Just because his family aren't interested !!! Far too much bad stuff going on I am extremely concerned.
DOR02378	I object to the plan to build on greenbelt sites. My objection is based on several factors. 1) The need to reduce greenhouse gases. This should be a priority for all local authorities. The green spaces around Wirral absorb carbon dioxide. Buildings and roads, and the increased traffic they will generate, will add to emissions. 2) Loss of bio diversity. Many species of birds, for example, including those listed under section 41 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act, require areas of suitable farmland in order to thrive. 3) Local amenities. Wirral promotes itself as a leisure area and a good place to retire to. Much of its attraction resides in the extensive network of peaceful green spaces and public footpaths. Developments such as those proposed can only detract from this. 4) Increased traffic. I have particular concerns about the proposed developments between Station Road and the M25 and along Gills Lane. Station Road is an extension of Storeton Lane and is heavily used by traffic heading to and from Birkenhead. There is a choke point at the narrow section at the junction with Barnston Road, which already results in long queues of cars at peak periods. It is well accepted that idling engines produce heavy concentrations of carbon dioxide, adding to global warming. Also, Barnston Road is hazardous where it goes through Barnston Dale, with a blind corner at the junction with Gills Lane. It is a major route for ambulances heading for the Emergency Department at Arrowe Park hospital and we often hear them turning on their sirens as they approach the narrow end of Storeton Lane and then on through the dale. Any increase in traffic resulting from building along Gills Lane could produce a genuine danger to life. I appreciate that the Council is under pressure from the government to build more houses. I should like to see an in depth analysis of whether or not there really is a need for so many new houses, based on demographic predictions. If the need is proved, then every effort should be made to provide them on existing brownfield sites, before any consideration of development on the green belt.
DOR02379	I note the main reasons on your leaflet for the consultation. I feel that the management has put a lot of blame on the central government. On the contrary, you should look at your housing policy and strategy. It is clear that the council has no clear strategy whatsoever. It also means that this consultation is totally unnecessary if the council had a workable strategy. This consultation clearly demonstrate the incompetence of the council. If we look at the number of house to be built by 2035 is really insignificant because it represents 800 dwellings per year. What is the problem. Surely this is an easy target. I would expect the council to do so anyway. In summary it is an exercise totally waste of time and money. I just wish the council knows what they are doing.
DOR02380	Please leave our greenbelt alone. SP052 Eastham Village has been comprised enough with a new Rugby Club being built and 21 new houses 4/3 bed unaffordable detached homes, I dread the think the state of the small village after the rugby club is up and running. Surely, the council can't be planning to totally destroy the rest of the village by proposing even more new builds and making the 'Conservation Area' which I was proud to live in a 'joke'. I moved to on the Wirral 3 years ago because I thought it was a beautiful place, well looked after and an area we would be happy living in. So far, all I've had since moving to Eastham conservation/greenbelt area is nothing but upset, tears and disbelief of what the council has/is allowing. My partner and I found our dream forever home, renovated it and now we are talking about moving because of the building plans. It's disgusting that all the residents (their objections it seems were never heard) have had all this worry put on them by their council! Please, no more.
DOR02381	I feel you are making a dreadful mistake in your plans to close Bromborough civic hall which has given a lot of pleasure to a lot of people over the years, some of which through disability or lack of transport cannot go anywhere else and I urge you to reconsider your proposal.
DOR02382	I am very concerned about the building on green belt.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02383	<p>Land to the rear of Pensby Children's Centre, Fishers Lane, Pensby (Ref: SHLAA 1742) The site above is listed as a site recommended for consultation for New Housing Development in Appendix 1, despite it not being on the Brownfield Register or there being a resolution to dispose of it. This land is integral to the entire Children's Centre site. Indeed, following 2 initial consultations in June 2015 and June 2017 under Section 77 of the School Standards and Framework Act (disposal of School Buildings and Playing Fields) of which surrounding neighbours received Neighbour Notification Notices and opposed its development The decision was made by the council not to include it on the Brownfield Register and retain it on the SHLAA (although not classed as previously developed land) as there was no resolution to dispose of the site. In 2018 a consultation took place to place the Children's Centre on the Brownfield Register and again, this was opposed and the decision taken not to proceed by the Council. Not all surrounding properties received Neighbour Notification Notices as they were a few metres further away than mandated by regulations to receive one despite backing onto the site (without notification the council had divided the site into two parts). However, subsequent questions of the Council via my MP and direct discussions with local councillors has highlighted that the Council intends to move the focus of South and West Wirral Early Childhood Services to Bromborough – services will still be delivered to the Pensby area just not via this facility. It has also been decided, following the poor Ofsted inspection of Children's Social Care, that all social care staff will be moving to alternate offices in Birkenhead. Local councillors were unaware of this and had been telling constituents that nothing was going to happen. Both these actions will empty the Children's Centre. Residents have received notification from One Vision Housing (a social housing company) of their intention to get planning permission for the site and start building from March/April 2019. During discussion the Housing association disclosed that the Children's Centre site is being considered a Phase 2 development despite it being an active facility. If the entire site is given over to housing, Pensby is going to become too dense – even with just 35 dwellings this is potentially 70 extra cars in the immediate area alone. This is especially concerning as I was told by one of the councillors that the Head Teacher of Pensby School is seeking to sell off the former Boys School site for housing following the school becoming an academy as well as the proposed loss of the land between Pensby and Irby to building. There is insufficient local infrastructure to cope with this – where and how are local services to be delivered in the immediate area if there is no council facility? If there is a mass of family housing built and occupied by families – where are the children to go to school, to the doctor and so forth? Considering the limited amount of public transport in the area how is public transport to be supplied on roads not suitable for large vehicles? This is a problem on the Ford estate where, following the speed limit reduction to 20mph and subsequent lower maintenance levels and funding for the road, led to damage to buses which were then reduced. In short, unless there is a local council facility available and a properly funded infrastructure provided, this will lead to Pensby becoming a crowded and cut off place to live. It seems strange to build houses on the site of what could be a valuable community resource (which I would wholeheartedly support).</p>
DOR02384	<p>I feel that I have to strongly disagree and object to the proposals by the Wirral Council regarding the releasing of Green Belt Land. There is so much information most of it produced and quoted by the Council that shows that Green Belt Land should not be the first choice to build on. There is enough Brownfield Land and Planning consents in the system which should be used first to satisfy the projected housing needs for Wirral for the foreseeable future. I hope the Council sees some common sense and take note of its own figures regarding future housing needs and not some unknown Whitehall Politician.</p>
DOR02385	<p>[SAME AS DOR02050] with the additional comments: If Greasby's beautiful green spaces are sold on for profit, our family will be affected hugely, amongst others. The wonderful dairy farm at Greenhouse/Arrowe Brook Farm is an asset to both Greasby and the wider area and should not be put at risk due to these plans.</p>
DOR02386	<p>There is no justification for building on our Green Belt. The combination of Wirral Waters and bringing more of the 6,000 currently unoccupied dwellings back into use will be sufficient to meet future housing needs. Had the Council bothered to comply with the 2004 Act of Parliament to produce a Local Plan, the sites the Town hall has implied are at risk would be secure.</p>
DOR02387	<p>I would like to voice my objection to the proposal to include the car-park in Bromborough on a list of suitable sites for future building development. Bromborough is lucky enough to still have a vibrant village atmosphere which would be totally killed off if the carpark was to disappear. Normal village shoppers would be likely to take the easier option of going to the Croft estate development. There is considerable debate as to the accuracy of the governments figures for future house requirements on the Wirral. Would it not make sense for Wirral Council to question the numbers put forward and offer an alternative. Peel Holdings have also reneged on their plans to build residences that were submitted. So come on Councillors try and maintain our way of life on Wirral and not put forward these short sighted and wholly unpopular plans.</p>
DOR02388	<p>I feel this is a ridiculous ploy to make some developers very rich and the council equally affluent. The areas being proposed as suitable sites are clearly those areas which people like myself moved to the area to enjoy. It was the draw, the attraction, the desirability. Build on this and that factor has gone. People are moving away from the Wirral as there are no new jobs worthy of the population you are seeking. I work in Chester, my wife in Liverpool... we enjoy where we live for what it is now, if by we could live in either city's suburban sprawl. This initiative would be unwelcome as it would not create "affordable" housing. There may well be a small proportion of cheap houses in the plan, but those sorts of developments are not in keeping with this relatively affluent area - the houses built would be expensive and unrequired. B - a huge amount of disruption on the local community would be unacceptable - schools are already oversubscribed, increasing population would make this unbearably difficult to pick a local school for your child. C - traffic would cause chaos and health implications as areas with already high traffic issues would become oversaturated with traffic out of these new housing developments - every journey would require a car as the developments are so far from current services with no plans to build new business opportunities. D - brownfield sites are all over the Wirral... instead of aiming to fill an area with hugely expensive properties so developers get the best returns, build some actually affordable housing - instead of commercial centres which lie dormant... for example the commercial development at the entrance to the Croft retail park is completely abandoned and has been for some time. There are also great big open spaces there, next to the Asda car park and the Mac Donald's which are pointless areas used for nothing.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	Grow up Wirral borough council.... do a bit of hard work and find these areas instead of destroying why people like myself live here.
DOR02389	I object to the plan as the green belt is an important asset for the physical and mental health of the local population, as well as the flora and fauna which are needed to help the many as I sites on Wirral. Brown field sites should be utilised first e.g. Peel Holdings plans.
DOR02390	The Council has previously stated that Wirral is to retain its identity by not merging one village into another. Building on the green belt will break this resolution. We are a small peninsular whose residents are passionate about living here and we want our greenbelt protecting. We elect councillors in to protect this on our behalf, and feel it is their duty to all Wirral residents to use the brownfield sites, of which there are many, for housing development when needed, and to preserve the green belt.
DOR02391	I am extremely against building on greenbelt land for environmental reasons. The land helps to reduce flooding in our area by soaking up the rainfall. Some of this land is quite boggy anyway and therefore building on it will inevitably result in more flooding of housing. As a planet we need to reduce the warming of the earth. We have been advised to plant more trees in our gardens to help reduce global warming so why would you build on so much greenbelt land which would be hazardous to our planet. The road network in our area is already overloaded. Travelling through Heswall is gridlocked and cars now backup along other roads such as Whitfield Lane and Downham Road North to avoid the queues. These roads are getting very busy and are not made for commuter traffic. Our good friends have recently moved from there as they have seen traffic increase in recent years. It will get much worse with more houses and cars. Commuting to work is already very congested. Travelling towards Chester, Liverpool, M53 or Levers Causeway are the only way out of West Wirral and could not cope with more traffic. We are not connected on the rail network here which increases road use. With Avon bus company going into liquidation the number 88 bus no longer runs. This was the only bus connecting Heswall to Greasby and West Kirby. The only way is via car now which again increases congestion and damages the environment. Our doctors, dentists, schools and hospitals are already overstretched. We could not cope with increased demand. Using the Greenbelt will reduce the health of residents. Less fresh air for those with lung conditions will suffer. Our beautiful countryside cannot be replaced once it has been destroyed. Future generations will suffer as result of your poor judgement. It has now been revealed that we do not even need these extra houses on Wirral. There is sufficient brownfield sites to build on in our area. The population in Wirral is more elderly, childbearing aged women are a small percentage so we are not going to have a population explosion in our area. These houses are clearly unnecessary. Wirral should be looked at in its own merits not have a blanket government approach to calculating population figures.
DOR02392	The demographics of Wirral (massive health inequalities and an ageing population) suggest that the government's national policy for housing developments will not fully serve Wirral's needs. Above all I believe vacant brownfield land and empty properties should be absolute priority to redevelop- the built-up and industrial areas populated by these properties/ land are the areas that will benefit most from redevelopment. The consequences of removing green space from built-up estates will decrease the value of existing houses, and have huge impacts of the wellbeing of local residents who use these areas to play, walk their dogs and socialize. Consultation with local residents should be mandatory and letterbox communication should be utilized in order to reach everyone. I also think the phrase 'affordable housing' should be reconsidered. With many low income families surviving on minimum wage incomes, 'affordable housing' is still a distant dream for many.
DOR02393	We are writing 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. 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 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 is so popular with walkers, cyclists and horse riders alike and why it is 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 principle 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, 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 and the Development Viability Baseline Report. 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 the land west of the Wirral Way had a perfect right to sell their land, to whomsoever they choose. However, the fact that it has been sold to Magnolia Properties Limited and directors of 3k Property Investments Limited, 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. Unless, they are starting a 'Land Bank', a practice which the government say they are keen to stop. Given that developing Green Field sites is more cost effective and profitable for developers and given that the above sale of land was undoubtedly known to the Council and has relevance to the local community we would be very interested to know 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 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. Whilst we accept that the housing plan contained within the Wirral Waters, Master Plan will not provide for all of Wirral's housing

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>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 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 encroaching 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. Seabank Road and Parkway aside, the few houses on the roads including Davenport ,Riverbank Road, Manners Lane, Wittering Lane and Banks Road in the main, border 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.'</p> <p>Whilst we accept that the housing plan contained within the Wirral Waters, Master Plan will not 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 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 encroaching 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 of 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.' 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 cross roads 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' states the following: 96. Access to a network of high quality open spaces and opportunities for sport and physical activity is important for the health and well-being of communities. Planning policies should be based on robust and up-to-date assessments of the need for open space, sport and recreation facilities (including quantitative or qualitative deficits or surpluses) and opportunities for new provision. Information gained from the assessments should be used to determine what open space, sport and recreational provision is needed, which plans should then seek to accommodate. 97. Existing open space, sports and recreational buildings and land, including playing fields, should not be built on unless: a) an assessment has been undertaken which has clearly shown the open space, buildings or land to be surplus to requirements; or b) the loss resulting from the proposed development would be replaced by equivalent or better provision in terms of quantity and quality in a suitable location;</p>
DOR02394	Please don't take our wonderful countryside We do need affordable houses but you don't have to build all over the green belt for that We don't need a Golf city for the few
DOR02395	<p>I have read and looked at both the proposed housing allocations and the proposed green belt sites. Having then looked at the Wirral peninsular as a whole it appears to me there are more than enough sites suitable for building without the necessity to build on Green Belt land. I suggest that Green Belt is a 'soft' option an easy option. Nothing needs to be knocked down, existing drains, sewage and power doesn't have to be disconnected and reworked. In effect you have a blank canvas to bulldoze over, which also makes for a cheaper option. Since the 1970s, 56% of wildlife in the UK has declined. Where our green spaces used to be full of life, lack of protection of our species has left us living in one of the most nature depleted countries in the world. Here on the Wirral we are very fortunate and yet instead of proposing laws to protect the environment and wildlife, you propose to destroy it. I do have a vested interest in the proposals and no I don't want all those extra houses built, but ignoring personal emotions, logic suggests that very little thought has gone into many of these proposals. Having lived in Irby for many years I want to know where all these new inhabitants are going to go for dentistry? or what Dr they are going to see, it's difficult enough now to see a Doctor at the Warrens. What hospital will they go to - Arrow park is already at capacity and has difficulty coping with the current population, particularly through the winter months. What school will their children attend?, Pensby Boys school has merged with the girls school and is now predominantly unused. So will you be willing to invest in education, the health service, the roads and infrastructure required? Somehow I find it unlikely, you are currently 'repairing' roads by quite literally pouring tar over the holes! The NHS says that over 25% of the population is now obese and yet you wish to build on the very places people are encouraged to walk. You have suggested so many Green belt locations I feel you are giving us a worst case scenario so when you offer to only build on one or two the campaigners will think that a victory. But for me with so many other none green belt sites available if you build on even one green belt site it will be defeat. The concept of Green Belt is for an area 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 is to prevent urban growth and having read the NPPF I really can't see any case for building on any green belt at this time.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02396	<p>The plan addresses a flawed formulae devised by the Government. It may be applicable to London and the south of England but not on the Wirral. The housing requirements of the Wirral are dependent on the adjacent big conurbations of Liverpool, Manchester and Chester. The amount of space required for the Wirral should only be dependent on the amount of employment (companies) available in the Borough. We should not be developing the Wirral as a vast housing estate ruining the Wirral's desire to be a place to visit for relaxation and a tourist destination. Please allow all our green areas to be protected from the unscrupulous building firms that have land banked many of our precious fields and green spaces. With the need for more recreational places as employment adjusts to needs of the 21st century we would be foolish to squander our wealth in this area. Once the areas outlined in the LDP have been brought out of the green belt they will be lost for ever. I would hope that our children and our children's children will be able to enjoy the Wirral for the fabulous place it is .Please do not squander this inheritance to developers greed. Please remember that every green space ruined will be costing the council in both infrastructure and pollution. The amount returned by council tax payers will not return the amount necessary to fund this especially when building estates rather than higher density housing like flats. DO NOT SELL WIRRAL GREEN BELT TO THE DEVELOPERS.</p>
DOR02397	<p>Objecting to developments on Wirral Green Belt areas. Sufficient brown site land and empty property's already in existence. On the area adjacent to my home SP044, this area contains historic house and site of archaeological interest, as well as site of Scientific interest, nature reserve. Contains essential farming land. Some areas prone to flooding. Also essential buffer zone to maintain areas identity between villages.</p>
DOR02398	<p>We live at Park Road east and are worried that building of houses on the land adjacent will cause parking problems. my reasons for this are people who work in the town centre use that area to park their vehicles and the surrounding rounds get really busy to.</p>
DOR02399	<p>The plans effecting Pipers Lane are outrageous. The lane is not suitable for increased traffic i.e.. not wide enough, no parking and is already difficult in bad weather. It is a LANE. This is an area of flora and fauna bordering the Wirral Way and Heswall Dales which will ultimately be destroyed. We need to spend money regenerating Birkenhead and making it great again and not building unaffordable houses.</p>
DOR02400	<p>Please do not build on green belt land. Wirral is known for its areas of beauty, without that we will be nothing!</p>
DOR02401	<p>The ongoing Wirral Council Green Belt briefings have had the fortuitous effect of bringing some knowledgeable people together . Following a meeting held at Hulme Hall a local barrister raised the issue of motorway proximity and health risks. As is his wont [another respondent] has done some further research on this issue and specific issues in relation to Claremont Farm which we'd like to share with you . Firstly consider the following information taken from the Claremont Farm Facebook page : It is very sad to think that this particular part of our farm in the photo could be taken away for development and housing! We must first make it clear that we do not own the land, we are tenant farmers and we have been farming here since 1906.....and we are categorically against any building on Claremont and our precious Wirral Green Belt. The family have a 100 year lease or 4 generations Agricultural Tenancy Agreement, which myself and my brother currently hold and we are the last generation to automatically receive the right to farm at Claremont. After us, who knows what will happen. The farm shop is also not ours, we have the right to run it for 30 years but then have to give it back, even though we have paid (with some help from our landlord and some Rural Development Funding) for the building to be built. The Farm and the Farm Shop are owned by the Trustees of the Poulton Hall Estate and land agents manage our farm & shop. If the Trust had no desire to develop, there would be no issue. This part of the farm is integral to our Farm and taking it away brings the viability of the whole of Claremont under speculation. We rotate our Home Grown Vegetables around this particular land as it's the closest land available to the shop, so we are not having to travel long distances every morning during harvest. It's also important that winter educational visits/welly walks can access these vegetables and enable the children to see these vegetables growing first hand. This part of the farm is also integral to our Higher Level Environmental Stewardship Scheme agreement, which works on a points basis, many of our points are gained in this area of land from infield trees & ponds, field corners, grass buffer strips, hedgerow management etc etc If we lose this land we will no longer have sufficient points to stay in the agreement and will also lose the right to offer 70 FREE school visits every year to the local school groups. There is a reason Bebington was voted the most desirable postcode in the UK to live and the Wirral is known for its green spaces, to take that away unnecessarily would be a travesty. Do we need to mention the obvious traffic issue and that it is already at capacity on Brimstage Road and the Clatterbridge roundabout.....and nothing is more frustrating than knowing that there are many more brown field and suitable areas where houses could be built but for political reasons, mismanagement and greed, these are not being utilised. We will back any campaign to save our green belt and to push the council to use the areas already marked for housing first and foremost. There are groups, such as the Claremont Defenders who we wish to distance ourselves from though and even though people may use our name they may not have our best interests at heart. (https://www.fishergerman.co.uk/offices/chester)</p> <p>Let us hope the Council make the correct choice, not to allow unnecessary building on our Green Belt. [Another respondent] provides the following information that Claremont Farm and others living in the surrounding area would do well to heed... Wirral residents are now aware that the main thrust of the great council Green Belt Sell Off for housing development is focused on a wide strip of land just east of the M53 from Prenton in the north to Raby Mere in the south. This huge area is currently farm land. Protests have so far focused on the harmful impact on current residents. The quality of life of current residents will be badly impacted by these unnecessary developments. However it is emerging that those who buy the new homes on this land adjacent to the M53 will also be put at hazard in terms of health risks. Several large scale clinical research studies over the last decade show that proximity to motorways causes significantly increased risk of heart attacks, strokes, dementia and reduced lung function in children. What is compelling in all this research is the demonstration of gradient effects: the nearer to the road, the greater the health damage recorded. It looks as though living within 500 metres of a motorway presents significant risks. In the land under threat, two areas already border the danger zone. Poulton Royd Drive to Colmore Avenue at Poulton Lancelyn lies just under 500 mts. from the M53. Blakely Road houses at Raby Mere are just on the boundary of safety. Any housing development</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	west of these sites will expose purchasers to serious risks. The new NICE Guidance requires Local Plans to 'site living accommodation away from roadsides. "minimise risk to vulnerable groups to air pollution by not siting buildings in areas where pollution levels will be high. "avoid the creation of street and building configurations (such as deep street canyons) that encourage pollution to build up where people spend time. 'The land south of junction 4 and east of the M53 is low lying where pollution can and does accumulate in light winds. Prevailing westerly winds blow fumes towards the current housing but it disperses in the open fields. New housing nearer the M53 won't be so lucky. Similar risks relate to areas at Brookhurst Avenue and near junction 5 and Eastham. Allowing, indeed encouraging, house building close to the M53, given the clear medical evidence, amounts to criminal negligence. This material was brought to my attention by a local lawyer. By the way the situation at 'Claremont', land parcel SP042 A, is interesting. The council intends to redefine all the land there which is currently green belt. This covers the farm buildings & shop, the near field, Poulton Royd house and the gardens of the large houses along Poulton Royd Drive. The owners are not happy! Lancelyn Green Estates has given permission for the council to release SP040 (south of Brimstage Road, and north of the farm) for development. This was a foolish tactical mistake since the detailed council plan just released lists options' involving ALL of the Lancelyn Green land from Brimstage Road south to Raby Mere SP040 – SP046 and other land besides.
DOR02402	No Green Belt land should be released for housing or development. The figures attempting to justify this are questionable at best. Wirral has plenty of sites available for new housing without resorting to using green belt. The factors that protect and provide for green belt preservation are being ignored
DOR02403	The new houses should not be built on Greenbelt land.. The government target figure is not proportionate for the size of Wirral. This Council is slowly taking away all our green space. I am sure the Labour councillors don't have any of the proposed plans where they live ? We also have many boarded up existing houses that should be utilised for social housing. Any new development that is built is often bought by investors and used for rental therefore building any new housing will not assist people getting on the housing ladder. Who checks that the purchaser is actually going to live in the house ? I think that these kind of checks have been missed. and will only increase rentals with high rents instead of actual purchasers wanting to buy a home
DOR02404	I am totally opposed to any development on green belt land and park land on the Wirral. According to your own guidelines, building on such land should only be done in an emergency. The Wirral is one of the most beautiful places to live in the British Isles, and the green belt is important for the health and well-being of its residents, as well as local wildlife. Any use of green belt land for development could set a precedent which could result in the loss of a significant proportion of it. There is a considerable amount of brownfield sites on the Wirral, particularly around the docks in Birkenhead. I understand much of this land is owned by Peel Holdings, and it is possible to buy this land from them using a compulsory purchase order. The council should prioritise the development of this land.
DOR02405	I object completely to the proposed extension of housing on the green belt land of the Wirral
DOR02406	I wish to personally object to all building plans on greenbelt land across the Wirral. Even more so the fields that are being sold off under our noses in the Heswall area. As a young adult, I am all for affordable housing. However, building on greenbelt is not the right approach. ruining the land that we all love and is the reason we moved here isn't going to increase the population on Wirral, it will drive everyone away. We live on what the young call 'paradise peninsular' a name that was given to the Wirral because of its natural beauty and wide open space to enjoy the countryside. Not only would the new builds never sell and decrease the value of the houses in surrounding areas. It would also drive away the young people investing in the local areas. Not just investing in homes but in business also. Once again the adults of now are not thinking of the generation of the future.
DOR02407	You need to build 800 homes pa you said across Wirral before 2035. You talk about affordable housing but that is not strictly true is it ? Affordable housing is based on a national average, not a local one. I should know, I went to look at the houses at Upton Pines, there were only about 8 2 bed houses built (at a price of £170K) and they were not affordable to the majority of first time buyers. Here's a suggestion :- Start building 2 up 2 down terraced houses again, for predominantly first time buyers. Do 4 roads of 50 houses each side. each year and there you go, jobs done ! It's a smaller area and easier to control and project manage. Make them a first time buyers target, no investment buyers to be allowed to buy them. Strict control needs to be reverted to here. At the end of each row, build one bed bungalows for the aged population who only need a small dwelling to live in. To me, it's a simple solution to a problem that you seem to be trying to make as complex as possible and use up the greenbelt within the Wirral. Use the brownfield sites for the development, terraced houses are cheap to build, they would create a lot of local jobs for the community, thereby putting good money back into the Wirral economy. It's time that developers stopped being greedy. I was always taught to "keep it simple" - KISS.
DOR02408	I object to using green belt land for building new homes on when brownfield sites are not being used or are tied up due to an inability for the council to remove issues with developers to move new affordable homes being built along. I find the figures unsubstantiated and outdated. Affordable homes will not be built on green belt land - maybe a handful and the rest will be unaffordable to the needy. The infrastructure hasn't been considered or been told to the people it will effect.
DOR02409	As someone born and grown up on the Wirral I am horrified at the planned use of green belt land for housing based on projections regarding future need. These figures are incorrect and should not be relied on. I also want to stress that the inherent character of the Wirral is due to its green and pleasant nature which is what makes it a wonderful place to live and bring up families but also draws so many visitors to its beauty spots and brings the tourism revenue that is so important. I urge you to think again.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02410	<p>I am appalled by the proposals to consider building on green belt. I am also appalled by the proposal to build on 3 fields within West Kirby All the proposed sites off Grange Road and Grange Old Road feed onto a high traffic area with high levels of pollution. I walk down Grange Hill to the bus stop and shops regularly as I don't drive, and the smell of exhaust fumes is already extremely worrying. The proposals to build 38 houses on what is currently a semi-rural field occupied by sheep and 18 houses on a farm field off a small residential road, almost opposite, is ridiculous. I think if a traffic survey was carried out in the vicinity, it would become apparent that this is not a good idea. There are currently 192 houses for sale and 30 to rent in West Kirby alone. We do not need any more houses building. We are a small semi-rural town that attracts visitors from far and wide because of our beautiful surroundings, to keep expanding the population would seriously spoil our unique attractions. I also know that our medical centre has had trouble recruiting sufficient doctors, it is already difficult to get an appointment, increasing the demand without extra doctors is another bad idea. I trust the council to agree that these proposals are not in the best interests of the local community, quite the opposite, and to allow the special nature of West Kirby and surrounding towns to be eroded would be to the detriment of all Wirral residents.</p>
DOR02411	<p>The day after the Port Sunlight meeting, it took me 11 minutes to get from the motorway junction at Clatterbridge onto Brimstage Road. The delay was due to a car having broken down on the roundabout. This roundabout and Brimstage Road are busy now and the infrastructure can't cope as it is. To add to this by building hundreds of new houses would be madness. I totally object to building on the land around Clatterbridge Roundabout.</p>
DOR02412	<p>I completely object to the use of green belt land being used for any other reason than why it was originally chosen as Green belt in the Wirral. There are plenty of other areas of brown belt and areas in Wirral which could be used for housing. The government figures which have been used in predicting the amount of housing required do not meet with the need of this area. According to council statistics there are more deaths than births in this area, there is not a need for housing. The houses are being built to generate income for the council in the form of tax. What the council actually needs is more money from central government to pay for the social and other services the council are trying to hold together. Housing is needed but not half a million pound property. What is needed is starter homes to help people get on the property ladder and smaller bungalow style properties for the ageing population of Wirral.</p>
DOR02413	<p>We are writing to raise strong objections to the proposals to include many greenbelt sites across Wirral in the Council's Local Plan for housing development. Greenbelt sites should only be used as a last resort. They should be cherished not destroyed.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The number of houses proposed exceeds the actual number required by ONS figures. • Wirral currently has thousands of unoccupied properties that should be utilised. • Use the brownfield sites for redevelopment. To develop these brownfield sites would bring investment to areas of the Wirral where it is much needed e.g. Birkenhead & Seacombe. This would result in bringing affordable housing to people that need it and would also result in providing a better environment in these areas. • Building on greenbelt sites will widen the divide between the poor and more affluent areas. As only luxury housing will be built on greenbelt land. • Peel Holdings should be encouraged to utilise the land they have been banking for housing with immediate effect. • Building on greenbelt will destroy the unique character of the Wirral. Wildlife habitats will be destroyed. • Infrastructure and amenities in many proposed areas will not cope with increased number of residents. • The population of Wirral does not require this amount of housing. Recent population analysis data do not predict a boom to Wirral population. • Building on greenbelt should be a last resort. It should be treated as a precious commodity not as an opportunity to line developers' pockets. • Keep Wirral villages as villages. Regarding Irby • Irby should be kept as a true village. Joining Irby to Pensby, Thingwall & Greasy as proposed would make a huge urban mass. As Pensby already joins Heswall and Barnston is also down to merge too. • The local roads will not be able to cope. • There isn't enough spaces at the local primary schools • The local medical centre could not cope. • Irby has been allocated an unfairly huge proportion of the proposed sites (800+ houses) for such a small village. • Irby currently has a good mix of housing. It has a village atmosphere and community. This would be lost • The properties that back on to the horse field on Thingwall Road have small gardens at a lower level than the field. • Harrock Woods benefits from having open fields surrounding it providing a natural source of food for the wildlife that live there. I trust that you will take into account people's views before you destroy this beautiful part of the world. I understand that extra housing is needed but all other options should be considered and utilised before green belt destruction.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02414	<p>My husband and I are both from Wirral. We are both devastated with the proposals to release any green belt land for development. The population in Wirral is dropping and I cannot see any evidence of major job opportunities in the area so why we would need to build 12,000 new homes in 15 years is beyond me. As I drive around I see plenty of brownfield sites which with creative thinking could easily meet this target without the need to take precious undeveloped land. We have an ageing population and incentives could be given to elderly people to encourage them to downsize. My own parents live in a 4 bedroomed house which if incentives were given I'm sure they would move into a smaller home. We simply cannot keep taking land and building houses without considering the environmental consequences. The green belt land serves as a balance to our fragile eco structure and it is wholly irresponsible to even consider taking this land away. Our son is living in a flat above our business. It took us 4 years for us to save up to make this flat habitable. On a block of 8 businesses only 2 of the flats have people living in them. If the council was more creative in there thinking then flats like these could brought back to life without any new homes being built. We all now have a greater understanding of how what we do now will affect our futures and the future of the planet. The development of greenbelt land on Wirral is simply not needed and we dispute that they are. Factors such as increased noise, traffic, pollution will all increase if greenbelt land is taken away. We are about to leave the EU and we do not yet know how imports of food will be affected. Surely this land which is mainly agricultural should be kept as none of us know what the future holds. In our area we have distinctive character. The semi-rural appeal is provided by the open countryside which we can see outside our windows. We both love to walk outdoors and yet more local healthy pursuits would be taken away. We have a conflict I think we are being told to live healthy lifestyles and yet if our land is taken from us where are we to go to walk? Finally smaller homes in convenient locations for are ageing population is surely what is needed not developments on green belt land which would require new schools, doctors and other services to be built. The land opposite our house would be unsuitable to develop as it has the potential to increase the risk of flooding something that surely no one want to be experience?</p>
DOR02415	<p>My main concerns about the Local plan are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Wildlife. Building on green belt land will impact on our precious local wildlife resulting in a reduction in the numbers of and variety in pollinating insects which are essential for food production. There will be a consequent negative impact on wildlife further up the food chain. 2. Food Production In a few months' time, the UK is supposed to be leaving the EU. This country is hugely reliant on importing food stuffs : we cannot feed ourselves. There is already concern over the adequacy of food supplies due to the legalities and practicalities of transport via for e.g. the Channel ports and therefore taking more land out of food production is just not a suitable decision. 3. Jobs and Transport. Although there are employment opportunities on Wirral, there are more extensive ones in the more built up, business and industrial districts of Liverpool, Chester and Deeside. Many people commute to and from these places on a daily basis. As a Heswall resident who used to work in Liverpool, the only viable option is to drive. However the roads are already rammed at peak times and more developments in this area would just worsen the problem. Public transport is very limited. The 472/471 buses serve Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Irby and whilst the service is frequent, it takes a long time. When I first moved to Wirral in 1983, there was a 'Rapidride' bus service at peak times which took half the current bus time and provided a viable option to driving. The train service is infrequent, unreliable and requires a change at Bidston. How are all these people in the proposed new developments around these areas going to travel to work with the current infrastructure? Cycle lanes are non existent. 4. Expensive v Affordable homes The plan is for affordable homes. It is well known that developers would prefer to build expensive 'executive' homes as they yield them a higher return. If these developments go ahead, what assurances and legal requirements will be put in place to ensure that only affordable homes are built?
DOR02416	<p>SHLAA 2024 Bromborough Civic Centre. The Civic Centre is at the heart of our village and is in constant use. I have recently retired and I attend Zumba classes there twice a week and also U3A meetings. There are different groups using the premises whenever I pass by from singing to Weightwatchers and even local planning consultations! I have also attended evening concerts and given much needed blood in the main hall. The government is very keen on preventative health measures, both physical and mental. The destruction of Bromborough Civic Centre would mean that groups providing vital activities for the well-being of local people of all ages would have to disband as there would be nowhere to meet. PLEASE DO NOT RIP THE HEART OUT OF BROMBOROUGH.</p>
DOR02417	<p>SHLAA2024 The Civic centre is the only community activity space and library in Bromborough, where else are local older people supposed to go?</p>
DOR02418	<p>Please do not build on any of our greenfield sites. Instead please focus on improving and building on brownfield sites in Birkenhead. This is an area which really needs help. It also needs good quality affordable housing and more expensive properties too, to ensure a representative social mix.</p>
DOR02419	<p>I do not agree with the application to release the land to housing developers and we should preserve the green belt.</p>
DOR02420	<p>Having attended one of the Planning dept roadshows yesterday and listened carefully to both the presentation and comments of the audience I would like to express my opinion: First of all, I feel saddened that the council has been put in this position by the government who have eroded the powers of local councils over the years. However, this 'Masterplan' seems more like a desperate search to accommodate the governments demands than a well thought out solution to the problems of the Wirral. The problems of the Wirral are that it is a peninsula of two halves....the more historically rich and traditionally more industrial east side with mass housing, poor air quality and therefore lower life expectancy, and the 'green' west side with wide open spaces and small settlements. Instead of addressing this problem this 'Masterplan' compounds it by removing all Green Belt land from the east side and concentrating development in areas that are already densely populated e.g. Rock Ferry, Seacombe, Tranmere, etc. In these areas we should be recreating more open spaces not filling in every available space. In Seacombe, for example, the council annexes are earmarked for housing development. Should this not be an opportunity for a Town Hall Square to compliment the wonderful Town Hall with its fantastic views? Don't these areas deserve more aspirations? This is a time to make important decisions about the future of the Wirral as a whole and needs a broader approach based not just on government demands but the wider</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	issues that must be addressed.
DOR02421	Do not build on Green Belt. Once it is gone it is gone. You will regret it for the short term gain. You will lose votes.
DOR02422	<p>I am against reclassifying our green belt land for development! Green belt land is sacred, apart from their purpose of checking unrestricted sprawl of built up areas, preventing neighbouring towns merging, preserving the setting of historic towns like Eastham and safeguarding the countryside, it makes people's lives bearable and happier living near these places. I am wondering if the reason Eastham has been targeted is because its on the edge of Wirral and there are plans afoot to designate it into Cheshire, it feels like Wirral Council do not care about Eastham putting forward these plans! More specifically I would like to mention particular sites and why I am against development in these place; SPO50 and SPO51, West and East of Rivacre Road. These areas form a buffer from the industry of the tank farms that blight the area. As residents of St Johns Road Eastham, which is within the area of danger if there is a spill, we are conscious that there is an area of green belt protecting us, it is a source of stress to receive letters from Nu Star warning us of what to do in case of an emergency and practice alarms are sounded every Wednesday. Also Rivera valley is a natural break between Eastham and Ellesmere Port. Eastham Village is ancient, pretty and happy village. , I am already incensed by the intention to build houses on the rugby field. Our house backs on to Torr Park and it is in constant use by families and dog walkers. We care about our green spaces and do not want them to become consumed by houses. The green spaces also protect us some degree from the tank farms nearby. SPO53 and SPO54 this is the golf course and St Davids backing onto the golfcourse, there are some allotments there which are well used for growing food and a natural 'break' between Eastham and Bromborough and the industrial area there. This area is well used for recreation. SPO55 Between Seaview avenue and Eastham Ferry is right by the QE2 dock, there are ships in there most days and they are noisy and smelly. On the right of Ferry Road going down to the ferry is a piece of land which is not managed, there was a proposal to build a gas station there which was turned down. This area is not managed but is left to grow wild and supports all sorts of wildlife insects, butterflies, bees etc. This marks the start of a walk down to the ferry, you can look out at the ships and over the river. A large fuel pipe is buried under that land. Between that piece of land and the Coop cemetery is a dwelling. That dwelling used to be on a field(Mayfield) which sloped gently down to the river, the spoil from the building of the QE2 dock in the 1950's was placed all around it without consultation with the residents. I believe the rest of that area should be left alone and the woods on the river side before you get to the ferry should be better managed. Finally I am a volunteer with the Cheshire wildlife trust at Lowfields woods SPO48, it is an ancient woodland, there are many species of native trees and evidence it was a managed woods for centuries with coppiced hazel and the clay pits. There is plenty wildlife there, foxes, many species of birds. I grew up in Lowfields Avenue before the motorway was built and as a child played there and new every nook and cranny of those woods. People who live along Lowfields Avenue now love living there wouldn't live anywhere else because of the woods. I strongly appeal against any development in that wood it is a place of natural beauty, and also a barrier between the motorway and Lowfields Avenue.</p>
DOR02423	<p>Wirral has large areas of brown land. Why are those being left empty and neglected whilst agricultural areas are targeted for housing. If necessary compulsory purchase could be used. Empty vandalised properties abound in the Birkenhead and Wallasey areas, e.g. Central Hotel In Birkenhead could be compulsory purchased, demolished and used for housing.. I believe the council eventually has an obligation to do this. Why are Wirral saying green belt all has to be continuous- other areas of the country are not insisting on this. On 3 sides the Wirral is surrounded by water, so no chance of joining to neighbouring green belt on 3 sides- surely a case could be made at the very least of allowing green belt parcels against the coast. Dibbinsdale is a park and should not be thought of as potential development land. It used to have football pitches, a trim trail and a short lasting children's play area. The council said there was a shortage of football pitches, why not reinstate one here? Dibbinsdale contains a local nature reserve and is continuous with a Site of special scientific interest. We need our green lungs for the health of our human and wildlife populations. Why is there no land east of the M53 being protected? We do not want a continuous urban sprawl.</p>
DOR02424	<p>The Wirral cannot compete with Liverpool for retail and can only compete for cultural events in a small way. The main potential for economic growth has to be in exploiting the natural environment (i.e. tourism). If Green Belt is sacrificed and The Wirral is turned into one large housing estate, who will want to visit? The loss of hedges and trees will have a disastrous effect on the local fauna and climate in general and where will the water go during periods of prolonged rain? Brownfield site development MUST come first - no matter how hard the process. Peel Holdings cannot be allowed to sit back, break promises and allow their land to increase in value whilst they do little or nothing. They've managed it on both sides of The Mersey and it's about time there was a concerted effort to put pressure on them - in the media and in government.</p>
DOR02425	This plan will destroy Wirral
DOR02426	regarding SHLAA 2024/5 Use of Bromborough Civic Centre and Car Park for housing. Many groups use this centre. We have been to Wirral Dance Club for 20 years here. Do not destroy this enjoyment for older people.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02427	<p>I would like to register my objection to the release of green belt from Wirral on the following basis.</p> <p>A) the numbers for the increase in population on Wirral are erroneous and unsupportable, requiring the council to object which is allowed under the local plan directive.</p> <p>B) population growth would require investment. The council and government have no money on their own admission. EU money will not be available after our exit.</p> <p>C) removal of top grade agricultural land at a time of massive uncertainty because of EU exit is irresponsible at best.</p> <p>D) Wirral has a marketing position of green and pleasant land. Not Northern satanic mills.</p> <p>E) increasing traffic on already congested roads will massively increase pollution.</p>
DOR02428	<p>I am a resident of Irby Village and attended a consultation meeting on at Pensby School. My feedback on the consultation meeting is that I was extremely disappointed at the format. I felt that the presentation was very poor and difficult to understand – many slides with drawings that you could not read and meant nothing to anyone. There was no opportunity to ask questions as you went along and therefore it was difficult to remember what was said. The presentation was also very poorly delivered. There were a number of people in the audience who liked the sound of their own voice and proved to be quite aggressive with their questioning. Whilst the deputy planning officer did a reasonable job of keeping his calm, I was appalled by a Councillor's behaviour and response – he was extremely aggressive and very unprofessional and certainly not someone who I would ever consider voting for after that performance. The one positive from the meeting was the opportunity to meet various people from the council before and after and ask questions with the maps in front of you. I found all of the council members very knowledgeable and helpful. My views and feedback on the proposals are as follows:</p> <p>1) The consultation timelines seem very rushed and no explanation has been given as to why this is the case. The local plan has obviously been a long time in the making; therefore, it is only right that the residents of Wirral are also given enough time to make their views known.</p> <p>2) There were unanswered questions and ambiguity on the number of houses that Peel Holdings will commit to build. There was also confusion as to how the council arrived at the figure of 12,000 new homes, particularly when the population of Wirral is falling year on year. It is also surprising that the council have decided, this late in the day, to employ a statistician to check how they should calculate the number of houses and maybe challenge the government. Surely, a better way to approach this would have been to have both of these points addressed before consulting with residents.</p> <p>3) I have four children in their 20's so understand the challenges that young people have of getting onto the housing ladder. However, I did not come away from this meeting confident that this plan would provide affordable housing for them. Indeed quite the opposite.</p> <p>4) If these plans went ahead, there does not seem to be any consideration as to the infrastructure that would be needed to support them. For instance, Irby is an extremely small village with a handful of shops. There was no mention as to how the village would cope with a sudden influx of people.</p> <p>5) My husband and I moved to Irby village in December 2017 from Heswall. The reason we moved is that we liked the small village community and the semi-rural setting. This would completely disappear if these plans went ahead. Consideration should be given to residents like myself who have lived in the borough all of their life and are now planning for their retirement. In summary, I feel a better approach would have been to get all of the facts first around exactly how much housing is needed, inform the residents of the split of that housing (i.e. what percentage affordable, executive etc) and rather than putting all of the greenbelt forward and causing annoyance to the whole of Wirral, make a short list of sites that have been fully researched and where there are genuine reasons for choosing these sites - concentrating on how building houses on this land will contribute to the area - taking into account the effect of residents in this area.</p>
DOR02429	<p>Wirral's green spaces are enjoyed and valued by its residents, visitors and holiday-makers. To contemplate building on any of them, when there are so many other options available, is a dereliction of the Council's duty to its electorate and future generations.</p>
DOR02430	<p>SP010A. Greasby copse. Is this not the site of a settlement over 6000 years old? I object to building unnecessary homes on land that is so archeologically important.</p>
DOR02431	<p>It is appalling that green belt should be targeted this way. As a resident of Higher Bebington it is wonderful to be able to walk around the local countryside starting at Lever Causeway and through Little Storeton village. This area has remained unspoilt for many years and should continue to do so for the delight and enjoyment of walkers, horse riders, cyclists and dog walkers. Building in this area will not only destroy the area for those living locally but also destroy the habitat of local wildlife. Surely there are other brown sites that could be considered first.</p>
DOR02432	<p>Disgusted with Wirral council plans to build on so many green belt sites. Next time I'm voting Green!!</p>
DOR02433	<p>There is NO WAY you can knock down Heswall Primary school??? It's been the heart of the community for 70 years?! Please tell me I have got this wrong?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02434	<p>Having recently attended one of your consultative sessions on Wirral Council's local plan for the next 15 years, I was extremely disturbed to hear you are considering taking Green Belt land for housing. I list my concerns below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Apparently Wirral needs 800 houses a year for the next 15 years. How was this figure arrived at? It is by no means clear how the "no. of homes required" was calculated to apply to the Housing Delivery test, which calls into question it's accuracy. Historically, population growth has varied in Wirral: between 1991 -2001 the census showed a fall of 22,000; the 2011 census showed Wirral's population had only increased by 7,507. An estimate in 2013 gave an increase of only 500, so how can we be certain all these extra homes are needed in the next 15 years? 2. The use of Green Belt land for building is completely counter to the criteria laid down by government for designating land as Green Belt. In such a small area as Wirral, further building will lead to urban sprawl. There is already very little open space between settlement areas. Section 2 (9) of the National Planning Policy Framework 2018 states that planning policies should "take local circumstances into account, to reflect the character, needs and opportunities of each area". Section 5 (60) states that housing development policy should be "informed by local housing need assessment, conducted using the standard method in national planning guidance, unless exceptional circumstances justify an alternative approach." I suggest that Wirral is exceptional in the first instance because it is surrounded on 3 sides by water, unlike many other boroughs in England. Obviously this greatly restricts where building can occur and the same areas are targeted for more development. Following a national policy cannot possibly take local factors into account. People enjoy living and visiting Wirral because of its open spaces. If further development is allowed, the open spaces between settlements will be lost. Currently it would only take 5 minutes to drive between Wirral's core strategy settlement areas which demonstrates their proximity already. 3. Continuing to build houses year on year will cause irreversible, negative changes to the Wirral peninsula. I'm sure this has already happened in other parts of the country, and have personally witnessed this in High Wycombe which was once a quaint historic market town as its welcome sign still states. It is now unrecognisable as such due to extensive housing developments, with corresponding multi-car households leading to severe parking problems and cars being parked on pavements and grass verges. I would like to know when an area is considered to be optimally developed and further building would significantly spoil the character of the area. 4. Does the council / government not have any power to make developers build on land for which they have already received planning permission? Peel Holdings in particular is apparently holding onto a large amount of brown field land on Wirral which could be used for affordable housing. Perhaps now is the time for a compulsory purchase order? 5. Our NHS on Wirral is already grossly overstretched with prolonged waiting times for treatments. Building more houses will increase the pressure on the service intolerably unless development is further escalated to support this which would be very expensive and lead to more overcrowding.
DOR02435	I think it is disgusting that the council is planning to build on green belt around our beautiful coastal and farmland areas when there are alternative brown field sites that could be used. The infrastructure around lower Heswall could not take the additional pressure and the traffic on the A540 and around Clatterbridge roundabout is already extremely heavy, these options are just not viable.
DOR02436	Do not build on the Wirral Greenbelt. To do so will have a huge impact upon our communities and will eliminate any trust that has been built. If the greenbelt is built there will be a public outcry, the likes of which will not have been seen before we fear as the strength of feeling is running so high. One only has to see the local reaction already to gauge this. To proceed would be a mistake on so many levels, environmentally, from a community and PR perspective.
DOR02437	I am against building on the greenbelt and believe there is no reason to do so. Instead the council should focus on agreeing plans for Wirral waters development by Peel, encourage or force empty properties to be used and use brownfield sites. The Hoylake golf resort plan is a sham and not needed by the local community. Instead the land should be used to develop a natural reserve and activities for the residents such as birdwatching and walks.
DOR02438	Do not take away our precious greenbelt land!
DOR02439	We must register our horror and objections at the possibility of losing such a valuable asset as Bromborough Civic Centre. Keeping ourselves physically active at our ages of sixty two and seventy four is very important to our well-being and keeps us from needing help from the health services. Also the dancing club Stepping it Out provides a social get together for people from all over the Wirral not just Bromborough. We ourselves travel from West Kirby, because being with like-minded friends is a big bonus and there is no other venue like it for regular dancing. Please listen to your people.
DOR02440	Appalling urbanisation of a community with no thought to regeneration, services or the community itself. I vehemently opposed the planned building in Bromborough and all Wirral green belt
DOR02441	We need to save our green spaces as this is our most valuable asset on the Wirral
DOR02442	Plans to utilise Green Belt Sites, homes for wildlife including birds, squirrels and owls, are completely abhorrent - building new properties in an area that already has sufficient dwellings will negatively impact not only upon the natural wildlife but also current inhabitants of those areas, with dangerously increased traffic size and over population. In our own area of Pensby, the surrounding areas of Barnston, Thingwall, Irby and Heswall will undoubtedly lose their individuality and merge into one. Local shops, already well patronized will become dangerous to approach for pedestrians owing to the increase in volume of traffic, especially the elderly and young and parking will be a major issue. I am vehemently against losing Green Belt sites to the building of unnecessary property which will have far reaching negative implications for current residents and wildlife.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02443	I appreciate that the Borough has a shortage of housing but Wirral Council's efforts should be focused on bringing forward brownfield sites for development not releasing the green belt. Even in high demand areas, there are brownfield sites which could be used to build new homes.
DOR02444	I wish to object to building development on Bromborough carpark and civic centre. This area is vital to the heart of the village and the community area. The civic centre is an important community hub supporting many groups, and of course, the local library. I think this would affect the whole village and its traders should the plan go ahead.
DOR02445	<p>I am particularly concerned about the proposals to remove the land to the west of Column road (SP013) from greenbelt. My reasons are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This land forms a break between West Kirby and Caldý. One side abuts Boundary Road which signifies the boundary of West Kirby and one of the purposes of greenbelt is to stop sprawl that merges defined communities. To infill this piece of land would mean there was no definition between Caldý and West Kirby. 2. This is a truly beautiful piece of rolling countryside that greets anyone who drives along Column Road. It would detract from the beauty of the area if it was built on. 3. This land forms part of a large tract of countryside broken only by Column Road and provides a habitat for many living creatures. To put housing on the land would prevent the animals from being able to travel from Caldý Hill to Thurstaston Hill. 4. All the schools in West Kirby are full. If houses are built on this land who will provide the additional school places necessary? 5. The consultation has identified sites where employment can expand. None of these sites are near to West Kirby and as West Kirby has limited employment opportunities the majority of people living in these houses will have to commute along already over stretched roads causing yet more congestion. 6. Why is it necessary to include Stapleton Wood in the area that will be potentially removed from greenbelt. The document states it is to be protected so why remove it in the first place. It needs to stay as greenbelt as it is used by 100s of walkers on a daily basis and is criss crossed by rights of way so could not be built on in any event. It is a truly beautiful piece of woodland made more beautiful by the views over the neighbouring fields so any building on these fields would have a negative impact on the wood which has already been identified as worthy of protection. 7. Much of the land in SP013 is agricultural land and is being farmed. Good agricultural land is in limited supply and this land produces plenty of crops each year. Unproductive land should be considered for development not beautiful productive farmland.
DOR02446	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02447	I disagree with the large scale of the proposals. The main reason being how lacking our infrastructure is/will be in supplying - safe roads, reducing congestion, education etc. Far too many properties/population to be brought into what is essentially and rural infrastructure, which will not be able to cope with the proposed demands.
DOR02448	<p>My main concern is the Thingwall Irby Pensby area, we were informed at the meetings that we are not separate areas but one settlement so you can join us together by building on the green belt my concerns are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Traffic - Thingwall corner is very congested already. some mornings it is difficult to get out of the road. we have had several bad accidents on Thingwall roundabout due to the volume of traffic. if the Irby Thingwall proposals went ahead then this would increase traffic further and the roads / people wouldn't cope. We haven't got the roads to cope with large housing developments. on the opposite side Heswall would be another route off the Wirral this is also already extremely congested.at peak times building in the area would make the roads over full and dangerous. 2. The warrens medical centre currently covers most of the settlement. It is extremely difficult to get an appointment if you are ill. Due to the nature of housing in the area we have an elderly population and they by their nature usually need more medical attention. The doctors is full to capacity now without adding to the problem. 3. Parking for Thingwall school. We are subject to parents parking in the area already and not always thoughtfully. sometimes it is dangerous to cross the road through the many parked cars. they are pared on kerbs and double parked. I'm surprised that a child hasn't been hurt . The levels of cars would increase which would have a negative impact on the residents. 4. The west side of the Wirral is known for its green belt and the feeling that although you are in an urban area there is still a feeling of countryside. This attracts tourists as i'm sure the visitor figures for Thurstaston will back up. i have met many people who come back over and over again as they love the feeling of space and countryside. If we have no countryside these people will not come and we will lose the income from them. We will be no different from the urban sprawl they try to escape form. 5. All other areas should be looked at before green belt, brown field sites and back fill like the champion estate in Upton 6. Building of a large housing estate is also happening in Hooton, which I appreciate isn't our council but they will use the same roads and tunnels. 7. I feel the figures for the housing need are too high houses don't sell that quickly and it feels again as though it's a one-size fits all approach is being used, we are not an island but not we do have limited infrastructure almost like that of an island.. 7. Why do we need to build anywhere else other than the waterfront housing development. This area would suite affordable family homes and Peel should be pushed to provide. 8. I appreciate you need to build but look at areas were the roads can cope there are areas on the proposal with dual carriage way links to the motorway that would also be more appropriate for families. and jobs. 9. The west side of the Wirral has been the quieter side and attracts people that retire here and are attracted to the green open spaces huge housing estates would spoil this and change the charter of the area . NO BUILDING SHOULD TAKE PLACE ON GREEN BELT ONCE ITS GONE WE WILL NEVER GET IT BACK.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02449	Why do they need to build on the carpark by Bromborough civic centre!? What is the point! Build houses?? Positives. They will be close to local amenities.... amenities that won't exist if people can't get to them. Hilarious. The amount of land going to waste on the Wirral as people are choosing to build somewhere that is used by many to go shops, get their haircut, exercise, book groups and other matters of life for people. I do not agree with the proposals to build there!
DOR02450	I moved to this area 27yrs ago from the city, to live in a greener place. My children have all benefited from our open spaces and when it's gone there is no going back. Trees are of great benefit to the environment and health in general. Enough properties are for sale in West Wirral or empty, to not have to resort to building on greenbelt.
DOR02451	I have a number of concerns: 1. From what I have read, it does not seem plausible that the Wirral needs quite so many new houses built in the relevant time period. Analysis has demonstrated that approximately half the planned number are required. 2. I strongly disagree with Green Belt Land being considered for such development. This land needs to be protected (as originally intended) in order to retain each towns'/villages' identity, prevent urban sprawl and conserve the important habitats. 3. There is plenty of brown field land that could be utilised to provide the extra housing instead, which is a much more sensible course of action. Developers should be prevented from "land banking" and persuaded to build the properties they have acquired permission for instead. This would regenerate land that has historically been left idle in a state of disrepair, inject investment and new life into barren ex industrial areas, while retaining the important green belt that makes the Wirral such an attractive area to live.
DOR02452	We are opposed to the potential development of greenbelt land, particularly that land which is situated opposite the junction of Thingwall Rd/Irby/Thurstaston Rd. This site is a particularly important site when the view from that point is an open vista to the hills of N. Wales and the old sycamore tree which has stood there for many years (I have seen photos of this site taken over 100 years ago). It would in our opinion be wrong to develop that site. The mantra we keep hearing is "affordable housing". House prices would reflect those in the area which would not fit this definition. There is an abundance of wildlife in this area which would be destroyed by any development. It also represents the beginning of the countryside with nothing between it and the Dee estuary. We also feel that the development of the land adjacent to Thingwall Rd would be inappropriate by virtue of the fact that it is destroying the boundaries between Irby, Pensby and Thingwall resulting in a built up area where one can't tell when one has left one area and entered another (e.g. Upton and Greasby). Irby is one of the few villages in Wirral which still has a feeling of "separateness". There is also the view to consider in the proposed development in the area towards Arrowe Park.
DOR02453	I am opposed to the use of Green Belt land for housing. I hope that the revised figures for housing need will make it possible to avoid using Green Belt land for building. There should be a high proportion of affordable housing in any development. Every effort should be made to avoid a negative impact on biodiversity and public amenities, e.g. access to natural habitats, woodland, footpaths and bridleways. This is important for the wellbeing of wildlife and human residents alike. The fragmentation of natural sites and the loss of wildlife corridors should be avoided. Development should be nature-friendly, with plenty of green space for the benefit of people and wildlife. An example can be seen in the partnership of the RSPB and Barratt Homes at Kingsbrook (kingsbrook-aylesbury.co.uk).
DOR02454	Column Road Fields - I strongly object to this land being considered because it is essential to the setting of Stapledon Wood. The wood was donated to the Council by Olaf Stapledon and is a wonderful green lung enjoyed by residents of Caldy and Newton, this is evidenced by the number of established paths within the Wood. What restrictive covenants were created by the transfer of ownership? Were the fields donated, perhaps to provide an income for the maintenance of the wood? Would residential development on the fields affect the health of the wood? Would the land be better protected if it was sold or transferred to the National Trust?
DOR02455	I am not at all happy about the loss of green belt land anywhere in the Wirral. When there is sufficient brown belt land available and the council's projected housing requirements are vastly greater than the actual needs. Remember this is our green and pleasant land.
DOR02456	Please do not spoil our green spaces, find other ways to make available additional accommodation. Use brownfield sites and put financial pressure on people sitting on vacant properties, perhaps by doubling their rates if the property is not occupied after a prescribed period
DOR02457	As a personally interested citizen in a possible Broad Lane, Heswall development, I am concerned that the proposed Coastal Path will conflict with such a scheme (Based on a recent meeting at Thurstaston Wirral Country Park), as Broad Lane itself is being taken as the line of the Path. Added to which, any further housing in this vicinity will seriously detract from the appeal/visitor potential of the area.
DOR02458	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 future 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, who could possibly see that as a good planning

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>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 tell me 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, Alister Rae, University of Sheffield, A Land Cover Atlas of the UK. The public outcry at these proposals must surely tell you that this will not be tolerated, therefore anyone going against People Power do so at their peril. The Council 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 to build on Green Belt land, so why is it that Council Leaders from other Council's around the country 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 Doctors appointment because there are not enough Doctors to serve the current population, the Ambulance service is over stretched, 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, we are almost an Island, lets preserve what little space we have left. 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 Councillor [the Council Leader] which lays out them disputing your allegations. 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>
DOR02459	<p>I feel very strongly about any loss of Wirral's green belt land and I am also upset by the councils settlement pattern programme done in 2012 without my knowledge and I suspect a lot of other residents knowledge. Statisticians have proved that we do not require this level of building or any at all, based on true figures. The council should go back to government with this and declare Wirral a special case, due to its geographical location etc. Even going back to Anglo Saxons and Vikings living together on Wirral , it has always been a special case, due to its location. It is ridiculous to build unnecessarily on our Wirral land when it has been proven that it is not required .Furthermore the retention of industrial land for industry should be built on as priority, as industrial employment is low. A lot of infrastructure to support all these new buildings is not in place, and probably never will be. I am making this effort to communicate with you on behalf of my children and grandchildren for their enjoyment of growing up, living, playing ,and working on the Wirral. Please do not destroy it.</p>
DOR02460	<p>The Wirral Peninsular includes areas of outstanding natural beauty, and very importantly the areas currently designated as greenbelt contribute to the natural beauty of the area. It is my view that every effort should be made to build on brownfield sites, and bring empty properties into use before any thought is given to releasing greenbelt land for development. Once greenbelt land is released for development it is lost forever for future generations of Wirral residents. I understand that the Wirral Waters site, owned by Peel Holdings, has planning permission for over 13,000 homes, but Peel Holdings are delaying full development of the sites they own. Because greenbelt is so very important in maintaining the character and beauty of the Wirral, consideration should be given by the Council to using its compulsory purchase powers to purchase and then develop Wirral Waters to meet current and future housing targets, and as a result protecting land that is currently designated as greenbelt. Why should the profits of a large company such as Peel Holdings take precedent over protecting our precious greenbelt? Alternatively, perhaps Peel Holdings can be persuaded to speed up the development of the site as originally promised by them. In relation to the greenbelt sites that have been identified for potential development, although I consider them all to be important, I have particular concerns about the following proposed greenbelt sites: SP061 - North of Gills Lane SP062 - West of Barnston Village SP064E - North of Whitehouse Lane These areas of greenbelt form a natural gap between the settlements of Thingwall, Pensby and importantly Barnston Village, which is currently surrounded by open countryside. To build on this land would destroy the separation and character of Barnston Village, effectively merging it into other settlements and creating an urban sprawl, and for this reason it should be protected. Also, the road infrastructure in these areas will not support the significant increase in traffic that further development would inevitably bring. Barnston Road, leading into Arrowe Park Road, is already very busy particularly during morning and evening commuter times, and there are already long traffic queues on Arrowe Park Road down to the Arrowe Park traffic lights, and on Woodchurch Road leading up to the Arrowe Park traffic lights. Also, the "Barnston Dip" on Barnston Road past the Fox and Hounds Pub is very narrow and cannot take significantly more traffic. The Gills Lane junction with Barnston Road is already a very dangerous junction given its proximity to "Barnston Dip" and is not at all suitable to an increase in traffic. I am also of the view that the target set by the Government for development in Wirral does not reflect the actual housing needs, which are significantly lower. The population of the Wirral has remained relatively static over recent years and only a very small increase is projected over the period of the Local Plan. When houses are advertised for sale, they often take a long time to sell and this does not suggest that there is a great unmet demand for additional housing. The Council needs to challenge the targets set by Government for housing needs on the Wirral. In summary, everything should be done to protect from development the greenbelt land that we currently enjoy. The Wirral is a beautiful place in which to live, and development on our greenbelt would have a real negative impact on our Borough and the natural beauty of the Wirral. For the reasons stated above I urge our Council to do everything it can to protect this precious commodity.</p>
DOR02461	<p>SHLAA 2024 Bromborough Civic Centre, Allport Lane As a regular user of the Civic Centre I wish to object to any plans which would change its current usage without there first being a viable alternative put in place. Of the many uses the building facilitates my own interest is in the ballroom dancing classes that are held there. Ballroom dancing is both popular and very beneficial for all ages, in particular the older generation. Regular exercise like this has both social and health benefits and should be supported by the council rather than threatened. Build your houses on the many brown field sites there are on the Wirral and put some investment into the remaining civic buildings you have so they may continue to serve the people well.</p>
DOR02462	<p>Development must not be allowed on Green Belt land until all of the Brownfield sites have been used. This consultation is of no value, other than to have said what I have said above, because the data has been significantly changed. Housing targets have been significantly downwards revised. A fresh consultation is required.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02463	There are many brownfield sites available which should be used before any proposals to use Green Belt land. Also, for various reasons, many developers delay projects perhaps in the hope of greater profits - pressure should be applied to encourage developers to complete their projects promptly.
DOR02464	SHLAA 2024 Bromborough Civic Centre, Allport Lane & SHLAA 2025 Allport Lane Car Park, Bromborough:- I strongly object to the proposed redevelopment of the Civic Centre which provides much needed social focus and cohesion for Bromborough and further afield. I attend dance classes every week at this unique local facility and would have to travel many miles to a comparable venue. The hall brings people into Bromborough and prevents loneliness particularly for older people. The library provides social contact giving more health benefits and both add to the cultural diversity of the area. The proposals for the area between the M53, Poulton Hall Road and the R Dibbin particularly trouble me. The Dibbinsdale SSSI and Local Nature Reserve are a green lung, not only for flora and fauna but also for the communities of Bromborough and Bebington on both sides of the Reserve. The farmland, mainly Claremont Farm and Vineyard Farm, is prime agricultural land and the crops which are grown are sold through the farm shops providing food with zero food miles and local jobs. Please reject the proposals for the areas above. In general terms I favour redevelopment of brownfield sites and am disturbed by the focus on releasing green belt land for building when the employment opportunities in Wirral are reducing, large areas of former dockland remain undeveloped and Wirral has a dwindling proportion of green areas and is bounded on three sides by water which will always limit public access to green areas.
DOR02465	<p>1] First and foremost, the GREEN BELT must NOT be touched. It was designed to protect adjoining areas from merging. It is now clear from the "consultation documents" that this merging is what is exactly proposed.</p> <p>2] The Council MUST compulsorily purchase the Wirral Waters land. This would be funded by the developers who would benefit from release of this land for immediate development.</p> <p>3] The proposed "Golf resort" at Hoylake MUST NOT go ahead. There is no need for it, it will not work and most certainly will not bring the employment or economic benefits claimed for it: it is "pie in the sky".</p> <p>4] There is NO justification for the ludicrous number of 800 houses per year for the next 15 years. From 1996 to 2018 the population actually dropped by 700! In the 5 years to 2016, it increased by 1400; nowhere near the 800 demanded. Where are all the extra numbers coming from? Certainly not from people seeking employment: Birkenhead is a virtual ghost town with M&S and poundworld closing among the numerous other smaller units that have also closed, following the decline of Wallasey decades previously. Liverpool One has killed off the peninsula's retail trade and there is no coming back from that!</p> <p>5] I understand that there are 91 brownfield sites available to produce 12000 homes but this seems to be drowned in the desire to give developers pristine sites in the green belt to build on. One wonders at the motivation for this.</p> <p>6] There is plenty of evidence that air pollution is killing 44000 people annually but this disguises the very real problem of chronic lung disease, asthma and the like. The simple fact is that trees, grasses and all the other flora that comprise the green belt soak up the pollutants causing such damage. It is bordering on the criminal to do anything to build on this land.</p> <p>7] It does seem that this Council is determined to despoil our lovely peninsula having already moved the fire station from a brownfield site in Greasby to a wholly unsuitable green belt site in Saughall Massie.</p> <p>8] The unacceptable delay in the production of a Local plan can only be explained by a deliberate policy by the Council to place the responsibility with an anonymous Government inspector so as to absolve themselves from criticism from the electorate.</p>
DOR02466	<p>1. We need to build more houses</p> <p>2. Although Green Belt land may be attractive if it is intensively farmed it can be poorer for wildlife than urban area</p> <p>3. With certain provisions built into the planning process many provisions can be made for wildlife such as green spaces, ponds, hedgerows, trees, swift boxes, bat roosts etc but they need to be COMPULSORY not voluntary. This can then be used to promote the positive aspects of house building. Follow the RSPB's initiative of working with Taylor Wimpey</p>
DOR02467	<p>We have sympathy for the Council having to produce a Local Plan imposed by a Government with such a poor planning record themselves. Are these figures realistic and will there be a proportionate employment increase? Can it be proved that some percentage of the Government's figure is arbitrary and therefore not realistic. Can all Wirral empty house owners be forced to ensure that their properties are occupied. We are wholly against any Greenbelt being built on for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1) Greenbelt food producing land is of fundamental importance and should not be used.</p> <p>2) Environmentally and ecologically bird & insect populations are plummeting mainly due to reductions in their habitat. So save the Greenbelt.</p> <p>3) In general Greenbelt would not provide the lower cost high density affordable housing needed.</p> <p>4) Impingement on local Greenbelt recreational capability could lead to more car trips causing more pollution and traffic on our already congested roads. A Government imposed Greenbelt plan could well have reaction at any election times. How can the necessary infrastructure be paid for in these cut-back times?</p>
DOR02468	Green Belt should never ever be considered for building on - any councillor of any party that votes for this should be voted out of office at the earliest possible opportunity
DOR02469	In my opinion any building on Green Belt is a despicable act as once it is gone it is gone forever, not five years, not ten years GONE FOREVER for future generations to enjoy - Wirral's Green Belt are the lungs of the Wirral - any councillor that vote for this should hang their heads in shame and be voted out at the earliest possible opportunity! Councillors should be able to have a free vote and we'd soon see who has the best interests of the residents of Wirral and who are voting the party line to stay in office

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02470	I attended the meeting at Pensby School on Thursday last week which was well attended and very well presented and handled. There are a number of points arising not least of which is the calculation of the number of new homes needed over the next 15 years when the population of Wirral has remained static over the last 25. Past performance is no guarantee of future growth (!) but Wirral is already a fairly crowded place. Infrastructure covers a multitude of areas but schools, doctors, dentists and hospitals are all struggling to cope with the 'clients' they have at present without another 30,000 plus people if the 12,000 house target which has been imposed on Wirral is achieved with even an average of only 2 occupiers per dwelling. The road system and, just as importantly, somewhere for all of the extra cars to park, needs looking at too as it struggles to cope except in the quietest periods of the day. Even at night time these days the motorway network is still busy. Finally there seems to have been little mentioned about the rise of the Internet, not only for the workplace, which means more and more people will work from home, but also for our shopping needs meaning, not only high streets but also, ultimately, out of town shopping areas will become increasingly redundant thus providing more urban and brownfield sites for housing development which have the advantage of already having services in place. We need to be thinking 50 years ahead not 15. With reference to the parking question, as a Heswall resident for over 30 years, the number of cars on the road is the thing which will bring Wirral and the country to a stop...we struggle to get out of our driveway and the roads around us in Heswall centres are already overfilled. Parking permits for residents and yellow lines are need to stop the strangulation of the town... And of course a large free car park... But that would take up valuable building space !
DOR02471	I was disappointed to note that Peel Holdings had reduced the number of houses they took responsibility for at the outset. No doubt they were offered 'sweeteners' so to do and now that it no longer suits them, they appear to have walked away from part of what they promised. Presumably, there no contractual obligations which bind them or are there? Another point, I wonder if the revised Government forecast is any more reliable than the previous one. They previously said Wirral needed to build 800 houses and now it's 500, an over estimate of 37.5%. Is Wirral MBC confident that the muppets at Westminster are right this time as precious Wirral Green Belt could be at stake? There are two Readers' letters appearing in Wirral Globe 10/10/18 which present a cogent argument for little or no Green belt needing to be released and until the arguments therein are answered, I will not be convinced that Wirral Council can be relied upon to look after the interests of the Wirral population and manage this matter efficiently.
DOR02472	With so much uncertainty about Brexit's impact on the population and the influence of austerity on Wirral life expectancy, the council should write to the Government. It is unacceptable to plan to build on Green Belt when the Tories have made the future so unpredictable. There is no way that we can make a decent estimate of housing requirements when a no-deal Brexit is still a possibility.
DOR02473	My wife & I want to object to the plan to the demolition of Bromborough Library & car park for homes & shops ?, WHY,
DOR02474	As peel holdings are not using the brownfield sites and forcing the council to use greenfield sites why not compulsorily purchased land from the?
DOR02475	<p>Response to the proposed release of green belt land In considering the proposal to release large tracts of green belt land to the east of the motorway for housing development and the requirement for much of the housing to be affordable housing available to young families, I would ask the council to consider the following. Before any decisions are taken on the release of land for residential development Independent research needs to be carried out in those areas to assess the levels of air pollution The nearer the motorway the cheaper will be the housing and much of it will end up being occupied by families with young children. The prevailing wind on The Wirral blows West to East. Increasing the housing density in these areas will increase the traffic flow resulting in more hold up with traffic stationary or moving more slowly resulting in higher levels of pollution. Fears of the harmful effects of traffic emissions have been raised in a major study linking motorway pollution with permanent and life-limiting damage to children's lungs. People who live within 500 metres of a motorway grow up with significantly reduced lung capacity, and even children who have never experienced asthma are at risk, scientists warn. Studies link permanent lung damage, which can shorten life expectancy, to traffic pollution. Previous research by the same scientists showed that children who grew up in areas of high pollution and car fumes were more likely to develop asthma. But the new study provides strong evidence that car emissions stunt crucial lung development in children between the ages of 10 and 18. The researchers suggest that traffic generated fumes are to blame. A Department of Health spokeswoman is quoted as saying "This evidence will be considered amongst other evidence of possible ill health from motorways or other vehicle emissions". Children who live near a major highway are not only more likely to develop asthma or other respiratory diseases, but their lung development may also be stunted. Children are especially vulnerable to auto-emission health impacts because, among other reasons, they breathe more air relative to their body weight than adults, are more physically active, and spend more times outdoors during times when pollutant levels are at their highest. (Hulsey, et al., 2004) Additionally, children have many more years ahead of them in which the cumulative damage caused by auto emissions can manifest itself in disease or disability. Women who live near areas of high automobile traffic during pregnancy have a 20 – 30% higher chance of having children with lung impairment. (Morales, et al., 2014) Auto emission PM exposure from nearness to high traffic during the third trimester of pregnancy doubles the risk for autism. (Raz, et al., 2014). According to a study that appeared in the Feb. 17 issue of The Lancet and is now available online, researchers at the Keck School of Medicine of USC found that children who lived within 500 meters of a freeway, or approximately a third of a mile, since age 10 had substantial deficits in lung function by the age of 18 years, compared to children living at least 1,500 meters, or approximately one mile, away. "Someone suffering a pollution-related deficit in lung function as a child will probably have less than healthy lungs all of his or her life," said lead author W. James Gauderman, associate professor of preventive medicine at the Keck School of Medicine. "And poor lung function in later adult life is known to be a major risk factor for respiratory and cardiovascular diseases."</p> <p>The report draws upon data from the Children's Health Study, a longitudinal document of respiratory health among children in 12 Southern California communities. More than 3,600 children around the age of 10 were evaluated over a period of eight years, through high school graduation. Lung function tests were taken during annual school visits, and the study team determined how far each child lived from freeways and other major roads. "Otherwise-healthy children who were non-asthmatic and non-smokers also experienced a significant decrease in lung function from traffic pollution," Gauderman said. "This suggests that all children, not just susceptible subgroups, are potentially affected by traffic exposure." Lung function was assessed by measuring how much air a person can exhale after taking a deep breath and how quickly that air can be exhaled. Children's lung function develops rapidly during adolescence until they reach their late teens or early 20s.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	A deficit in lung development during childhood is likely to translate into reduced function for the remainder of life. "This study shows there are health effects from childhood exposure to traffic exhaust that can last a lifetime," said David A. Schwartz, director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. "The [institute] is committed to supporting research to understand the relationship between environmental exposures and diseases, and to identify ways to reduce harmful exposures to all populations, especially children so they can realize their full potential for healthy and productive lives." Previous studies have demonstrated links between lung function growth and regional air quality. The findings in this study add to that result, demonstrating that both regional air pollution and local exposure to traffic pollution affect lung development. People living "downwind" of highways with 4 or more lanes (2 lanes in each direction) are exposed to higher levels of fine particulate matter. (Brugge, et al. 2007) However, this circumstance does not exempt one side of a highway from PM dangers. In many regions, wind direction changes not only depending on weather conditions, but also between day and night. In addition it must be considered that the resulting urban sprawl will change the nature and character of the environment on the Wirral and cannot be justified in terms of population growth and employment prospects in the area. The need to use green belt lands for housing is purely driven by outside agencies who want to exploit the area to make vast profits by building high cost properties in large quantities. There are many brown field sites which can be built on removing some of the deprivation which already exists on the Wirral. The current proposals will turn further large areas of existing housing on the Wirral into run-down deprived area. The redevelopment along Church road Tranmere is what we should be aiming for as an excellent example of how to reach targets while improving the environment.
DOR02476	The Green Belt Removal plans amount to wanton destruction of our beautiful area of England. The need for so many houses has not been proven nor has the Council demonstrated that there is insufficient brown field sites to meet demand. It would be laughable if the consequences were not so vitally important.
DOR02477	1. More housing in green belt areas SP058, B ,C, D, and E. Adds relatively few houses, and does not meet priorities like social and affordable housing. 2. The houses likely to be built on the land at the end of Pipers Lane would be executive style , high profit margin. The only beneficiaries would be a small number of landowners and developers. 3.A large proportion of Pipers Lane is single vehicle width only. Increasing the number of houses at the far end of the lane will only make the traffic nuisance worse. 4.My garden is currently visited by a variety of wild life including foxes, badgers, rabbits as well as a wide range of birds. Housing development in my garden would prevent its use by wild life. 5.The green belt land at the rear of numbers 85 to 103 Pipers Lane is owned by the householders. It is very unlikely that they would sell their gardens, ruining the value and amenity of properties. So why put this land in the plan?
DOR02478	I think that we seriously need to consider the effect on our natural habitats. The Wirral is an outstandingly beautiful environment and these greenbelt areas must be protected.
DOR02479	Having read the Council's Local Plan documentation (going back several years), attended public meetings and presentations, discussed the issues, facts and figures with Family, Friends, colleagues and others, and made my own assessments (following a working life in project and building design), I have concluded that: 1. The Process is critically flawed. It has the wrong starting point and approach, uses some out-of-date data and bizarre projections, and reaches wrong conclusions at this intermediate stage. 2. I cannot detect reasonable cause why opinions held fairly recently have been so fundamentally changed without pressure of some kind applying. 3. The Local Plan process should have been completed long ago and without recourse to the current draft Standard Methodology. Had it been so, there would have been no prospect of the release of Green Belt. The people of Wirral have been let down. 4. The shortlisting of 48 Green Belt Sites for further investigation should never have arisen and the process by which the Sites were selected was clearly rushed, incomplete and came up with totally wrong selections. 5. The Council is not listening to the People and are in danger of not even attempting to deliver what they want despite the flimsy grounds for not doing so progressively getting ever more shaky. I urge the Council to take a new direction and work hard to deliver a Local Plan that releases NIL Green Belt land but instead makes use of other considerable assets that Wirral has and needs to be used beneficially.
DOR02480	I believe that you should not be building on green Belt land Local towns and villages should keep these buffer areas to save their independent identity
DOR02481	I have read a considerable amount of the documentation concerning the local Plan and attended a briefing session. I wish to make the following points which explain my opposition to the Local plan in its present form. 1. The plan as it is currently drafted takes no account of reality, and a plan which is not based on evidence is deeply flawed. Any figure for the demand for housing must take account of the potential demand, and so far, no-one has explained how Wirral is going to move from the current annual demand for 250 - 300 houses to a figure of 800 or more. Where are the extra 550 households per year coming from? This is not just a matter of a further statistical review as suggested in the consultation I attended, but a crucial question. When challenged about the numbers behind the plan, the council official observed darkly that there were other factors, but did not detail them. 2. The Office for National Statistics is reported in the Times of 21st September, 2018 to have revised the forecast for the number of new households from the previous figure of 210,000 households per year nationally to 159,000. This knocks a 25% hole in the Government's figures. The ONS also says that a large proportion of the growth (88%) will come from people over 65, so Wirral's declining population definitely runs against this trend. 3. One possibility, an increase in employment opportunities, does not help, as currently a large number of residents travel outside the area for work. They would be most likely to take a good proportion of these jobs, especially as the cost of travel is on the increase, and therefore the demand for houses would not be increased significantly. 4. If the prospective demand is from elsewhere in the City Region, I see no reason to sacrifice Wirral's Green Belt just to save someone else encroaching on their own green belt to meet a target which is also probably a fantasy figure.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>5. There is fundamental clash between the “viability” tests outlined by the Council Official and the requirements restated recently by the Government about the circumstances when green belt land could be considered for development. Basically, everybody recognises that it is cheaper to build on greenfield sites than to redevelop brownfield ones, but there is still a requirement to use brownfield sites first where possible. Wirral is fortunate to have such a site and can meet most, if not all of the projected demand over the next 15 years, even at the fantasy levels in the local plan. Viability is not the only test, nor the over-riding consideration.</p> <p>6. The use of Green Belt land is being “sold” to local residents on the grounds that affordable housing is included in the scheme, offering the prospect that residents’ children can obtain house locally. It was therefore staggering for the Council Official to admit that it was common practice for the big housebuilders, faced with the requirement to provide 20 per cent affordable housing, to buy out this obligation, and for the council to use the money elsewhere. This is deception in plain sight.</p> <p>7. Once green belt land is scheduled for release for housing it is lost for ever. This proposed local plan is “last ditch” and “panicky”. It does not serve the people of Wirral and must be amended.</p>
DOR02482	<p>I object to any loss of amenity green space that is currently enjoyed by the public. I object to the reclassification of current green belt land on the basis that it would result in the loss of flora and fauna such as valuable pastureland and wildlife habitat, in particular bats and birds of prey. I object to any large housing development on what currently is designated green belt land because there is not sufficient drainage infrastructure to cope with the disposal of either the foul or surface water flows that would result from any significant development. This would result in an unacceptable increase in potential flood risk to both the existing overburdened foul and surface water drainage system on the Wirral. It would also impact on the flood risk associated with several local watercourses that combine to drain via pumping stations to the Mersey. I also object on the basis of were development to occur on what is currently green belt land then there would be an increase in traffic on the local road network again with an associated increase in accident risk. I also oppose any reclassification of green belt land to allow development when there are already sufficient brownfield sites on the Wirral that would allow housing targets to be achieved, with the added bonus of having existing services and infrastructure (roads, power, drainage etc) already in situ. Current planning policy resists any significant housing or commercial development on land within a green belt and so rather than take the pathway of simply surrendering the green heart of the Wirral to housing development, the council should look at incentivising the development of the currently abandoned or unused brownfield sites within the borough.</p>
DOR02483	<p>I am very concerned about the proposed releases of parts of the Green Belt for development. There are no "exceptional circumstances" for such releases at the present time. I know that the number of houses that are required in Wirral can be found without recourse to the Green Belt. As a resident of Lower Heswall I am particularly concerned by the suggestions for development in parcels numbered SP098, 100, 101, 103, 104, 110. These are fields near my home and I know that apart from being prime agricultural land they are also used in winter by many wading birds for feeding and roosting. These include curlew, snipe, lapwings, and black-tailed godwits. The Dee Estuary which adjoin these parcels is a highly protected site for wintering birds in international law.</p>
DOR02484	<p>I am totally against any plans for building on Green Belt land in Wirral, particularly when there are so many Brown Field sites available. Wirral Council must be much firmer in its dealings with companies (such as Peel Holdings) which hold vast tracks of land. The council appears to be bent on appeasing them, rather than residents. The original projected population numbers for the area were grossly overestimated by both the government and Wirral council. I wonder what else is incorrect. Please listen to the thousands of residents who wish to continue to live in Wirral with its "amazing coastline and beautiful countryside". Do not ruin the area for them.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02485	<p>We vehemently oppose the proposals to reclassify Strategic Land Parcels in the Lower Village Heswall to an Infill Village within the Green Belt category. The Specific reference numbers are SP099, SP100, SP101, SP102, SP103, SP104 and SP105. All of these should have the same protection as SP098 and SP106 in being totally protected under the principles of the Green Belt. As you state in your assessment, the line of the Wirral Way provides a clear boundary to the urban area in Settlement 7 and the more open coastline to the west. If development was permitted on any of the aforementioned parcels, then this distinction would clearly be lost. Such development along the coastal strip would massively impact the character, appearance and feel of this area. The Description used for each of those parcels is not correct. For example, on SP100 you state there is a small area of ribbon development along the coast, there is in fact 5 properties along this frontage which gives a very different perspective than a “ribbon development”. It further makes comment about the “wooded nature of settlement fringes and ridgelines” this is factually incorrect. From the boundary of the line of the Wirral Way, unfortunately now developed for housing many years ago by a council with no foresight or desire to preserve the area, to the coast there are uninterrupted views to the shoreline with no wooded features other than a low hedge and there are certainly no ridgelines as the land slopes down to the estuary. How then can you state “woodland would continue to screen views of the urban edge”? We are also perplexed when it refers to the “small area of existing ribbon development to the South of Marine Drive” as to the south of Marine Drive is the Dee Estuary with no development whatsoever. It is inconceivable that any of these sites, referenced above, could be considered as “Infill Village” given the open nature of the area and the limited residential properties in the vicinity of the sites. National Guidelines and Local UDP policies give great protection on land west of the Wirral Way to the coast and which the Council has a legal duty to protect, specifically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be exceptional circumstances required to build on Green Belt land • The Council need to ensure environmental and wildlife preservation of protected species, biodiversity, SSSI, Ramsar protection in this area which have official legal, International, European and National status. • The Council have a duty in checking the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas • The Council have a duty in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. • The Council have a duty for Coastal Zone protection and, in particular, being a last resort unless development cannot be undertaken elsewhere. • The Council have a duty to protect prime agricultural land and the necessity to retain and develop such land, not destroy such an asset. <p>No account has been taken of the limited infrastructure in the area which is totally incapable of supporting anything like the number of properties proposed. Currently there is inadequate drainage to serve the existing properties in the area resulting in flooding. Certainly, the road network is lacking with only Station Road serving this area of the Lower Village and any increase in traffic will be very detrimental to the area as a whole. In summary the only conclusion is that none of the aforementioned parcels are suitable for release from the Green Belt and there should be no other option for the land other than to remain in its existing use and status as protected Green Belt.</p>
DOR02486	<p>I am very concerned about not only the proposal to release green belt land, but the impact of doing so on the infrastructure that is already congested and creaking under the current volume. Additionally, the impact on the value of property will be adversely felt by existing communities. I am only able to speak with knowledge of the Clatterbridge / Spital area, but am aware that many residents are considering relocating in the event of further development in the immediate area. Having spoken to other Wirral residents there does appear to be grave concerns about the environment and demands upon local facilities such as medical [GPs], dentistry, car parking, schools and the future of local shops if car parking is removed - such as proposals for Bromborough. I appreciate development is necessary but implore you to look at every feasible brown site that can be utilised before any of Wirral's green belt land is released.</p>
DOR02487	<p>I know that you have received multiple comments, including a very comprehensive series from the Wirral Green Spaces Alliance. Greasby Community Association has commented on the two areas of the village referred to in your documents. Both these areas are highly valued green space, and should only be considered for housing development in very extreme circumstances. In particular, the area between Arrowe Road, Rigby Drive and Mill Lane has several sensitive sites included within it - including apparently Neolithic and Roman remains - with the copse which is already known to accommodate one of the earliest known settlements in Britain (8500BC) lying immediately adjacent to the area indicated for potential development. I am also well aware that the figures on which the proposals were based have now been superseded by significantly lower figures of housing need, making the appropriation of green belt land quite unnecessary.</p>
DOR02488	<p>I would submit that it will now be impossible to demonstrate "exceptional need" to justify removing large areas of Wirral's Green Belt. The more recent ONS figures, the lack of increase in Wirral's population, the development of Wirral Waters, and the incomplete listing of Brownfield sites all point to the above conclusion.</p>
DOR02489	<p>The Wirral does not need more housing the population is relatively stable and if anything what we need it is more housing that people can afford. A lot of the areas that have been defined as suitable for development are not going to have houses that young and first time buyers can afford. The green and open spaces that we enjoy across our peninsula are what makes it such a pleasant place to live and that attracts visitors to the area. Lose these to developers and we lose many of these assets. The Wirral is bordered on 3 sides by water which on hand is one of its many attractions but on the other limits how people can escape from the relentless march of property development. This has to stop before everything is covered in concrete. A lot of the areas suggested will suffer from increased traffic, lack of amenities (which the council struggles to provide currently how will it manage then) and people pressure in such a limited space. It is all very well for the government to blindly say that each area must provide 'x' amount of new housing without taking in account the individual needs of a particular area or locality. Get developers who have promised to build specific numbers of houses on brown field sites to actually do what they agreed to.</p>
DOR02490	<p>I have looked at the planned building areas on the green belt SHLAA sites and I strongly object to any new housing that will, in my opinion, be detrimental to the peninsula. Further reduction of the already limited green belt is going to diminish those wonderful areas that Wirral residents can get out and enjoy be it trail walking or beach combing. The extra housing will also put pressure on already stretched local services and make extra demands on hospitals, GP practices and schooling etc. Has any of the councillors considered that in 10 to 15 years the ageing 'baby boomer' population will have passed away and the housing stock will go from scarcity to surplus. I urge councillors to recommend building new housing stock on existing brown sites and implore that they should leave the green belt alone, there is little of it as it is.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02491	First point - If the plan goes ahead will brownfield sites be prioritised before Greenbelt, i.e. build on and exhaust Brownfield options before Greenbelt is touched. Over time things can change - Government targets, Peels position etc so this would make sense. Secondly what plans are there to improve the road/ network infrastructure with so many new dwellings being proposed for Irby - Arrowe Park is gridlocked most days already. Third point - this is being positioned as Labours plan and being pushed through despite huge residential concerns - Labour councillors don't expect to be re- elected (this from a lifelong labour supporter)
DOR02492	I strongly object to any use of green belt land for future housing. I have looked at the proposals and feel this is too much land to give to housing in an area which is already quite densely populated. Wirral must retain its last remaining green spaces both for the environmental impact and continued tourism in the area.
DOR02493	The plan massively exaggerates the number of houses needed. The Wirral Waters development scheme more than accounts for the future housing need, indeed the Council approved it. Organisations like ITPAS have made detailed and constructive suggestions, which have been completely ignored. The plan underestimates the amount of Brownfield land available, why? Areas like Irby, Greasby, Thingwall and Frankby will be ruined forever by this 'Plan' and with most of Wirral. The assessments of ITPAS and your own criteria for exclusion of sites have been virtually ignored in this rushed and flawed shortlisting of 48 Green belt sites. I recommend you listen to organisations like ITPAS and your VOTERS.
DOR02494	The plan greatly exaggerates the number of houses that need to be built in the coming years. The release of large amounts of Green belt land is nothing short of a disgrace, Wirral Waters will more than cover the needs for the foreseeable future. There are numerous Brownfield sites available that this Council has completely ignored.
DOR02495	The proposals to take so much green belt land away from the Bromborough and Bebington areas are unfair to those areas. There is no existing barrier between Bromborough and Birkenhead so they don't get the same protection that the settlements on the west side of Wirral get. Further development on the east side of the motorway will have a terrible impact on communities such as Storeton and local businesses (such as Claremont Farm) which will have a further impact on the community. The Bromborough / Bebington area manages to combine industry, housing and travel infrastructure while retaining a high quality of life for the residents. This is some achievement considering how compact the area is. Altering the green belt and increasing the amount of housing will reduce the quality of life.
DOR02496	I do not want construction on green belt land for the environmental issues it would cause. The attraction of living here is for its parkland and rural green belt areas. it would be better to rehabilitate houses in downtown Birkenhead and make this area more attractive & recover services & people in the Grange Road shops. Similarly the docklands could be used for development like in Liverpool and this would create more families going into the Birkenhead/ Wallasey town centres. Protect the greenbelt. Wirral doesn't need more houses- revamp the existing closed up terraces in Birkenhead and Wallasey and help town centres survive.
DOR02497	I wish to register my concern about local rumours in relation to development in the vicinity of Riverbank Road / Davenport Road, particularly by reference to the possibility of infill sites in the area. I am already concerned by the amount of traffic in the area all of which crosses Davenport Road/ Riverbank Road, which is an open section of the Wirral Way. This is becoming increasingly dangerous for children on bikes and any further development will inevitably lead to accidents. There are few places in the area where children can cycle safely and more traffic across the Wirral way will create a real hazard to life. There is also the question of access which, before station road sends traffic either down Wallrake, which is very narrow and often blocked or past Gayton or St Peters schools. Many children in the area walk or cycle to school and additional traffic including construction traffic would create a real danger. I would also be concerned about the further impact on local wildlife which is so abundant in this area. Only recently we have seen many migrating geese. Wildlife habitats seem to be under so much pressure at present and need to be protected for the sake of future generations
DOR02498	On behalf of Heswall Primary School, I would like to add the following comments. 1. The land around the school is precious to us and is a big attraction to our parents. We are an eco-school and highly value the area around our school. We utilise the public footpaths to access the local facilities. We value the nature, the fields of crops, the animals that often graze the fields next to the school. 2. The school is already oversubscribed and the school wants full consultation with regards to planning for school places for the inevitable increasing population. Any impact on the school being including us being required to offer additional places would mean additional building. The school needs information at the earliest possible time and full consultation. 3. The area around the school can get wet easily. This school has had to plant hundreds of trees over the years to stop erosion of soil banks.
DOR02499	One of Wirral's strong points is its greenbelts. If building houses on this land is allowed to go ahead the enjoyment of the peninsulas open spaces will be destroyed. According to the NPPF, there are five stated purposes of including land within the green belt: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Once an area of land has been defined as green belt, the stated opportunities and benefits include: Providing opportunities for access to the open countryside for the urban population Providing opportunities for outdoor sport and outdoor recreation near urban areas The retention of attractive landscapes and the enhancement of landscapes, near to where people live Improvement of damaged and derelict land around towns The securing of nature conservation interests The retention of land in agricultural, forestry and related uses. Keep it and don't use it!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02500	I appreciate the need for the Wirral reviewing greenbelts rather than allowing the government to do it without local knowledge. I am however, deeply concerned at the sites chosen. You mention that you want to preserve the character of the identified local area but in building on the two sites identified in West Kirby, you're going to completely destroy the character of key green areas within the village. My other concern, is that given both sites locations on 'the other side of the hill', i.e. up and over Black Horse Hill, what will actually be built will be expensive homes which aren't affordable for the vast majority of people, owing to the location and size of surrounding executive homes. If you're looking to maximise the volume of homes built, you should look to identify areas which can accommodate smaller, more affordable homes which will allow people to actually get onto the housing ladder which I believe to be the key issue here. Building on those sites in West Kirby will not fulfil this requirement. As a resident of West Kirby, I would be horrified to see the deforestation of the site along Grange Road. The woodlands are beautiful and absolutely critical to local residents who walk here, take their dogs or children for a walk here. I for one, would feel like West Kirby would suffer immensely and become less beautiful and desirable. West Kirby will not benefit from a handful of expensive homes which serve a few, in place of beautiful countryside, woodlands and scenery which serve the many.
DOR02501	I am concerned that any development in the Caldý area would fall outside "affordable housing". Properties in this area are normally on the market for several months, which appears to me that there is no great demand for them.
DOR02502	Please do not ruin our beautiful Wirral peninsula by building on greenbelt areas and use brownfield sites only. We live in Irby and this village would be totally spoilt by building here. The roads would be congested and would not cope with more traffic. Schools and health services would be over run. Wildlife is prominent in this area and we see many birds of prey, herons, owls, woodpeckers. Pheasant in the fields behind our home. Surely they cannot be evicted when this can be avoided by planning properly and with due consideration to the environment.
DOR02503	I object to the plan of using the land outlined. As it will destroy a rural area that I have grown up in. There are no transport connections to meet the needs of the community that require housing. This land will just be used by the rich who don't need to look for housing here. We need affordable accessible housing for the vulnerable people in our community. We currently have no bus service in the area. There are not any shops either. Why would you remove this beautiful countryside to house people who can look for housing anywhere they want. You are not meeting the needs of those who need it. You are lining the pockets of the rich yet again. There are substantial empty properties in churches, disused business etc that can be accessed. I suggest you look at those empty properties first before you destroy the Wirral & bulldoze our outstanding countryside.
DOR02504	The council needs to get more assertive to get the brownfield sites developed. If need be take it off them and build on it. Leave the Green Belt alone because that's what makes the Wirral a lovely place to live in and enjoy.
DOR02505	This Labour led council is an absolute disgrace. Affordable houses could have been built over ten years ago on brownfield sites. We don't need any more mansions in Caldý, Hoylake or West Kirby. we need homes for young families and beautiful places where locals and visitors alike can enjoy fresh air and nature. Its high time that the Labour group had a good shake up, in particular their leader who should be ashamed of himself.
DOR02506	<p>I am concerned about the proposed use of greenbelt land along the Dee Coast.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. This is actively farmed arable land and has been so used for as long as I have lived on the Wirral some 40 plus years. 2. In the current political situation the ability to produce food is increasingly important as access to continental trade is going to be inhibited regardless of the final outcome of the Brexit negotiations. Therefore, local and national markets will need the support of crops grown in this area. 3. The particular area along the Dee coast has a very limited infrastructure to support additional housing. 4. The sewage treatment works located just off Broad Lane are frequently overwhelmed by the requirements of the existing housing density in the area. 5. Despite extensive remedial work in recent years the Wirral Way still regularly floods from the Farr Hall Road Bridge along its length towards the far end of Broad Lane. 6. Additionally a great deal of water drains down from the Dales and the drains in Broad Lane at the top of Banks Road flood. 7. Delavor Road is regularly icy and impassable in winter with cars from the steep surrounding roads parked along its length. 8. Road access in the area is limited with narrow winding lanes some of which are very steep. 8. Access through the Lower Village in Heswall would be difficult for large earth moving and construction traffic. 9. There are sufficient brownfield sites on the Wirral that could be utilised for housing developments without taking valuable quality farmland. 10. The unnecessary proposed golf course in the Carr Lane area would be more sensibly used for housing. The existing golf courses are struggling to survive. 11. Maintaining useful green belt is essential for minimising carbon emissions and helping the fight against global warming. 12. Greenbelt land is essential for the wellbeing of not just the local population but the many visitors who come from around the country to enjoy peace and calm and the wonderful bird life of the estuary.
DOR02507	Local Plan should be deliverable with NIL RELEASE OF GREEN BELT. The Council is taking what they see as the simpler, quicker and more lucrative option and that is wrong. Rushing through a last minute, inadequate Review and Public Consultation, after wasting 14years doing nothing, was also wrong.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02508	<p>I feel extremely strongly that building homes should be because people ACTUALLY need them and where they need them. It is almost criminal to think of building on productive farmland. The government talks of improving the population's health (given the obesity epidemic) so how does that stack up with Wirral Council proposing to build on farmland that grows food? The idea these days is good, local food wherever possible and low food miles to help combat climate change. If the council insist on using farmland we are all one step closer to being even more unhealthy. It seems that the proposal to build around Raby Mere has not been thought out - how will new home owners get to stations, local shops? there will be huge amounts of congestion along Blakeley Rd and around Bromborough golf course. Blakeley Rd is already used as a 'rat-run' at certain times of day. Most people who live in Raby Mere chose to live there because of its proximity to countryside - a 5 minute walk - what right has the council to take that away? House prices in the area will drop - Wirral Council should, at the very least, be liable to pay compensation for this. Build on brownfield sites before ruining the Wirral countryside.</p>
DOR02509	<p>Strategic Parcel 062- Green Belt land west of Barnston Road, Gills Lane, Whitfield rd.... I disagree that there is a need for Wirral council to consider the re-designation of ANY green belt land for development purposes. I have lived on Barnston Road for over 12 years now. Within this time congestion on the road in rush hour traffic/motorway shut down is horrific. More houses in the area will not only put more demand on the road increasing pollution in the area as well as possible collapse of the very tight historic Barnston Dip. This dip adds to the beauty of Barnston. Furthermore, the congestion on Storeton lane is bad even now, adding further houses will cause a grid lock at rush hour. Additionally, the ability to turn out from your own drive will be very difficult and then be faced with congestion queues!! New houses in this area will increase the burden on an ever overloaded NHS/GP system which in turn will increase the patients journey to be seen in a timely manner for investigations and appointments. The current NHS system as well as schools are struggling to deliver the care they are required to do so without extra burdens being placed by building extra houses. There are currently brown field sites that need development first without taking away the urban land. Green belt land is essential for wildlife. Taking this away will cause decline in wildlife/birds/insects which are essential in to maintain environment status quo. I hope that you will listen to the voices of everyone in the area and withdraw your plans and utilise brown areas. This is a complete disaster for the area if you go ahead with your proposals.</p>
DOR02510	<p>I use the shops a lot in Bromborough village and think it is a disgrace that you plan to build houses there. Without the car park the local shops and businesses will suffer. I object to the plans proposed</p>
DOR02511	<p>We should be protecting our green belt and only building on brownfield areas.</p>
DOR02512	<p>Greenbelt can never be recreated, once it is gone it is gone for ever. The council needs to understand that their stewardship of the Wirral is just a moment in this areas future, wrecking the distinct green gaps between the Wirral's traditional villages is vandalism of all our children and descendants future. Previous councils have granted permission for previous greenbelt to be destroyed, all the brown field sites on the Wirral should be used before it is even discussed and any land bankers like Peel should have the land removed from their ownership.</p>
DOR02513	<p>Wirral has plenty of other options for building on BEFORE they even start thinking of building on our precious Green Belt. Just how much more land do they need.</p>
DOR02514	<p>I am writing to register my total disapproval and concern regarding the Government's housing target of 12,000 homes to be built on the Wirral by 2035. What sort of formula has the Government used to arrive at these preposterous and unrealistic figures? Wirral is a unique environment. We are a peninsula, practically an island, and there is no room for us to "spread". I do recognize the need for a reasonable increase in housing but the amount that the Government suggests is totally unworkable. Our roads are grid-locked as it is. Further, I do not see the need for any of our precious Greenbelt to be part of this plan. As you know, Wirral is 45% urban. The national average in England of urban percentage is around 10%. This means that we have a far greater urban sprawl than most of the country. We do not want to become one mass of metropolis, which is what would certainly happen with these ridiculous targets and we need to preserve what precious greenbelt we have. As a volunteer worker in an Animal Sanctuary on Wirral, I see only too well the daily results of what heavy traffic and loss of habitat does to our local wildlife. I attended a recent Local Plan meeting in West Kirby and the overwhelming public view was a great disappointment in Peel Holdings reining in promised development of our docklands. This would have been an ideal development. We do not need any more "executive homes" in West Wirral. If anything we need first time starter homes or apartments. I urge the council to show backbone to this Government. This is OUR area. By all means make a plan but specify that these numbers are unrealistic, and that no planning on any greenbelt can even be considered until ALL brown sites have been actually built on. It is well-known that builders will cherry pick the green belt areas first as they are easier, cheaper and more profit-making for them. If the government want more houses then they should help meet the cost of this so-called decontamination of brown sites.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02515	<p>I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Green Belt land to the rear of my property. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. 2.) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. 3.) It will spoil the character of the area and would result in the merger of Pensby, Irby and Thingwall turning it into urban sprawl. 4.) There is such a wonderful view from my house and the fields are currently a home for horses but have previously had cattle, sheep and goats. There is wildlife that live close by. We are visited by bats, hedgehogs, badgers and foxes to name a few. 5.) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6.) Increased traffic and major congestion. 7.) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. 8.) I implore you to use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes and please leave this and other green belt sites for our children and their children to enjoy.
DOR02516	Totally disagree that any building development will encroach on green belt surrounding Harrock Wood; which will essentially merge Irby and Pensby into one.
DOR02517	<p>I wish to place on record my appeal regarding plans for housing civic centre, car park, Bromborough village. Bromborough is a thriving village, people do visit from surrounding areas, and need to park. The civic hall is a lifeline for people using library, computers, and day to day contact for vulnerable people. I cannot stress enough my disappointment about this plan. I also have grave concerns over if plans did go ahead, village would not survive, extra people living in village would put undue burden on local drs, dentists, health services.</p>
DOR02518	I am concerned about the wildlife that will be killed in the area. There are endangered species there. How will these be protected/rehomed. There are many great crested newts in the area.
DOR02519	<p>I attended one of the local meetings and it was perfectly clear from the attitude of the staff at the tables and the lack of interest and knowledge with which the Executive Planning Officer delivered the information that the council staff regard this as a "done deal" and the meetings were nothing more than a box ticking exercise. I think it is absolutely disgraceful that the council are guilty negligence by not submitting figures to the government, despite the fact that this is what they are paid to do. I was at the council meeting on 10th sept in Wallasey town hall, and watched 44 councillors agree with building on greenbelt land when all historical figures show that the population of the Wirral is declining and these houses are not required. The 4000 or so empty properties that the council owns are ample to house people on the streets, along with brownfield sites already identified. Of the councillors that voted against building on greenbelt land, most of them openly stated that the public are being fed lies (we already knew this) and that it is totally unnecessary). I am so angry that it is impossible to put into words without writing a book, but the council needs to know that the public are not stupid. We know that you are lying and that this is all about money - selling off our green spaces to make fat profits, whilst endangering wildlife, putting at risk human mental health, reducing agricultural land for food, which will be required even more so in the future due to Brexit and climate change. Just in case there is any doubt, I ENTIRELY DISAGREE WITH BUILDING ON ANY GREENBELT LAND. We will fight this as long as we have to, and I am sure that the end result will be a public enquiry as it is clear that we cannot trust the council.</p>
DOR02520	<p>I wish to object to the proposal re Bromborough Shopping Area. To demolish the library, civic centre and parking area to build houses on the cleared site is staggering even for this council. Your idea would certainly kill the shopping area because of the lack of parking (which my wife and I always park), plus the library and the civic centre is used constantly (When the library is open). What would be replacing the library and the civic centre to enable those activities to continue, and please don't say they can go to Bebington or Eastham and overload their systems. With all these extra houses planned to be built in the area i.e. Acre Lane, where are the children to go to school which are overloaded because the infrastructure is insufficient to cope with the extra capacity. The previous Labour government years ago instructed local authorities to plan for future housing and this authority sat on its hands for years and did nothing, and now it has been forced into action, causing this panic planning to happen. Please reconsider these plan and think again.</p>
DOR02521	I am against any building of houses onto the green belt land in the Wirral. there are many areas available that can be utilised that are an eye sore and require development. Land by the Birkenhead docks and stretching from Seacombe to Woodside has been left for many years and is crying out for investment.
DOR02522	Think it's a disgrace when plenty of areas have houses suitable for renovation, or bulldozing and rebuilding on. There is little enough countryside without building on the green belt. The surrounding areas will stop being desirable to live in. And nature needs all the help it can get.
DOR02523	<p>Any plans to build upon Greenbelt Land must be stopped. Wirral has a plethora of Brownbelt sites that could be far better utilised. Our village has one, already extremely busy road, and any additional building would have a detrimental effect on an already overused road. We have no doctors or dentists within our village, and those in the surrounding areas of Neston, Heswall and Willaston are already oversubscribed. Additional building will only exacerbate the situation. To date there have been no adequate 'very special circumstances' identified that would indicate that the building upon Greenbelt in Thornton Hough would be advisable. To do so would cause significant detrimental encroachment into the countryside which in turn would have a major impact on the conservation area. It is time for the council to look at the areas where brown belt is lying vacant and to make use of this as a viable resource.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02524	I would like to object to some of the proposals in the Wirral Local Plan. I feel generally the land to the west of the Wirral Way leading down to the Dee coast is an asset to the Wirral and a unique area of great natural beauty that should be preserved for future generations and is part of what makes the Wirral a beacon for visitors. Specific comments about planning in area SP099: this is a quiet residential road and not a village to be infilled! The majority of the houses are of character and in keeping with each other. It would totally spoil the aspect of the road to try and increase the amount of housing. Each of these houses has unique views down to the Dee estuary and any prospect of building as "infill" would totally ruin the aspect and character of this road and affect the privacy of most of the buildings already present. Any increase in population in this area would require a massive upgrade in access, lighting, utilities and broadband speeds. At present the roads are narrow and not well lit, the road regularly floods with raw sewerage at one end and floodwater at the other. There are few public transport links. Any increase in population would also change the quiet, rural feel to the entrance to the Wirral Way at the top of Park West and as pedestrians and cyclists make their way to the Wirral Way at Riverbank Road, they could be having to negotiate busy access roads with the subsequent increased risk of accidents. This quiet family leisure route would become a busy, hazardous journey. I feel this is a beautiful, characterful area, full of wildlife and varied natural habitats and should be regarded as a major asset of the Wirral to be preserved for future generations
DOR02525	wildlife the plan takes no account of the local wild life it will disturb. there are also endangered wildlife in the area in particular bats whose habitat cannot be moved . for example there are bats nesting in the field behind me. they are protected has the la conducted wildlife surveys to ascertain what other bats and animals, protected or not , will be harmed. if they are protected, then permission cannot be granted. area. the government requirement is to provide housing. the LA are trying to find land that developers may like. that is not the same thing. there are plenty of land and sites near the docks which are celery not as desirable but that is not the point. the LA have to provide housing and it can choose sites near the docks which are unused and can be developed. by building on the sites identified, the la will take away the essence of the borough. i object to the plans to build on green belt
DOR02526	I am strongly against development on Wirral greenbelt land
DOR02527	The Local Plan does not satisfactorily justify the proposed release of much loved and justifiably protected Green Belt. The Council's reports includes inaccurate growth projections for Wirral and also under-represents the areas of Brownfield land that are/could be available for housing development. This misinformation, used as the justification for releasing such vast areas of Green Belt, is not acceptable. The Green Belt that is at risk in Wirral far exceeds amounts at risk in other Councils despite Wirral having a higher than average percentage of Brownfield land as well as thousands of empty homes that could and should be used as a priority. There is clearly no justification for the release of the Green Belt proposed. The release of Green Belt should only be done in exceptional circumstances. Wirral does not have exceptional circumstances. The Council should be promoting urban regeneration not urban sprawl. The plan to release Green Belt land shows complete lack of understanding of local communities - their desire to maintain local identity and heritage and to protect "sense of place". The proposed sites for release would result in merged communities with the loss of clear boundaries and identities, as well as the loss of large areas of natural land. The Green Belt currently provides Wirral residents (and visitors) with valuable open space and attractive landscapes that promote healthy communities and increase well-being as well as providing valuable habitats for wildlife. The value of this Green Belt land should not be under-stated and once gone it will be lost forever. The Green Belt should be protected until there are no other options. The other options have not been appropriately considered and/or are being understated. Please reconsider.
DOR02528	<p>I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Green Belt land across Wirral. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As stated by your own councillors, the population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. • Developing Green belt land will spoil the character of the area. • Green Belt open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for many local residents. • Green Belt land is home to a variety of natural habitats and therefore wildlife will be severely affected. • Unrivalled views will be destroyed with irreparable damage across Wirral. • Increased traffic will cause major congestion to areas. • It is not only homes that will need building but think about the infrastructure that will be needed too! • Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. • Some of the sites are huge. Once released from Green Belt, building could cause unrestricted sprawl, with historic villages merging. <p>Thank you for reading my concerns. I feel that, as an alternative, a more in-depth look at using existing space on brownfield sites for homes would be more beneficial. There are also a number of empty properties that can be used and redeveloped.</p>
DOR02529	I object to the plans to build on pipers lane in Heswall. This road is not suited to extra volume of traffic Also I believe green belt areas should be protected and brownfield sites should always be used instead.
DOR02530	It is unacceptable for the Council to take the easy option of building on green belt to address its own failure to produce a plan in the timescale required. I 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. I 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.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02531	Building homes is essential but they must be built on appropriate land. Wirral has plenty of brown belt areas that need redevelopment, leave the green belt alone!
DOR02532	<p>1. From the Wirral Council communications about the challenge we all need to rise to, to develop our Local Plan & deliver our share of increased housing stock and the availability of affordable housing for those looking to get on to or start to climb the housing ladder, it would seem that at least a major part of the solution should be for Peel Holdings to deliver on their previous commitments for Wirral Waters. How can we pressure Peel Holdings to deliver on their promise to build 13,000 new homes on the Wirral Waters land? If they're back-tracking, shouldn't compulsory purchase an option?</p> <p>2. What 'guarantees' will the council give to ensure that the unique beauty & appeal of the Wirral peninsula will not be materially harmed by green belt development - our stunning coastline, woodland, dales, fields & pasture land, and the stunning views we & our visitors enjoy from our country parks, footpaths, cycle trails & bridleways, and from our towns & homes all over the Wirral? What are the principles that the Council Planners are using to decide what green belt land should be made available for development, and what rules will be applied to ensure development is sympathetic to the surrounding environment, flora & fauna?</p> <p>3. What logic is behind the proposal to develop on the greenbelt land to the East & West of Piper's Lane, Heswall - in an area of high nature conservation interest, adjoining the beautiful Wirral Way country park, and with very limited road & services connections? If development was to be approved, what restrictions would be made to the type of housing that would be allowed, to ensure limited impact on the beauty of the environment and on the fauna & flora that live there? What guarantees will the Council give that the local infrastructure will be developed to ensure it can cope e.g. local schools, transport network etc</p> <p>4. For land in private ownership, is the Council proposing compulsory purchase as an available option to free up current greenbelt land for development - and how will local homeowners be compensated for impact on house prices as a result?</p>
DOR02533	I think the current plan is irresponsible, short-sighted and environmentally disastrous. To even consider building on green belt areas when we have so many brownfield sites and empty housing stock is lazy and smacks of profiteering. However I would respect a plan that cleaned up industrial wasteland; used brownfield sites; enforced planning permission which has already been granted and restored our empty housing stock. We should show a responsibility for caretaking our green spaces and nature reserves for future generations to enjoy while improving urban areas so that all Wirral residents enjoy a better landscape, wherever they live. The current plan will give a diminished landscape for all Wirral residents while providing even more high end and prestigious accommodation instead of affordable homes. I speak as someone who attended a local consultation meeting about the plan and listened to the various points of view raised therein.
DOR02534	I'm very much against the development of buildings on the land north of 90 to 92 Grange Road, West Kirby (SHLAA0716) as this is a valuable open space within West Kirby. This land just gives the peace back which the busy road next to it destroys.
DOR02535	I am appalled to see that Bromborough library is under threat yet again, since we have successfully opposed it's closure in the past. The library, civic hall, and carpark are well used by the local community, and to remove any of them would have a negative impact on the heart of Bromborough.
DOR02536	As the population of the Wirral is declining I believe building on Green Belt sites is unnecessary and wrong. Green belt is essential for food and the population wellbeing ,once built on will never return to Green Belt.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02537	<p>As a local resident of Barnston I would like to register my serious objections to Wirral Borough Council's current proposals. It is my understanding that land may only be removed from the Green Belt in exceptional circumstances, yet it seems to me that these proposals fail to meet the criteria in the National Planning Policy Framework. The Green Belt is enjoyed by residents across the whole of the Wirral for leisure activities, with public footpaths providing many country walks for families of all ages. Given the rise in obesity and other illnesses caused by sedentary and indoor lifestyles, the potential destruction of green-belt land seems to be counter-productive to other government targets to get people taking exercise, and enjoying fresh air, and could lead to further pressure on NHS services. Additionally, the existing infrastructure in the area – roads, drains, sewers etc. – barely copes with current demand and population levels. As a regular user of Barnston Road (on foot and in car) I can confirm that it is extremely busy at peak travel times already (and it is a Council-designated Accident Route) making it difficult to cross on foot especially with children. It also floods regularly with heavy or sudden rain. Any additional housing would only add to these problems. As a mother to a young family I am very concerned about the impact of any development. The local primary schools, particularly Barnston and Heswall are also full to capacity in either all or some of the year groups. I believe any further housing development would put unmanageable pressure on schools, not just in class sizes but school facilities e.g. numbers of toilets per pupil etc. The immediate area around Barnston School is already overly congested with cars at school opening/closing. Additional cars would cause a serious safety risk. Walking to school is already sometimes dangerous, as mentioned crossing Barnston Road, as well as Brimstage Road where there is no designated crossing facility (having been removed due to lack of Council funding). Public transport in the area is poor (few trains from Heswall station and irregular bus services) meaning additional housing would result in additional cars, posing safety issues as stated and adding to further environmental pollution and climate change. Destruction of wood and farmland increases this negative environmental impact further and reduces biodiversity. Having undertaken some research, I also understand that the figures used and assumptions made for housing needs across Wirral may be flawed, and so the demand for additional housing may be low. I understand that the central government aim is increase in affordable housing. Given market rates for property in the Barnston/Heswall area is high, I would have concerns about the long-term viability of affordable housing, and suspect that new properties would quickly be re-sold at market rate, meaning those in need of affordable housing would be unable to live there. Overall there seems no exceptional need for the release of green-belt land, except as a means of fundraising for private owners, development companies, and (I would hate to think) Wirral Borough Council. The lives of our children should not be compromised for profit.</p>
DOR02538	The Green Belt should be preserved at all costs for wildlife and to keep our beautiful countryside.
DOR02539	<p>We have numerous brownfield areas and vacant properties which could be used to increase housing in the area. However the Wirral population is actually falling so it is difficult to understand any justification to do so. The proposed plans are for 12,000 houses to be built over the next year. Not only would this see us losing our green spaces but we also do not have the infrastructure to support additional people moving to the area. Hospitals, schools, children's services, doctors and transport links would all be severely compromised.</p>
DOR02540	<p>Please do NOT develop on green belt and use the brownfield ones or derelict houses across the Wirral. Building on green belt is not needed. Too many old buildings that aren't being used could be turned into houses. Don't take it away from our children to have some green areas to explore in and play in</p>
DOR02541	<p>I wish to register my objections to the proposed changes to the Green Belt around Eastham. Removing the Green Belt protection would result in an urban sprawl all the way from Ellesmere Port to New Brighton. Green Spaces, hedgerows and mature trees would be lost forever. The quality of life for people living in Eastham Village would be affected detrimentally. Eastham Village has already lost the rugby field to new developments. A move that no one in Eastham wanted.</p>
DOR02542	<p>I have concerns about the proposed development of Wirral's green belt. In particular I feel that the character and identity of the Borough will change irreparably if greenbelt land is developed. Wirral is privileged to have clear green boundaries between its settlements. Unlike other parts of Merseyside which have sprawled east, Wirral's urban expansion has so far been prevented by the green belt. Further urbanisation will damage the environment and will harm the unique character and identity of our ancient townships. The proposed sites at Greasby for example are some of the oldest inhabited sites in England. We owe it to existing residents and future generations to do all we can to prevent excessive and unnecessary urbanisation and unnecessary destruction of the environment. The greenbelt should therefore be protected at all costs. There are alternatives. It simply cannot be acceptable for brownfield sites acquired by Peel Holdings and the like to lay undeveloped. If the government impose targets for housebuilding then they should approve a mechanism for the compulsory purchase of brownfield land that is not being developed. Legally that can be fine. In Birkenhead there are great areas of potential development land. The proximity of this land to transport links and Liverpool make it prime land, in my view, for new homes. I strongly oppose development of Wirral's greenbelt areas as proposed in the Council's plan. In my view it is a wholly unnecessary proposal which will have catastrophic consequences for the environment and the character of our borough.</p>
DOR02543	<p>WBC have acquiesced to Governments flawed and aggressive recommendations set out in 2016 report. WBC should remember they are elected to represent the people of Wirral. The very nature of communities, and desirability of Wirral localities is dependent on the Green Belt that distant (and unaffected) government officials seek to rape and pillage in their diktat. To add insult to injury, WBC then seek to explain their silent surrender as an unfortunate and unavoidable conclusion. First, WBC's calculations as to 'Housing Needs' are fundamentally flawed in so many areas that the use of 'objective' is fraudulent. Brown-field sites, redevelopment quotas, vacant properties, unused planning consents and 'Wirral Waters' collectively provide more than adequate opportunities. WBC continue to mislead re Peel Holdings and 'Wirral Waters'. Surely getting the proposed 13,500 dwellings on the go, is the priority. WBC appears to be looking for easy answers, but at what cost? Truly, the proposed development of Green Belt will destroy Wirral.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02544	<p>I must make it clear that I do not oppose building on the Green Belt absolutely. It may be necessary for the provision of housing where there is no alternative. I should also point out that the present proposals do not affect me directly. This is not a case of Nimbyism. I do however categorically oppose the proposal of Wirral Borough Council (WBC) for the following reasons:-</p> <p>1 Following their failure to perform their legal duty to produce a proper Local Plan on time, it was only when the Government threatened the possibility of a form of direction from Liverpool City Region that WBC stated that they could produce the Plan in two months, a process that should take two years if carried out properly. As a result WBC has not applied the government formula properly. It brought in outside consultants to produce a report showing that parts of the Green Belt should be released but the consultants pointed out that their report had to be based on the Projections of Growth prepared by WBC. It is those projections which are wildly exaggerated.</p> <p>2 Wirral is not an area of high housing pressure. Compared with most other local authorities WBC has a much greater area of brownfield land and buildings including the un-redeveloped docks, de- industrialised areas, cleared former housing areas, both many and large, as well, as thousands of empty homes waiting to be brought back into use. Despite this, the area of Green Belt which is proposed to be released is ten times the average for other local authorities.</p> <p>3 Given their situation the houses to be built on the Green Belt are likely to be at the higher end of the market when any shortage of housing is at the lower end, for first time buyers for example. Indeed the areas that are in need of development and investment in Wirral are Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry, not those adjoining the Green Belt.</p> <p>4 I cannot see why WBC is not prepared to respond to reasoned arguments and objections by various local bodies including Irby Thurstaston & Pensby Amenity Society. WBC continues to publish misleading and inaccurate information in support of its case and seems to be determined to pursue its policy regardless of valid and substantiated objections to many of the steps in the purported rationale of its proposals. I do not know whether it is being disingenuous or simply incompetent.</p>
DOR02545	<p>Having been a resident of the Wirral for 83 years I have seen a lot of changes and not all for the better. We must always bear in mind that it's Public Money that we are dealing with and it is easily squandered away. The proposals for building on Green belt has to be very carefully considered as there is no 'going back' once the plan has been executed. I am aware of the increase in population and also the increase in those who will pay not anything into the 'coffers' so to speak so it will be the likes of me to pick up the bill in the future. No doubt most eventualities have been considered but the increase in vehicle owners is going to be a problem with more roads needed in and out of these estates that are proposed. It is also so important to retain as much flora as possible for the health of all the residents of the Wirral. I hope to live a little longer to see that we don't rue the day that we have been a party to overkill on this project.</p>
DOR02546	<p>I strongly oppose the use of any Greenbelt sites being developed due to the existing undeveloped Brownfield sites and empty properties within Wirral. I find the Council's figures flawed and would like to see a re-appraisal.</p>
DOR02547	<p>Please use as much brown land as possible, minimise use of green belt ,utilise existing areas of town. Do not destroy the natural Wirral beauty</p>
DOR02548	<p>There are plans to build directly behind my home, ruining the view, increasing noise, increasing vehicles, privacy reduced. I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Mill Hill Road and anywhere on Wirral Green Belt land. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. 2.) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. 3.) It will spoil the character of the area. 4.) Wirral open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. 5.) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6.) Increased traffic and major congestion, our road is already used as a cut through by fast vehicles increasing risk to pedestrians and increasing noise pollution. 7.) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. 8.) Damage to conservation areas. 9.) Once released from Green Belt, building could extend, causing unrestricted sprawl, with Irby & Greasby almost merging therefore Irby no longer a village. 10.) Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes.
DOR02549	<p>I do not agree with building on Bromborough village car park or removing the civic centre. Bromborough village is thriving and should be allowed to remain so. There is no space for more houses in Eastham and Bromborough. Surely there is unused land elsewhere which would be much more appropriate.</p>
DOR02550	<p>We need to leave our greenbelt land alone for us and future generations to enjoy . Housing is needed but use brown belt lane fix new ferry and other run down areas so people want to live there</p>
DOR02551	<p>Please don't build on any more green spaces in Saughall Massie and Meols. You have lots of derelict spaces and empty factories ,build and develop on them. The Wirral is renowned for its green belts don't destroy it for our children and grandchildren. Wirral a pleasant place to grow or a concrete jungle?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02552	This is a flawed idea since no consideration has been given to using many of the existing brownfield sites in the borough for development or is that because the private developers will not make enough profit from brownfield sites. There are many linear sites where roads are already laid out on the banks of the River Mersey where there is no realistic prospect of current development, these could all be utilized for housing and would have good views over the river. The proposals shown on your map totally disagree with Lord Leverhulme's vision of a development free central Wirral and let us be realistic the minimal amount of social housing that will accrue from these private developments is abysmal in other words this is just an excuse for private building forms to make more profits from the public. I totally and utterly disagree with these proposals.
DOR02553	If the greenbelt goes we can't get it back. It's important for wildlife/ plants. It helps promote wellbeing by enabling people to connect more easily with nature. There are plenty of brownfield sites (land that has previously been used for housing or commercial industries) that can be used instead. Don't go for the easy option of building on our beautiful green belt land.
DOR02554	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02555	I have a number of concerns: 1. From what I have read, it does not seem plausible that the Wirral needs quite so many new houses built in the relevant time period. Analysis has demonstrated that approximately half the planned number are required. 2. I strongly disagree with Green Belt Land being considered for such development. This land needs to be protected (as originally intended) in order to retain each towns'/villages' identity, prevent urban sprawl and conserve the important habitats. 3. There is plenty of brown field land that could be utilised to provide the extra housing instead, which is a much more sensible course of action. Developers should be prevented from "land banking" and persuaded to build the properties they have acquired permission for instead. This would regenerate land that has historically been left idle in a state of disrepair, inject investment and new life into barren ex industrial areas, while retaining the important green belt that makes the Wirral such an attractive area to live.
DOR02556	So short sighted!! We need the green space!!
DOR02557	I live on the Barnston/Heswall border. My concerns with using the green belt land locally are the road infrastructure is extremely poor and the congestion at Barnston village where the road narrows and there is a right turn towards Storeton, Thingwall roundabout and Arrowse Park junction, Clatterbridge roundabout and Chester High Road are all extremely busy and congested both in the morning and evening and extra cars from further housing would increase this congestion further. Indeed both myself and my husband have to leave far earlier than we would like every morning in order to get through the current traffic to ensure we get to work on time. If an accident occurs locally the knock on effect is further congestion and delays on other local roads. The road infrastructure is not fit to take extra traffic. My other concern is that the local schools are at full capacity with children having no choice as to school due to current birth rates. Indeed some children locally do not even get into their local school in some years. Extra housing would further increase the demand on limited school places with children having to go out of area for school places and further increasing local traffic and congestion around the schools. School crossing patrols have been cut and with further cars on the roads this again increases risks to the local children. We should be protecting our green spaces not developing them.
DOR02558	How dare you even think about getting rid of Bromborough car parking facilities! Do you want to kill of Bromborough itself? Where do you think shoppers and visitors are going to park? Leave Bromborough alone - save money on your over-paid salaries!!
DOR02559	It is not acceptable that the London government intend to force the Council to use Green Belt sites instead of brownfield sites for the local plan re housing needs. They should instead pressure Peel Holdings to keep their 2010 promise to build on their brownfield site. Our environment, source of our health, is under enough pressure without having to add favours for landowners to the mix.
DOR02560	I hope that the council will revise its plans to build on the green belt. Wirral is unique in character and we risk losing this. We should instead focus the plan on redeveloping brownfield land. As a young resident of the Wirral, I hope that the plan could also make a reference to the standard of the standard of the new builds. We need to be building homes that are future ready, and as a person looking to get onto the housing ladder, I wish to build an energy efficient home, unlike many of the homes which are being built on the Wirral at the moment. All have tiny windows, not maximizing solar energy, and built with poor materials for cheapness. The Local Plan has potential to encourage energy efficient housing, and I think this should be the case given that this plan will form the basis of our building for the next 15 years.
DOR02561	In the documents provided online, the Council are assessing the suitability for development on each parcel of land in isolation. To provide habitat for wildlife the greenbelt areas of Wirral need to be considered as a whole. There need to be wildlife corridors across the width and length of Wirral so that species can move around the peninsula and into and out of the area from coast to countryside. Without adequate protection and conservation of wildlife corridors local extinctions can occur. Please take this into consideration.
DOR02562	The current housing plans take up too much green belt land.
DOR02563	I object to the local plan because Green belt is precious and Peel holdings are waiting to build on brownfield sites if the council could be bothered to process the plan.
DOR02564	How can the Wirral Council sell the piece of land at the rear of 31-47 Dutton Drive SHLAA 1616. This piece of land was given to WBC by Broseley Estates on the condition that it was laid out and equipped as a children's play area.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02565	Swings area on corner of Warrender Drive and Tollemache Rd is only used by young people for meeting up and carrying out anti-social behaviour ; upsetting for residents. This area should be built on with two bed bungalows to take people out of three bedroom houses that they don't need as there are only two residents; also they would accommodate elderly people; similar to the bungalows in Warrender Drive.
DOR02566	The village of Irby is already congested and difficult to drive through any further development in this area would cause problems. The field SP059E at the back of Irby Hall has historical significance with its moat from the Grange of St Werburgh and the ancient mere used by a variety of wild life including crested newt. The trees of the hall provide habitat for bats. The field is used by migrating birds. I would therefore oppose any alteration to this greenfield site.
DOR02567	The increase in traffic and major congestion. There is already a huge amount of traffic at peak hours along Storeton road, mount road, Broadway, Thornton rd and the causeway. Building more house could lead to a grid lock. The intersection at Storeton Ln and Barnston rd is already ridiculous backed up. What infrastructure is there to support this housing - schools are already oversubscribed. Drs surgeries can they cope etc will there be more funding as a result???? The causeway is green belt area it is a beautiful relaxing walk way used by everyone in the area. There are so many more reason why building more housing on the causeway should not go ahead. The powers that be know that this is immoral. The money making machines should look elsewhere to build there housing on green belt land. Heswall/Thurston for one plenty more space.
DOR02568	Wirral is not an area of high demand for new housing - with independent population growth assessments indicating a stable , not expanding, population growth - as has been the case for many years now, There are many Brownfield sites available & Peel Holdings have made clear their dissatisfaction with WBC over the use of misleading information about Peel Holdings projected buildings figures. I have been a resident of Greasby for 15 years and before that 29 years in Irby. It seems basic common sense - when seeing the run- down state of various places in our borough e.g. Birkenhead being a prime example , that it is in such places that development is urgently needed i.e. NOT ON GREEN BELT LAND !!!
DOR02569	<p>The Local Plan, which has taken an eternity to materialise, seems hell-bent on releasing Green Belt land for housing development. I whole-heartedly disagree with this and wish to register my objection to the plans. In support of my objection here are several points which need to be noted:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * There are five purposes of the Green Belt Scheme, none of which are being taken into account with the Council's plans. * It was widely understood that from the outset, Green Belt was sacrosanct and untouchable for perpetuity. There appears to be many underhand schemes afoot to circumvent this in order to develop lucrative housing programmes. * The National Planning Policy Framework stated that Greenbelt could only be released if there were exceptional circumstances which were fully evidenced and justified. There are no exceptional circumstances here. * If the Council followed their own mantra of 'Brownfield First' then even with the abnormally large housing estimated requirements it was possible to fulfil them with Brownfield sites. With the new revised estimates then it is most certainly possible to fulfil without using Green Belt sites. * In addition there are various other options available to supplement this using empty properties and similar possibilities. * The current Brownfield register is patchy and not comprehensive. There are many examples either missing possibilities or not utilising their full potential. Many more housing opportunities could emerge as a result of completing this in depth. * The proposed programme of Greenbelt release is ten times the amount of other local authorities. This is an unacceptable amount considering Wirral 'isn't an area of high housing pressure' and other authorities don't have the wealth of Brownfield opportunities that Wirral has. * Building on Greenbelt is easier for developers, providing them with increased profits whilst also giving the Local Authority higher dividends from Council Tax. However this is to the detriment of the localities and the people who live there. * The proposed housing would not be affordable housing for those who most need it. Developing the many Brownfield sites would be affordable and would 'kill two birds with one stone'. * The figures provided by the Council to Government regarding housing needs were based on flawed interpretations of the data and projected growth of population and jobs. The falling birth-rate and ageing population reinforces the need to reassess the figures. The latest ONS figures provide a much lesser figure for housing needs but the Council seem very keen to ignore this and other data in order to further their desire to release Green Belt. * The Green Belt was intended to prevent urban sprawl and prevent merging of local distinct villages and townships. Removing the Green Belt status would mean that parts of Wirral would become one large conurbation. * The unique and historic character of many smaller villages would be lost if infilling were to occur. This is against the premise of the Green Belt also. * The Green Belt was supposed to stop encroachment into the countryside which this plan certainly would be. The effects of this are numerous - increased noise, light and traffic pollution / loss of agricultural character and landscape / loss of views and vistas / risk to wildlife, both protected and otherwise, and the possible permanent loss of species which have been indigenous to Wirral for centuries. * Many proposed development sites are on areas of high archaeological value.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>* Loss of trees would not only mean loss of habitats but increased risk to the water table and flooding. This would also increase with the rise in number of drives and paved patios preventing water escape.</p> <p>* Scant regard has been given to the strain on the amenities of these areas with increased populations. Transport, traffic, medical services, schools, parking etc etc would all either have to bear the brunt or have investment in increasing the amenities accordingly. It is to be hoped that due regard is going to be given to the representations made by sincere and knowledgeable groups such as ITPAS (Irby Thurstaston and Pensby Amenity Society) and the Wirral Green Space Alliance. They have the interests of the area and the population at heart. Much time, thought and effort has gone in to the formal objections made by those groups.</p>
DOR02570	This is a disgrace, we have a lovely and clean environment with lots of nature and building houses will not only destroy this, but it will tarnish the living standards and environment around it, congested roads, polluted air and much more. This is an abomination and should not go ahead whatsoever.
DOR02571	I feel we should use all brown sites for re-development we should keep our greenbelt otherwise Wirral will become unrecognisable.
DOR02572	I am concerned at the amount of development on green belt land and the implications for even further traffic congestion.
DOR02573	<p>I currently live in Irby, which is a beautiful Village. We have a really close knit Community and take pride in our Village. The plan to develop on Greenbelt will destroy this. We would become too large. Our local schools are already full and the catchment area has been reduced. Out GP service is already overstretched and getting an appointment is difficult. The junction of Irby Village would struggle with all the extra traffic. The road I currently live in has a brook that runs alongside, this tends to flood when we have large amounts of rain, the drains in the road cannot cope with the extra water so to replace land which absorbs water would only make this worse. We have a large amount of wildlife that live on these fields, pheasants, rabbits, a variety of birds, bats and badgers, building here would destroy their natural environment. Whilst I understand there is a need for more property there is plenty of "brown" land which could be used first. I understand that not as many houses are required as first thought and I think it is only right that other locations are consider first before our Greenbelt is taken from us. I strongly oppose the building on Greenbelt land.</p>
DOR02574	<p>Firstly, there is no demand in the area for the additional housing and if the green belt land was to be released only executive style houses would be built in these locations, making the objective of this land release pointless. The infrastructure cannot cope now, the traffic and delays at Thingwall Junction / Landican Road during peak times is already unbearable. Loss of open green space will influence people's health, we already have an obesity endemic affecting the NHS service, no natural free space for walking and other leisure activities will increase this burden. My objections to the council releasing Green Belt land for development include the following points: Local population growth figures do not match the projected housing targets identified by the council/DCLG A true examination would reveal the population of Wirral is declining. Large number of empty premises and brownfield sites should be considered for development as a priority. Planning applications that have been approved but not started because of harvesting by developers / agents, enforcement measures should be deployed to deter these actions by developers / agents. Planning applications that are being delays, i.e., Wirral Waters (Peel) - Wirral Council should make this scheme a priority action and hold Peel Holdings accountable for delays and lack of action in redeveloping Wirral Waters. There are declining areas of Birkenhead, Seacombe and New Ferry which are in desperate need of regeneration and improved social housing should be considered as first priority. Lack of local and central government funding for infrastructure to maintain and upgrade the current infrastructure. Existing facilities are stretched and underfunded, no margin exists for additional resource stretch cause by increase in local population. Lack employment opportunities and dwindling industry in the area to provide employment for influx of population. Limited employment opportunities for current population of Wirral. Only service industries which are low paid and underfunded available in local area. Lack of investment by local and central government in local facilities, availability of which is declining. Land values in my local area and others will not be sufficiently profitable to enable development of affordable houses, hence, executive more expensive homes will be built. Isolated and remote nature of Greenfield sites and access to facilities, i.e., no regular transport routes and lack of local shops and amenities. Total Loss of biodiversity and public access to open areas / spaces, e.g., access to natural habitats, woodland, footpaths, and bridleways. Impact on wildlife in Green Belt areas. The Green Belt areas on Wirral are a precious commodity and under no circumstances should they be considered for release for housing that has been proven as NOT required. Should these plans be approved then my family and I will have to consider migrating from the Wirral area, this is the consensus of others that have been consulted. This is a once in a lifetime decision that if allowed to go ahead will destroy the borough of Wirral for our future generations. PLEASE REJECT THE PLANS AND DO NOT LET THE GREEN BELT LAND GRAB HAPPEN.</p>
DOR02575	I strongly disagree on using the green belt lands on Wirral for more new homes. Part of the enjoyment of living in Wirral is the open green space. We need these spaces as more and more people move in new builds already. Wirral has enough homes just renovate the buildings homes that are in need of renovation. Wirral prides itself on its green belt and open spaces.. please keep it safe for future generations to enjoy.
DOR02576	No building on green belt, use up brown sites even though it is more costly
DOR02577	<p>West of Column Road (SP013) - It affects us on a personal level as we live in close proximity to the proposed development, as in heavy traffic, schools, losing the beautiful rural feel and possibly effecting our house prices. - This is a conservation area and it shouldn't be allowed. - Your talking about affordable housing I do not believe that the developments on West of Column Road (SP013) meet that criteria, they will be luxury housing and this is also required due to the details in policy CH11 is Caldý Conservation area, so this should not be built on at all as the proposals are for affordable living housing. - Concern regarding the drainage I clearly see there is a problem at the bottom end of Column Road. - Being a conservationist knowing how this will affect the migratory birds in the area and the nesting area for the barn owls close to this development. - The government are requesting housing but this cannot be the case for all councils, this is being taken advantage of by the council for your own benefits.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02578	I feel I must write to express my deep concern over the proposed plans to build thousands of new properties in Wirral's greenbelt. Wirral does not need thousands more properties, Wirral does not have the thousands of new jobs!! Building on greenbelt should not be an option. The damage this will do will be catastrophic and irreversible. Wirral is a beautiful green county with diverse wildlife and residents have decided to live on the Wirral because of this. Wirral is a peninsula and therefore traffic is restricted on how it leaves and enters the County. The M53 is at a standstill during peak hours during the daily commute to and from work. Queues to get off the M53 tail back onto the motorways at several junctions including Bebington which is extremely dangerous. The A41 and Chester High road are heavily congested along with both Mersey tunnels. Clatterbridge roundabout and surrounding areas, Clatterbridge Hospital and down towards the Croft retail park, are also very congested. Building houses on the greenbelt land around this area would result in gridlock. New developments around Clatterbridge/Storeton would be devastating for the area. The greenbelt and wildlife would disappear for ever and the chaos it would cause would be catastrophic. Building more houses would lead to more cars, more congestion, more standing traffic resulting in higher pollution levels that the government is trying to reduce!! Wirral does not have the capacity to provide jobs for thousands more residents therefore they would have to commute. Wirral does not have the road structure or public transport capacity to cope with this increase. It already struggles. Liverpool, Deeside, Chester and Manchester are all areas of major employment. Don't let Wirral become a commuter belt for these areas. Local hospitals are unable to cope at present with the numbers of patients building more houses would be irresponsible. Say no to all building on greenbelt and any new developments be affordable housing and on a much smaller scale be built on brownfield. Don't build on Wirral's Greenbelt
DOR02579	the houses which are currently empty should be modernised and rented to people who really need them or sold for affordable prices rather than taking greenbelt we are going to end up like London no greenbelt
DOR02580	I have several queries about the plan which I believe require answers. The plan has been imposed without consultation and in my view is deeply undemocratic.
DOR02581	I am against the plans to build on green belt. There is investment going into Wirral Waters which includes housing (when they finally get on with it) and there is brown belt. A key concern is local wildlife. A few years ago there were so many more hedgehogs, butterflies, garden birds... This development will threaten further.
DOR02582	Wirral is a beautiful, desirable, community rich borough that must not be a victim of false hope, promises and decimation of our green spaces. It has been widely reported that there is more than enough brownfield for development within the area without the need to build on areas so opposed by the whole community. We are told more affordable housing is needed but the properties promised sound anything but. Do not be the ones to make decisions that will be suffered by generations forever more. Do not take the green areas that make Wirral so wonderful, so healthy and so attractive and then build housing that cannot be bought by those who need the properties. Listen to YOUR area and YOUR people
DOR02583	As a resident living in a designated conservation area I find the proposal of using the land allocated currently for parking to Bromborough Village completely flawed. The residents currently living on The Rake do not all have access private parking or have limited parking so frequently use the car park for themselves or relatives visiting. The Village itself is key to the community and also has many fairs taking place throughout the year, I fear this would come to a gradual end and cause dire consequences for the village. The roads in the area already get quite busy and I would also question whether they could cope with additional housing and the traffic that would bring. That also applies to the local schools. We moved to the area from Wallasey and love its charm and cosy character all of which I fear would be lost. There are many other areas that could be used for additional housing that would have less impact in its surrounding area and less risk of damaging local businesses and community.
DOR02584	SHLAA 2018 - Former Foxfield School Site I welcome the development of this site but please ask that parking is taking into account in a way that supports the businesses on that part of Hoylake Road. We are heavily dependent on street parking spaces on Ely Avenue for customers and really cannot afford to lose them if that side of the road was lost to the development.
DOR02585	Completely out of touch with needs and local reality. Too many homes planned. Use brown sites instead.
DOR02586	Following revised number of houses needed to be built the local plan should be delayed and revised. This local plan does not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment and would intrude in a disadvantaged way. Although areas such as Harrocks wood and Storeton Wood and public pathways are said to be protected, building housing estates so close to these areas would inevitably damage the flora and fauna in these natural environments. Protecting only 22% of the green belt land would change Wirral into an urban spread increasing congestion and pollution, reducing areas for exercise and enjoyment thus detrimentally affecting the health of our residents and future generations. Just look how cities are suffering from this. This could also have an impact on tourism thus reducing potential income for Wirral. The plan would also lose the special character of the few villages that have not been merged such as Irby and Storeton. I understand that a decision was made few years ago to consider Irby, Pensby and Thingwall as one settlement, as far as I know without any public consultation, which of course historically they are not. If this decision goes ahead it will be irreversible once this beautiful countryside is lost it will be forever. Our young people do need AFFORDABLE housing but they also need a healthy place to live.
DOR02587	There's is no reason to use the green belt land for building houses. We have a responsibility to protect the green belt for the future generation. There is more than enough brown belt land to provide land for houses and there are plenty of empty houses to provide homes for families. The LA brown belt data and the population data is inaccurate and incomplete so the consultation process is flawed. Storeton village and the Lever Causeway are historic places with special character and should not be built on. There are badgers and bats around the Lever Causeway area and they have to be protected. This land has been incorrectly labelled in the plans so how many other plots of land have been incorrectly designated. The land either side of the Lever Causeway is high quality agricultural arable land and not for grazing horses. Release of this green belt land will cause unrestricted sprawl and will merge Storeton village into Higher Bebington. The local authority data is inaccurate and out of date. How can you consult on incorrect information. There are political and financial reasons for the local authority to release green belt land which is contrary to the wishes of the residents of Wirral. There is insufficient infrastructure to cope with increased housing and there will be increased traffic and major road congestion, insufficient health and educational

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	provision.
DOR02588	I object to the plan as the green belt should only be encroached upon as a last resort. There are plans to build on brown field sites that should be approved first.
DOR02589	I use car park several times a week - mostly on drive home from work so would simply have to go to Croft retail park if parking became an issue. I cannot express enough my concern at the thought of losing the library. I also really appreciated the public toilets when our bathroom was being done recently. Please leave these spaces alone and find alternatives -Our Councillor seems to suggest they are available. Please make an effort to make it work.
DOR02590	I am shocked and saddened to view your plans to destroy our green belt . We are so proud of our heritage and these plans appear to completely disregard the villages and farms of Wirral. This will affect directly the farming industry here and the mental wellbeing of our local communities. It will have an impact on traffic and air pollution .
DOR02591	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02592	The green belt should not be built on
DOR02593	I think it is a disgrace to even think about building on the site of the car park and civic centre in Bromborough. The civic centre and library are the hub of our community, used by all for various purposes. I have been there personally for mums and tots groups, slimming world, yoga, giving blood and car boot sales, just to name a few. I also would definitely not shop in Bromborough cross without a car park as I have difficulty walking long distances so would rather go to an out of town shopping area instead. The Bromborough cross shopping area is the centre of our community and we would have no sense of community without it.
DOR02594	There are enough properties that are hard to let within social housing, invest and look at selective demolition and rebuild on brown site.
DOR02595	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02596	I do not support WBC's plan to develop on land marked as part of the Wirral's greenbelt; an area which is designed for the natural environment/agriculture/outdoor leisure activities etc to prevail and resist urbanisation. I feel priority is being given to potential economic development and consideration has not been given to the local environment; these are areas that are not only essential for local wildlife, which WBC should be striving to protect and enhance, but are also frequently used by locals and tourists for leisure activities, again something WBC should be encouraging. The benefits these spaces provide for the local community is immeasurable and one of the benefits of residing on the Wirral is the access to the outdoor spaces that are not heavily populated, or over developed - the most important aspect to the greenbelt is it's openness and therefore the Wirral's greatest asset. Emphasis should be given to build on Wirral's current 'brown belt' availability before encroaching on its natural landscape - once it's gone, it's gone.
DOR02597	Eastham greenbelt SPO's
DOR02598	I am against the proposed plan to build housing on this area. The car park provides the only free local parking that allows people to use the local village shops. The business's in the village already have to compete with larger retailers and the attraction Of close proximity free parking is a unique selling point. The amount of people that would be housed there would not counter act the amount of customer loss that would impact the businesses. I feel like this money could be better spent investing in redevelopment of areas in new ferry and Bromborough pool. I fear that this New plan will result in another monstrosity like the one that has been built on mark rake. Where additional housing has been
DOR02599	I understand that residences must be made for people but sensitivity should prevail. Use unused industrial land first, claim back derelict properties. We need our green spaces for our future generations. Eventually Wirral could be like Bournemouth and Eastbourne etc; where there are no green spaces between the towns if we are to allow too much new buildings. Wirral has everything let us keep it that way, we are unique.
DOR02600	[SAME AS DOR00234]
DOR02601	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is essential to protect green belt land and areas of natural beauty in Wirral. 2. There are plenty of brownfield sites in the borough which must be developed before any green belt land is touched, give developers incentives to build in these areas, improving and reusing derelict and urban land will improve the whole of the Wirral and improve employment prospects for people who already live in these areas. 3. The countryside must be protected. 4. The Wirral is a lovely place to live, green belt land needs to be protected at all costs.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02602	I would like to see revised plans as per updated statistics from the Office of National Statistics revised figures. The population of Wirral will not grow as rapidly as previously predicted, indeed we do not possess the schools, hospitals and infrastructure to support this. Brown field sites should be considered first and whilst re-developing Birkenhead and its surrounding area would be more costly, the town centre will become a ghost town if this does not happen. Peel Holdings should not be allowed to hold onto large swathes of brown field sites, which could provide some of the required homes. Once we lose this green belt, the landscape of the Wirral will change forever. Think carefully about the long term impact of this decision. Will your children thank you in years to come?
DOR02603	I object to the change of use of all green belt land on Wirral when other options are available, unoccupied housing , use of brownfield sites and Peel holdings plans at Wirral waters . The field on Gills Lane that has been identified in consultation by Wirral provides drainage to a natural pond in the corner The pond provides a habitat to a range of wildlife including birds , amphibians and bats that can be observed feeding on the field in late summer and early Autumn If the fields change of use is allowed I feel the wildlife will be harmed and the pond be affected Gills lane is narrow in parts and extra traffic would affect the dangerous junction at Barnston Road Pensby Road at the other end is already a very busy road due to additional HGV vehicles unable to travel along Barnston road due to narrowness and dangerous bend at Barnston dip.
DOR02604	I OBJECT
DOR02605	<p>I am a resident in Thornton Hough and wish to have recorded, my opposition to the potential Infill Village on land near to Oxford Drive Thornton Hough. My reasons are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The existing estate is small, surrounded by prime agricultural land. Any further development would impinge on this land. • The Wirral has a much less percentage of Greenbelt land compared with the rest of the country. The majority of Wirral is already urbanised. • Statistics show that the population of Wirral is not increasing, therefore the demand for housing should be reassessed. Land already identified for redevelopment such as Brownfield land, land which already has planning permission should be developed meeting the building targets, without the necessity to use Greenbelt land • The Local Planning Authority state that Infill development maybe considered if they are larger villages with good public transport, some local shops. Thornton Hough does not meet this criteria. • There is not a great pressure on housing in Wirral as the majority of house moves involve Wirral residents moving within Wirral. • There is very little infra structure in Thornton Hough linking local urban areas. Public transport has been reduced year on year making reliance on private cars a necessity, in turn having a negative impact on the environment. • The village does not have a Doctor's surgery or general stores. The village school does not have the capacity to take more children. • The land identified to build on is Grade 3 agricultural land and as defined by DEFRA, is Prime agricultural land. • The character of Thornton Hough village should be retained, further building would be detrimental to the local area. The village is too small to accommodate new roads and increase in traffic.
DOR02606	The plan allows excessive reduction of green spaces and open areas. Likely result- excessive congestion, poorer quality of life, poorer health.
DOR02607	How were the figures for predicted population increase and house building obtained? A population increase of the size predicted would throw further strain upon an infrastructure that already struggles to cope with existing numbers. Are there plans to expand hospitals, schools etc.? Has a proper impact assessment been carried out?
DOR02608	I wish to express my concerns on the use of green belt for housing development. The environmental issue with regards air quality in proximity to the M53 motorway. The proposed 800 per year build when this number has not been achieved in past years. The non increase in population in Wirral over the past years if the demand is not there the houses do not need to be built. The present infrastructure cannot handle the increase in houses. The government need to understand the land restrictions on Wirral caused by the boundaries of the Mersey, Dee and Liverpool Bay and that this 12000 house build demand is the thin end of the wedge. If their demands continue the Wirral will become one big housing estate!
DOR02609	I believe that the Local Plan is absolutely outrageous. There is no necessity to release such valuable green belt land for housing when the brown field sites and Birkenhead dockland could well cater for the requirement for the foreseeable future. Once open land is built upon it is lost for ever and this council will be remembered as the Council that destroyed Wirral. At the moment developers are just waiting for the green light to move and make large profits at the expense of our quality of life. There is no excuse for this development other than greed by the developers and "others". Please do not allow this to progress.
DOR02610	The areas between the Mersey and Storeton Woods seems to be completely developed except for school playing fields and allotments. Thus, for several thousand people, Storeton Woods is the best/only area for running, skipping, shouting, dog exercising, etc. If, when all the brown field sites have been re-developed, it is still necessary to develop more land I suggest a new site in the Brimstage area. It is between Heswall station and M53 junction 4: good for road and rail commuting. Maybe check the flooding records.
DOR02611	Object to the building on the site previously known as Pensby Park Primary School
DOR02612	I feel that the plans for Bromborough are detrimental to the area and will kill off the community as it's is now. It was greatly affected when the Croft retail park was built. Why should we be without a community building and library when there are proposed plans for spending a great deal of money in West Wirral to develop a golf course. Please get the priorities right and consider the east side of the Wirral which seems to be earmarked for the greatest development.
DOR02613	Please leave the greenbelt and brownfield sites alone and don't build on them. Harrock wood is used by locals for dog walking and children to play as well as much wildlife.
DOR02614	The Wirral peninsula has adequate brown field sites to meet its housing needs. I object to the destruction of Wirral's green lung for short term financial gain.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02615	I have a number of objections to the current plans to develop greenbelt land, while appreciating that people must live somewhere. If greenbelt land is to be used it should be equitable throughout the Wirral. Why should Irby with 1.9% of Wirral's population bear the burden of 24% of Wirral's housing needs. It has a population of 6110 and proposed greenbelt houses are 1771 out of a total of 7390. Has anybody thought of the congestion that will be caused at the road junctions Thingwall Corner and Arrowse Park heading to Birkenhead and Liverpool and the M53, if that number of houses are built. There is no other direct link to these destinations. Also in Irby Village with traffic turning to Thurstaston and Heswall. Irby village already seems like a parking lot at certain times of the day. What extra provision is there for health care and increased primary school places albeit that half of Pensby School is empty. The proposed development would mean the loss of high quality agricultural land and of our local country parks such as Harrock Wood and Thurstaston Common. It seems to me as if a group of people got together ..looked at a map of Wirral and decided "oh we could fill in that area there and this area here" without any regard to topography of land and the integrity and history of local communities.
DOR02616	Greenbelt must be protected. Wirral is becoming a concrete jungle.
DOR02617	Feel a serious reassessment needed to prevent the rape of GREEN BELT when other solutions are possible. Costly infrastructure and congestion are a problem and would lead to the detriment of Wirral as a whole.....I could go on!
DOR02618	West Kirby redevelopment of sites on /near Grange Hill. This is already a very busy road serving as the main route in and out of West Kirby. What plans have been made to deal with the increase in traffic ?
DOR02619	This is disgusting, there are plenty of rundown buildings on the Wirral in Birkenhead and around the docklands that can be used to regenerate and build on. The council are backwards thinking.
DOR02620	Wirral's population is not increasing in the same way it is in the south east of England. If there were a housing shortage, the price of my house would be a lot higher. The Local Plan does not appear to take any notice of this. People who are currently rough sleepers will not be able to afford houses built in Barnston. The proposed changes will not solve any problems in the borough. They will merely create the kind of resentment that will result in electoral consequences. Furthermore, there is no justification for destroying landscape of historical, environmental and agricultural significance.
DOR02621	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> * WBC should continue to try & get the Government to reduce housing targets for Wirral. * Build truly affordable homes for families. *Make available good quality rented homes for young people. *As an older person myself, I think the large proportion of older people living on Wirral are these days in a better financial position & can downsize easier than young people & those with young families. So housing emphasis should be on younger people. * On subject of affordability - the houses to be built on the Hoylake Golf Resort make a mockery of any aims to provide good affordable homes for families. * New homes to be built should be energy efficient with water meters and solar panels. * Try to end seemingly endless land-banking e.g. by Peel Holdings. *Build on some of the less-used of the 16 golf courses on Wirral. *Prioritize especially those parts of the Green Belt which are land-roosts / ground-nesting sites for our coastal birds/waders.
DOR02622	I am concerned about the proposed development/demolition of Bromborough Civic Centre & Library and also building on Allport Lane car park. The loss of the civic centre and the library would devastate the community, losing the car park would severely hamper the small businesses in the village. Ironical when they may have benefited from the Acre Lane development bringing in extra customers. I am unable to find details of the proposals on your web site, all I can come up with is a map, are there any details available if so where can I find them?
DOR02623	Please do not spoil our lovely green belt, surely there are other alternatives
DOR02624	I am quite disheartened by the risk that greenbelt could be lost from the documentation provided by the council when there is so much existing brownfield and previously agreed development land (e.g. Held by Peel Holdings) available as well as there being a large number of empty properties on Wirral already. Over the last 50 years the green spaces between places such as Upton, Greasby and Moreton (as just a few examples) have been eroded to effectively join-up these areas. The in-fill policy suggested in the council plans will gradually remove the final areas where wildlife has some room to live and travel between. Some of the land identified as in-fill is close to important sites such as the Heswall Dee SSSI area for birds and shellfish. Indeed a few years ago Welsh Water installed a storm drain to protect this. Adding concrete and more people will not help. (Some is identified as high quality agricultural land too.) There are better alternatives than to keep reducing available greenbelt. Please reconsider the number of new homes needed and ensure greenbelt is not lost as the easy option. Where will that end? Please re-use and recycle existing developed land first. Surely the Peel Holdings land area to north west of the peninsular would be perfect for redevelopment (as I believe they originally suggested before they got ownership of it).
DOR02625	I regard the proposed housing and employment allocations as sensible use of building opportunities within a built up landscape. I regard the decision to regard the M53 as the future boundary of green belt to potentially urbanise everything to the west as alarming. I live at Eastham and all the green spaces around are under threat if green belt status is removed. Eastham village conservation area, a relic of a pre industrial Wirral needs green space around it to preserve its character. The green belt areas 050 and 051 are surviving remnants of the landscaped parkland of Hooton Hall and need to be retained to preserve the character of Eastham Village, as well as being beautiful in their own right. To remove green belt status to such highly valued areas as Eastham Woods and Leverhulme playing fields 054 is alarming. Site 055 would also severely impact on Eastham Country Park. which is one of the few places east of the A41 in Wirral with a countryside feel. What is also of concern is the lack of detail in the green belt maps which adds to the sense of worry in the community. What is to be developed, what preserved? People here feel they will have to travel

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	into Cheshire to see any countryside if Wirral Council is allowed to destroy what countryside is left here.
DOR02626	<p>SP062 West of Barnston Village - Objection to Plans for New Housing Development. The area marked for development is considerably large, and has the potential for mass housing, however the impact on the local area and community would be detrimental. With a variety of matters to be considered prior to such an undertaking, I would like to raise some items below with regard to the proposed development:-</p> <p>1) Potentially, the plans show an extreme reduction in open space(s), currently used for recreation, walking, and educational purposes by the local community and schools. What measures would be in place to ensure these are maintained?</p> <p>2) Clearly, in the event of development on the land, the local wildlife and existing farm land would be massively impacted upon. It would be favourable for development of local farms as businesses, which could provide for the local community and visitors to the area.</p> <p>3) The required volume for school places would be significantly increased. It has been noted that the school adjacent to the proposed development site, Heswall Primary, is already oversubscribed.</p> <p>4) Greater demand on local roads and transport networks would result. Many of the minor roads in Wirral have been developed from existing/historic lanes, therefore do not conform to modern road layouts and would not cope well to further increases in traffic volume. Currently, local road maintenance and repairs are not always achieved in a timely manner. What measures are in place to manage this part of the proposed new development?</p> <p>5) A lack of evidence to support employment in the local area for the increased number of residents. If commuting to work outside of the Wirral is required by many, then this will put greater strain on transport networks, mainly road and rail - refer to previous comment. These items are just some of the factors that would limit any new mass housing development in the local area from being a success. I chose to live and have a family in this area of the Wirral, in part due to its semi-rural environment, having access to green open spaces. Vastly reducing such areas in the Wirral would have a negative impact on those prospective new residents and people of the existing community.</p>
DOR02627	I am extremely concerned about the lack of foresight which has been applied to these proposals. Some of the Wirral's most beautiful areas of greenbelt have been earmarked for development. Such changes are permanent and irreversible, and threaten to destroy what makes Wirral such a pleasant area to live in in the first place. Thousands of years of our local heritage could be written off, and in the name of what?
DOR02628	I note the revised population growth projections released by the ONS on 24th September. It suggests 500 new homes p.a. are needed, as opposed to the 800 homes p.a. that was originally being used as the basis for the Local Plan. This is a material reduction of circa 4,500 homes over the 15 year Local Plan period to 7,500 homes. I also understand that independent analysis by [another respondent] suggests only 220-350 houses p.a. are needed i.e. 5,250 homes at the upper end of the forecast. It is estimated that there are anywhere between 2,000 and 6,000 empty dwellings in Wirral. In addition, Peel Group has been granted planning permission for 13,000 dwellings at Wirral Waters and believe that 6,450 dwellings could be built during the 15 year Local Plan period. This alone should mean that Wirral is more than capable of meeting its housing obligations for the 15 years to 2035 without releasing any Green Belt land. One of the purposes of Green Belt land is to prevent urban sprawl and engender urban redevelopment. Releasing land on the East side of the M53 from Storeton through to Bebington, Spital, Bromborough and Eastham would clearly violate the principles of Green Belt policy. Development of these areas would also place significant strain on already stretched local resources and amenities, as well as increase the risk of loss of life in road traffic accidents, such as at Spital Crossroads – already an accident black spot. Further, it would destroy high quality farm land. Wirral countryside plays an important part in enhancing the lives of residents and is a key reason why many people choose to live on Wirral. We should feel proud of Wirral's beauty, as a result of this countryside and do our utmost to protect it for future generations.
DOR02629	<p>The Wirral Green Belt has been successful in its objectives in preventing urban sprawl, separating built-up areas, allowing agriculture to exist, protecting wildlife and nature, giving a green open space recreation area for Wirral's population, sustaining a good environment for the community and providing a good selling point for attracting visitors. There is no case for throwing away our valuable, tried and tested Green Belt on the flimsy arguments presented in the consultations based on unsound population and growth forecasts. The population and growth forecasts used to justify the need for 12,000 new households over the life of the plan are not supported by existing trends or population growth or economic trends let alone the impact of Brexit and the loss of jobs which will arise. The Government response to Wirral on this issue supports the case for a substantial downgrading of any calls on Green Belt land. Other assumptions like net migration trends should also be taken into account in downgrading demands on the Green Belt and designation of Green Belt for housing in the plan. Wirral is blessed with a huge reserve of brownfield land especially with the Wirral Waters perimeter. Dialogue with and pressure on Peel Holdings should be intensified and grant aid to facilitate reclamation and development increased. Indeed it is in Peel Holdings interest to see the Green Belt maintained at current levels to aid development of homes in the Wirral Waters zone. With Wirral Waters, reviewed housing demands and use of brownfield sites, there does not need to be any release of Green Belt land.</p> <p>Wirral Council also has two mechanisms to promote household provision on brownfield sites - through the Growth Company now set up and the new powers to borrow for construction of council</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>housing. These should be used to provide a guaranteed release of new homes into the market place and built in as a core element of the local plan. The level of empty houses is also a key source of household provision and is already successfully releasing new homes into the market place. This programme should now be increased and should be built into the Local Plan at an increased rate to further reduce demands on the Green Belt. The framing of release proposals for Green Belt land is crude and destructive of the aims of the Green Belt - popular and valuable places which are important to various aspects of Wirral's lifestyle and environment will be seriously damaged or lost - e.g.: Storeton Woods, Stapledon Woods, Raby Mere, Poulton Hall, Claremont Farm, Lever Causeway, Eastham Village etc. The proposals tear up the core principle of the Green Belt in keeping separate and distinct existing built-up areas so that such places as Pensby and Barnston, Irby and Pensby will become blocks of built-up land. Equally the A540 will become one long string of housing beyond Heswall. The proposed release areas also are very poorly situated for public transport routes (rail and bus) and will increase pollution in increasing car use. And are unsustainable. While the plan does not include Hoylake Golf Course development as an option for development, it is argued that this should have been included and then dismissed as unnecessary for new housing and contrary to green belt policies. The consultation should now be paused to review the whole plan in terms of the population and growth projections (including the impact of Brexit) and reissue of scaled down Local Plan proposals with no or minimal call on the Green Belt. The plan should then be reconsulted with the public over again based on sound and realistic projections taking into account the output from dialogue with Peel Holdings, Empty House programmes, building of council houses in built-up areas and the existing Green Belt be protected to the absolute maximum excluding unnecessary and non-social housing development on the Hoylake Golf Course site (which should be designated for development as a nature reserve to protect Wirral's national and international wildlife, boost Wirral's attractiveness to visitors and Wirral's image as a great place to live).</p>
DOR02630	<p>I am totally opposed to further encroachment on green belt land when so much brownfield land exists which can be built on. New homes should only be built on existing urban land. Improved public transport should be prioritized over new roads and new car parking provision. The more roads you build the more cars will use them and the more car parking you'll need. It really doesn't make any sense to keep favouring the use of private over public transport.</p>
DOR02631	<p>Totally disgusted by the councils plans to build on Bromborough Library/Civic Centre site. So soon after forcing through building on Acre Lane site against the wishes of the local people. We have significant concerns about extra traffic loss of public services. Pollution from air traffic has increased in the area and now we have the extra risk to public health through this proposed development. You truly do not care about the ordinary working people of Wirral</p>
DOR02632	<p>I wish to lodge my objections to any re-designation of Green Belt for development in Wirral. The revised ONS data details a requirement for 7000 extra dwellings by 2035, however even this figure is open to dispute, given the falling demographics across Wirral. Peel are proposing to build 6450 dwellings by 2035, there are also a considerable number of empty properties across Wirral. This figure seems to fluctuate between 4000-6000, however it is still far in excess of the required need, even at the lower end. There is therefore no justification for building on Green Belt Land. The question must be posed – What happens to Brownfield sites if Green Belt is developed? Are they left to slide into decline? It is precisely these areas that require regeneration. Since the Local Plan consultation began, Clatterbridge councillors have spoken to many residents, they have expressed their concern regarding the effect of building on Green Belt on their quality of life and many are anxious for the future of both themselves and their families. This is having an adverse effect on their mental health. Vineyard Farm and Triangle SPO40 and SPO42 These are areas of farmland at the end of narrow country lanes, surrounded by more farmland. The proposal to build hundreds of homes on this site would have a detrimental effect on local infrastructure. The roads are already congested – the main Spital Road becoming a standing car park from the junction with the M53 to Spital Railway Station. Cars stand idling, emitting more pollutants into the atmosphere; this road just could not cope with the extra traffic from such a large development. Equally, Spital Station is very busy, being the station of choice for commuters from Heswall and Thornton Hough. It is full by 8am and commuter traffic overflows into residential side roads, causing disruption for residents. Other services such as schools, doctors' surgeries and dentists are also either full or close to capacity and totally unable to cope with such a large increase in numbers. GP services are already stretched, no practice in the Clatterbridge ward will be offering extended hours and recruitment of new GP is difficult despite a national campaign. This area of the Borough has also lost vital local bus services connecting the far end of Poulton Road with Bromborough, Raby Mere, Eastham and Heswall as well as the only service to Arrowe Park hospital where the new urgent care facility will be based. Merseytravel are in no rush to replace these services and there is no guarantee that any new routes will be like for like. In summary, this would be a development to secure profits for the builders, few services for the residents and a likely further stretching of services for the current population. Clatterbridge Hospital SPO76A Whilst I accept that this is not Green Belt, it has been designated as a possible site for development. This campus contains 2 hospices, 2 hospitals (1 of which is a world renowned Cancer Centre), a Mental Health Facility as well as a nursing home. The disruption caused to patients during construction would not be acceptable; however there is space for infill development where the old Clatterbridge Hospital buildings once stood. I would suggest that housing is not appropriate, given the on-going disruption that would be caused by such a development to patients and that the Elderly Persons Village proposed for Thornton Hough would be far more appropriate.</p> <p>Public Health There is a growing body of evidence linking impaired lung growth in childhood with air pollution, particularly for those living in close proximity to busy roads In 2007 The Lancet published results of research in California which showed "pronounced deficits" in lung development in children aged between 10-18 who lived within 500 metres of a motorway These results were corroborated in 2015 by a paper in The Journal of Thoracic Health in the USA. In 2016 The Royal College of Physicians published a report starkly setting out the dangers of living in an area of polluted atmosphere. The report linked cancer, asthma, stroke, heart disease, diabetes, obesity, changes linked to dementia, general illness and premature death to living in air polluted areas. In 2017 Research was published by the Public Health Service of Amsterdam which found that living near to a dual carriageway was as harmful as being exposed to second-hand (i.e. passive) smoke from 10 cigarettes a day. And on 19 September 2018 The Times published the results of research into air pollution, which showed that those exposed to fine particulate matter of 2.5 microns and</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>nitrogen dioxide were particularly vulnerable to health problems, the main source of these compounds being road traffic. A substantial swathe of land in the Green Belt north of the M53 which is proposed to be released for development would fall within 500 metres of the motorway giving rise to concerns regarding the health of people living within those areas. Council's 2017 Public Health Report stated that:- 1 in 3 avoidable deaths that year were caused by cancer, 1 in 4 by CVD and that coronary heart disease, lung cancer and COPD were amongst the most specific causes of avoidable deaths. The report went on to say that it supports "people to take more control of their health and well-being" by "most of all, expecting better for their own health and that of their families"; By releasing Green Belt land near to the M53 motorway, the Council is not supporting people to take control of their health and well-being. In fact, it is encouraging the building of homes in known polluted environments which independent research has shown leads to significant ill-health particularly in children. PHE's own data shows higher rates of childhood asthma in Liverpool living close to busy roads. The cohort studied in 2007 is too young to determine the knock on effects into adulthood. However it is already known that such childhood disorders can increase the risk of COPD. We should not be risking public health in this way.</p>
DOR0633	<p>I'm amazed that Wirral Council is able to act as guarantor for Peel Ports. Who will suffer if they renege on the deal, how many services will be cut as a result of this agreement? It doesn't bear thinking about. They have a lot of money and own huge amounts of land on both sides of the Mersey. I don't understand how planning permission for more than 13,500 homes can be granted but not started unless the Council is a guarantor. Peel Ports should be persuaded to sell some of their land in order to raise capital and begin building, or lose the planning permission. If I was given planning permission I would be expected to fund the building work myself. I also think continuing pressure should be put on owners to ensure properties aren't left idle when housing is so badly needed. It's encouraging that the ONS has revised the new homes target. I think every effort should be made to argue against the use of Green Belt land regardless of government directives or Wirral may no longer live up to the description of 'leisure peninsula', which seems to be one of the few growth areas in the local economy. The Government expectations for house building should not be used as an excuse to develop Green Belt land which will not increase the number of affordable homes available, but will increase the profits of house builders who construct 'luxury' homes. Consultation meetings have been sporadically attended as it's likely people feel they are only consulted as a legal requirement and by that time key decisions have already been made. Public opinion should be sought much earlier in the process, as one excuse for pursuing a Hoylake golf resort is that money already spent in research would be wasted if it didn't go ahead. But why spend more money on another golf course when there are already so many. And on a sport which is struggling to maintain its profile. The council would be wise to bear in mind that a 'Local Plan should meet the needs and expectations of local people'. It is not about being at the mercy of multi million pound companies that don't seem prepared to deliver on their own plans which the Council has approved.</p>
DOR02634	<p>The plan has not adopted a brownfield first approach. The plan does not meet the Wirral's housing needs, in particular the need for affordable housing. The lack of investment in Birkenhead and neighbouring areas is symptomatic of the plans not meeting the true needs of the Wirral. The sites have not been given due consideration and appeared to have been based on "developer speculation" as opposed to the needs of the resident and future resident of the Wirral</p>
DOR02635	<p>I am extremely against building on greenbelt land for environmental reasons. The land helps to reduce flooding in our area by soaking up the rainfall. Some of this land is quite boggy anyway and therefore building on it will inevitably result in more flooding of housing. As a planet we need to reduce the warming of the earth. We have been advised to plant more trees in our gardens to help reduce global warming so why would you build on so much greenbelt land which would be hazardous to our planet. The road network in our area is already overloaded. Travelling through Heswall is gridlocked and cars now backup along other roads such as Whitfield Lane and Downham Road North to avoid the queues. These roads are getting very busy and are not made for commuter traffic. Our good friends have recently moved from there as they have seen traffic increase in recent years. It will get much worse with more houses and cars. Commuting to work is already very congested. Travelling towards Chester, Liverpool, M53 or Levers Causeway are the only way out of West Wirral and could not cope with more traffic. We are not connected on the rail network here which increases road use. With Avon bus company going into liquidation the number 88 bus no longer runs. This was the only bus connecting Heswall to Greasby and West Kirby. The only way is via car now which again increases congestion and damages the environment. Our doctors, dentists, schools and hospitals are already overstretched. We could not cope with increased demand. Using the Greenbelt will reduce the health of residents. Less fresh air for those with lung conditions will suffer. Our beautiful countryside cannot be replaced once it has been destroyed. Future generations will suffer as result of your poor judgement. It has now been revealed that we do not even need these extra houses on Wirral. There is sufficient brownfield sites to build on in our area. The population in Wirral is more elderly, childbearing aged women are a small percentage so we are not going to have a population explosion in our area. These houses are clearly unnecessary. Wirral should be looked at in its own merits not have a blanket government approach to calculating population figures.</p>
DOR02636	<p>I feel that housing should be replace on land were houses have been remove over the years due to poor living conditions. This land that has been left unused should be considered first.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02637	The plans for the West of Barnston Village are concerning and would have a huge detrimental impact to the quality of life to all that choose Barnston as their home. If the land was to be built on the area would become a carbon copy of those areas that suffer from poorer quality of life due to pollution, overcrowding and lack of already stark resources. Currently the children can enjoy free, open green space and get to appreciate nature in all of its glory. This is something that educational departments less fortunate to have the areas around us encourage families to do, it's one of the reasons many people including us have chosen Heswall Primary. The traffic surrounding the school is dangerous at peak hours, with several accidents and near misses in the past couple of years. It would be a total disservice to our future generations to put them in escalating danger with every new house built, new road laid and increase in traffic that goes hand in hand with each build. With weather conditions becoming increasing unpredictable it would be a huge risk to remove land that absorbs extreme conditions such as torrential rain witnessed this year. Green spaces are for all to enjoy, for generations to have when we (the current stakeholders) are long gone. I understand that targets have to be achieved set by governments but I urge you to reconsider the land you are considering and start looking at the many sites occupied by large corporations that land lock and prevent growth and opportunity to build a better more sustainable Wirral.
DOR02638	I think there are more options available to save green spaces ... 1. relax planning permission to allow ground floor extension to yards and rooftop extensions to utilize more space ... we also have a network of tunnels all around the Wirral, many are abandoned which is health n safety issue, could create sink holes ... so why not build below rather than above? ... start creating an underground city so to speak. this way ... more green spaces are protected. Also housing to be given unused shops or areas above shops that are unused. Offer grants or easy to pay back loans to split houses into flats, make it affordable and support those who offer.
DOR02639	The Councils failure to deliver the Local Plan in a timely manner has led to the unprecedented and unnecessary 'cherry picking' of green belt sites for development across Wirral. The fact that no brownfield sites or re development sites have been put forward in the Plan only reinforces the belief that the Council intends to build on these sites no matter what reasoning or statistics are evidenced to the contrary. Local residents are incensed at the scale of the proposed intention to take precious green belt so beloved by the people of Wirral. The sweeping scale of the Plan is fuelling a climate of distress and uncertainty among residents. There appears a lack of knowledge as to the needs of the population of the borough. Areas of Birkenhead are some of the most deprived in the whole country, regeneration in this area should be a priority. The needs of young people wishing to get on the property ladder and older residents wishing to downsize are being ignored. The provision of smaller dwellings in a more sustainable plan is being completely overlooked. Destruction of green belt should be a final resort when all other options have been exhausted. Compelling evidence that the due process in evaluating the housing requirements and economic reality of Wirral is not demonstrated in the Local Plan. I urge the Council to take note of the facts being presented by many likeminded individuals, groups and societies across the borough and use this information to deliver a sustainable Plan that addresses the needs of its residents now and in the future.
DOR02640	This is absolutely disgusting that a proposal like this could even be suggested. We have only lived here for 3 years and if this goes ahead, our property will go into negative equity. Who picks the bill up then?? We will be seeking legal advice and will fight this in the courts if this happens. Social Housing in this area is not needed, build it in Birkenhead, Wallasey, New Brighton where it is needed and does NOT affect the beauty of our Green Belt areas. Wirral is known for its beauty and attracts tourists for this reason. What exactly is going to be left, NOTHING! We don't even need these houses as Wirral is a declining population where 60% of us commute to Liverpool, Manchester, Chester etc, so why build. Our local counsellors and residents will NOT stand for this and we will go the Supreme Court before a shovel touches our fields.
DOR02641	Can you please stop to consider the impact on wildlife and how that impacts us as human beings. Renovate existing buildings, build on wasteland not areas of conservation and wildlife. We are killing our own environment with all of this, you have a beautiful natural reserve in the Dee estuary. Keep it that way
DOR02642	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. It is generally accepted that the housing requirement for the Wirral as submitted by the Council has been considerably overstated. 2. The "exceptional circumstances" required for building on the Green Belt have not been shown to exist. In particular land to the west of the Wirral Way is a coastal area that the Council has a legal duty to protect. 3. The infrastructure does not exist to support extensive building on the Green Belt which would inevitably become a dormitory area for people working in Birkenhead, Liverpool, Chester or further afield. Schooling, doctors and public transport and road systems are already overstretched. 4. There are many thousands of empty properties in the Wirral, which if made available for habitation could go a long way towards meeting the alleged housing requirements. 5. In addition, Peel Holdings has pledged to build a large number of dwellings on the brownfield site of Wirral Waters. The Council should give every encouragement to expedite their construction. 6. Finally, any discussion of building another golf course at Hoylake is an irrelevant distraction.
DOR02643	I think that there should be no housing built in areas that have and should be kept green belt land. There is loads of areas on the Wirral that can cater to affordable house. Some of the areas that have been outlined for the sale of green land are in expensive areas i.e. Heswall/West Kirby, which won't offer affordable housing for new families. It just seems that the local council want to make maximum profit from the areas that would draw in out of priced housing. There hasn't been a look at the areas that are being planned to have housing built on them how the road networks are going to handle the extra traffic. The prime example of this is for the sale of land in Heswall down a road called pipers lane, the road can only support 1 car going through it at certain parts and building houses on this the road won't be able to support the extra traffic.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02644	The consultation has not made a case for releasing Green Belt Land for development. Housing pressures and population growth do not demonstrate a need for developments that cannot be met from brown field sites alone. The council should concentrate on housing & developing communities where the communities would benefit from new investment and renewal. The council should not be releasing land from the green belt for housing in any circumstances.
DOR02645	I am opposed to Wirral's Local Plan I am opposed to all reduction in the area of Green Belt land on Wirral. The Council has chosen to use the necessity of finally having to produce a Local Plan - which should have been done years ago when the current financial constraints and governmental requirements to build houses did not exist - to significantly reduce the area of Wirral given Green Belt protection, in order to "bank" land for future income generation. The Council has a strongly reducing income - like all councils. Concentrating on just "doing the basics well" has never been a priority. The Council has only one approach - to increase income from increased Council tax from increased housing. It has preferred all the higher and highest housing figures which would lead to this result. Reduction in the area of Green Belt is not necessary. The 12000 houses quoted in the Plan are NOT needed - that is a spuriously uplifted figure used to gain leverage. All concerned, including the Council, have now accepted that. The government has updated the national and local population and household projections for the next 25 years (ONS website September 21st 2018). In the case of Wirral both the population growth and the household numbers growth have halved based on 2016 data. It is even doubtful that a figure of 6000 will actually be required, given Wirral steady long-term population decline and declining economic importance. This has now been accepted by the Council and representations made to Government to use a reduced figure. The consequence is that any necessary development can occur on brownfield sites - and when developed they would enhance, not destroy, the environment. Since the significantly inflated on which the Local Plan was produced have therefore now become out-of-date, the Local Plan itself and the consultation on it should now be withdrawn and redrafted to meet actual requirements. This would mean that the current Green Belt boundaries can be maintained. A good Local Plan would do just that - and even consider expanding its area, given its clear benefits. Certainly any development which the Planning Committee considers has passed the "exceptional circumstances" test - such as the Saughall Massie Fire Station - should be mitigated by newly designating an equivalent or larger area as Green Belt. It is not "Wirral's" Green Belt, but forms part of the "green lung" for Merseyside - absolutely necessary for the health and well-being of all the people and wildlife of the area. It is not "this Council's" Green Belt - they hold it in trust for the future citizens of the Borough and of Merseyside as a whole. Much of the Green Belt land is an important supportive habitat for the nationally and internationally designed and protected coastal areas, vital, for example, for overwintering waders, in sharp decline nationally and internationally exactly because of the kinds of habitat removal and degrading contained in the Plan. Much of the Green Belt is farm land - at a time of rapid climate change, food should be produced as locally as possible. In short - we don't need the houses; we do need the Green Belt.
DOR02646	By no means what so ever should the Wirral's (and UK) green belt be built on. This is a natural habitat for native wildlife. There is clearly enough brownfield sites to accommodate the plan
DOR02647	I don't agree with building on green belt land when there is ample brown land available but not being utilised. Similarly, empty properties of which exist across the Borough should be used. The Wirral Peninsula is currently a beautiful place to live but it feels like it's green spaces and towns (such as Heswall) are being turned into concrete. Handsome well-built houses are being knocked down and rebuilt as faceless apartments, thereby ruining the landscape and generating more people, traffic and noise. Patches of green are being swallowed up by more housing / apartments. Profit for the few seems to be put before health & well-being of the majority. Poor planning now will affect generations to come. It is our legacy. A true local plan should reflect the feelings and needs of those that will be directly impacted in the locality of any development. If some companies have 'land banked' areas with false promises of future development, then dialogue should be encouraged to move things forward, but with thought and goodwill of all Stakeholders. The impact on the environment should be assessed. Organisations with a real interest and positive impact on The Wirral (e.g. Heswall Society) should be listened to.
DOR02648	I am totally opposed to the proposal to build on green belt land on the Wirral.
DOR02649	Clearly the numbers of houses required by Government is too high. Sufficient housing can be built on brownfield sites (e.g. Peel's site) and gained by addressing empty properties. The efforts should go in those areas and green areas need never be diminished. Once that begins there will be no end to it.
DOR02650	Q1: Priorities order: 8,1,4,2,5,3 I reject the Government's planning straightjacket and think we should defy it and approve our own strategy. Q2: ! is best, 2,3,and 4 are unacceptable. Q3: Agree strongly with 1, Strongly disagree with 2,3,and 4. Brownfield sites should be developed, if necessary with acquisition and remediation by the Council. Release of greenbelt land will reduce likelihood of brownfield development. If there really were demand pressures, existing allocations would be used. I reject the economic growth ambitions and therefore the population forecasts. Q4: All the greenbelt objectives are still valid but there are no large sites which do not conflict with them. Q5: Priorities order: 1,4,8,6,7,5,3,2 (Generally, not any particular area); Planning and interventions should encourage improved community life. Housebuilding should require good pedestrian, cycle and public transport facilities, enforced by watertight Section 106 agreements, (to enhance he lives of the young, old, disabled, impecunious, disqualified, lonely, or otherwise not using cars) Subsidy and quality improvement of the public transport experience (especially evenings and Sundays) required. Other comments: A local plan should be submitted compatible with the environmental imperative of sustainability and conservation instead of the chimera of improvement through indefinite 'economic growth' and resource consumption.
DOR02651	Despite the amount of misleading information that is circulating it is clear to me that there are sufficient brownfield sites available that can be quickly developed to provide the much needed social housing. As a member of ITPAS I fully support the excellent submissions that they have made denouncing the Council's irrational plans to release "Green Belt" for development.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02652	I am outraged at the proposal to release for building the Green Belt fields either side of Lever Causeway and from Mount Road towards Claughton. - The population growth projection upon which the overall future demand is based is fundamentally flawed and overegged. - There is sufficient land already available in urban areas to meet future needs. In addition, there are many old buildings on the Wirral ripe for renovation to offer quality housing. - The area and views around Lever Causeway provide a relaxation area for many local residents. - People who visit us are frequently impressed when we drive them along Lever Causeway - especially by how quickly you arrive in a place with a rural feel. Building in this area will reduce the attraction of Wirral to tourists. Please do not ruin this beautiful part of our peninsula!
DOR02653	Objection to release of SP043 East of Poulton Road. SP043 includes: Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve & Brotherton Park High Value Agricultural Land Core Biodiversity Area (over 75% of Site) Dibbinsdale Brook. Land at Risk of Flooding. Protected Species of Animals and Plants Ancient Woodland Status. SP043 is a cherished Greenbelt asset, used daily by residents for walking, exercise and recreation. It is our local greenspace, its removal would mean no access to greenspace for local residents. It provides extremely valuable land for food production and sale of local produce to local business as acknowledged in WBC Map of High Quality Agricultural Land. There is less than 50% of Wirral's Greenbelt that offers High Value Agricultural land. Agricultural land must be protected to secure our supply of food in the future. It is susceptible to flooding as recognised in Wirral Borough Councils Flood Zone 3 maps. Building on this land would increase flooding risk to the existing properties boarding the site and have a huge impact to Dibbinsdale Brook that provides drainage from SP043 and the neighbouring countryside. It provides a corridor for Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve and Brotherton Park to the wider Countryside. This is recognised in the Map of Core Biodiversity Areas published by Wirral Borough Council. The Area of Biodiversity must be retained to ensure the halt on overall loss of Biodiversity in accordance Biodiversity 2020. Proposals to release SP043 for development does not assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment as discussed in NPFF and would eliminate the setting and special character that exists between Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve, Lancelyn Farm and the Poulton Lancelyn estate. The Poulton Lancelyn estate was built to ensure open spaces and access to greenspaces for residents. The use of SP043 for development would destroy the preserve of this setting and the special character it holds. Local Infrastructure and services are not suitable and inadequate to support further development at SP043 for the following reasons: Access to SP043 is via a Country lane and a known accident blackspot. The Country lane is accessed from Spital Crossroads (another known accident blackspot) which is congested and gridlocked at peak times. Traffic is exceptionally bad at the weekends and peak times with ques stretching all the way past Spital train station). Access to Spital crossroads is via the M53 (junction 4) the slip roads from the M53 are so busy they have standing traffic spilling onto the motorway at peak times. There is one local School Poulton Lancelyn which is full and oversubscribed. The School has two classes per year with limited scope to expand. Access to Poulton Lancelyn from SP043 would be by Road as the country lane is far too dangerous for pedestrians and has no footpath. Poulton Lancelyn School is on Venables Drive which becomes impassable at school drop off and pick up times. The situation is already a danger to pedestrians, increasing the number of residents by developing SP043 will increase traffic on Venables Drive and make it more difficult and more dangerous for children walking to and from school. Local congestion problems at peak times would be exacerbated further by developing SP043. Shops and Local Services are severely limited in Spital which is the closest set of shops for SP043. There is very limited parking to one doctors surgery and a local shop with no local post office or banking services. There are no Playing fields, football pitches or recognised greenspaces in the Local area of SP043.
DOR02654	Scrap your plans and revise them based on realistic housing requirements and not the grossly inflated ones you dreamed up for purely party political reasons
DOR02655	My concern is the potential loss of Stapleton Wood and Caldý woods in West Kirby. These two areas enable lots of wildlife to survive locally and allow a great many dog walkers and walkers to relax and exercise in beautiful scenery and views across the estuary. The loss of protection to this land would be 'criminal' . Building on the farm fields below Stapleton Wood is hard to accept but understandable considering shortage of building space on Wirral. PLEASE PROTECT this area of NATURAL BEAUTY and leisure for our sakes and generations to come.
DOR02656	[SAME AS DOR00384]
DOR02657	Object to SP059E
DOR02658	There is more than enough brownfield sites and run down housing that could be used for new homes without using green belt land. We were approached by a company called something like Millpark Homes who have bought the land from Eastham to junction 5. They knocked on our door looking for signatures to say local residents are happy for this land to be considered for housing. Why have they been allowed to purchase land for building homes on? This is vital green belt land and will add pressure on local services. It sounds as though this is a foregone conclusion as these developers will continue to apply for change of land use. I am disappointed that this sale has been made possible and will be even more disappointed if the go ahead is given. We need the council who we elect to govern our area and not to sell out to the easiest option. Redevelop brownfield sites and other areas before you carve up the countryside please. There are other options to consider.
DOR02659	Bromborough village needs the car park - without it, people will stop shopping there & it will deteriorate. Won't be long before it's a ghost town like New Ferry
DOR02660	This is a big mistake there is plenty of brownfield sites that you can use. You cannot ruin the countryside and green sites of the Wirral to build houses that will not be affordable for all. The builders will only make more money and the wildlife and peoples well fare will suffer. You should consider compulsory purchase of all land currently held by businesses with no plans for the land and waiting for the land to increase in value. There will be an impact on wildlife, traffic and infrastructure. The Wirral special and needs to be protected for the future please reconsider

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02661	We are writing as long time Heswall residents. our family relocated from l'pool in 1960's attracted by the green space and fresh air. As a family we have lived in Heswall for over 50 years. It is the unique qualities of the green belt which have sustained our families love and loyalty to the area. From a personal point of view it is the open land of the Green Belt and the historic nature of the coast line which provides our family with the opportunity to walk out of our front door and enjoy nature, plus the luxury of privacy. Over the past 50 years we have noticed an increase in leisure activities the Wirral Way has to offer, acknowledging the need for save environments for people to exercise outdoors, offering safe clean space for walkers, joggers, horse riders and an increasing amount of cyclists. The prospect of developing Green Belt will bring an increase of vehicles/pollution which can only be to the detriment of the safety of such outdoor pursuits. You might say it's a privilege of those with choice - but the professionals who choose to live here in the lower village are the same people we all rely on in our business's, hospitals, law courts, schools etc. They are not only supporting our area but also Liverpool and the north west - which can sometimes be overlooked by central government. If the proposals to build on GB in this area are passed, and property developers such as Magnolia developments are given permission to build and profit, we will lose the unique green space of this area and could jeopardise the incentive for long established professional residents to remain. Heswall only has one GP surgery which is oversubscribed and straining to facilitate the community. two oversubscribed primary schools. The public transport in the lower village is inadequate for commuters. Residents currently rely on their own vehicles for transport but parking facilities are limited and expensive. Please could you continue to protect the Green Belt in lower Heswall and retain the natural beauty and conservation of this part of the Wirral.
DOR02662	SHLAA 0718 and SHLAA 0716 We have these 2 sites at the rear of our house. There are badger setts in this area which are currently listed and protected by law. These badgers use the fields for foraging for food and also may have dug some new yet unidentified setts. We have video evidence of the badgers in these fields searching on a nightly basis over a period of years. As badgers are a protected species, we and our neighbours will vehemently object to any proposed housing development which will destroy their habitat. We have already informed the Wirral and Cheshire badger group and will be contacting other groups. Both fields for many years have also been used as grazing land for sheep.
DOR02663	BROMBOROUGH cannot take anymore it is full, with the new industrial estates and the retail park let alone the new housing on acre lane. Can you imagine traffic on the Wirral and Bromborough. The roads around here are, during weekdays, awful. The council dont look after the roads now let alone when an extra 1200 houses are built, BROMBOROUGH has an iconic village and because the council want an easy way out they are prepared to overpopulate maybe with foreigners. What a big mistake
DOR02664	I am extremely against building on greenbelt land for environmental reasons. The land helps to reduce flooding in our area by soaking up the rainfall. Some of this land is quite boggy anyway and therefore building on it will inevitably result in more flooding of housing. As a planet we need to reduce the warming of the earth. We have been advised to plant more trees in our gardens to help reduce global warming so why would you build on so much greenbelt land which would be hazardous to our planet. The road network in our area is already overloaded. Travelling through Heswall is gridlocked and cars now backup along other roads such as Whitfield Lane and Downham Road North to avoid the queues. These roads are getting very busy and are not made for commuter traffic. Our good friends have recently moved from there as they have seen traffic increase in recent years. It will get much worse with more houses and cars. Commuting to work is already very congested. Travelling towards Chester, Liverpool, M53 or Levers Causeway are the only way out of West Wirral and could not cope with more traffic. We are not connected on the rail network here which increases road use. With Avon bus company going into liquidation the number 88 bus no longer runs. This was the only bus connecting Heswall to Greasby and West Kirby. The only way is via car now which again increases congestion and damages the environment. Our doctors, dentists, schools and hospitals are already overstretched. We could not cope with increased demand. Using the Greenbelt will reduce the health of residents. Less fresh air for those with lung conditions will suffer. Our beautiful countryside cannot be replaced once it has been destroyed. Future generations will suffer as result of your poor judgement. It has now been revealed that we do not even need these extra houses on Wirral. There is sufficient brownfield sites to build on in our area. The population in Wirral is more elderly, childbearing aged women are a small percentage so we are not going to have a population explosion in our area. These houses are clearly unnecessary. Wirral should be looked at in its own merits not have a blanket government approach to calculating population figures.
DOR02665	I live in Clatterbridge ward of the Wirral and I am greatly saddened and alarmed at all the areas of Green Belt, particularly those in West Wirral, that have been earmarked as potential development sites for new housing. While I understand the need for more housing I fail to see why the numerous brown sites on the Wirral cannot be developed first along with regeneration of plentiful existing empty buildings to provide starter homes and low cost housing. Once the Green belt has started to be developed it will open the way for unlimited building and all the beautiful green spaces of the Wirral will be lost forever. Green belt should be fiercely protected, always. I know that it is cheaper to build on 'untouched' land but this is a very poor excuse in my view. I urge you to please, please leave the Wirral Green Belt alone to be enjoyed for generations to come.
DOR02666	There is no local plan to support / underpin the proposals - the proposed use / release of green belt sites is entirely unacceptable. The green belt must be protected. The speed with which attempts are being made to push these misconceived proposals through would appear to be driven in part by personal self-interest and an ignorance of actual, demonstrable local need. The council needs to take stock and think again - start by exhausting Brown field solutions in the first instance and in doing so clearly explored the need for affordable housing.
DOR02667	Land behind Stanley Avenue and on the Levers Causeway, Higher Bebington CH63 5QE - proposals for development. I strongly oppose the proposal to build on this land for the following reasons: 1. It would cause too much congestion - there is already traffic that backs up in all directions several times a day. 2. The land that there are proposals to build on is marsh land and would cause extra flooding to the houses that back on to it and for the proposed new houses (Stanley Avenue already has issues with sodden land.) 3. The air space above the land is a direct flight path to Liverpool airport and therefore causes noise pollution, which is not conducive to harmonious living.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02668	I am concerned that the information used to produce the plan is flawed. So many parts of it have been challenged by local groups and the national data has been called into question. The situation with Peel holdings has further complicated matters as the development of that site is well overdue. Wirral tries to market itself as a tourist destination hence the enormous amount of resources that have been used to support the proposed golf resort development. It seems contrary to this ambition to propose removing so much green space from the Borough. From an ecological and a wildlife perspective we should be nurturing this space for the good of residents not building on it. Open land properly used and trees are a major factors in carbon capture. It seems particularly wrong to target this space along the motorway.
DOR02669	I understand that affordable housing is badly locally and nationally but feel that there must be enough brownfield/old industrial sites to be utilised for this purpose. These sites could have the advantage that they are close to local amenities and road networks, schools and shops. I am not convinced that were greenbelt sites such as the one in Storeton to be developed that the housing would be 'affordable' A prime site overlooking countryside would be crying out for developers to build smart four bedroom detached houses at prices way beyond first time buyers pockets. I repeat that I want new housing to be affordable, so maybe force developers to build on land they have already acquired but are holding on to. Pursue the promised waterfront scheme before taking our precious greenbelt.
DOR02670	The Council's greenbelt policy is fundamentally flawed. By allowing Peel Holdings to procrastinate over the West and East float docks development (by not stipulating a time limit for development) they have put all their eggs in one basket and consequently have had a knee jerk reaction by proposing development in large swathes of Greenbelt land. If permitted the 'leisure peninsula' will become just one large housing estate and the unique identity of villages such as Irby, Thingwall, Greasby etc. Will be lost. The developments planned will not address the need for cheaper, social housing as the Council will want houses in band D and above to boost their dwindling resources. Those houses that are built tend to be a visual blight as they all look the same, with no thought to mixing up the type of property, use of different coloured bricks, etc. There is already plenty of brownfield sites on which development can take place. Greenbelt land that is lost can never be regained. Why should the Wirral people have to pay for the Council's mistakes?
DOR02671	I wish to object to your proposals for shlaa 2024 and 2025, Bromborough library and Allport car park, in the strongest possible way. Removal of these facilities is Vandalism and will be the death of the village. The council does not NEED the few houses that this would provide so there must be an alternative agenda in play. An excuse to remove the library, thwarted at your last attempt, or possibly something else to save Money. I will be interested to hear your reasoning for what I regard as an outrageous plan
DOR02672	I disagree with the proposals to build on green belt sites.
DOR02673	<p>I strongly object to Wirral Council's proposed removal of Green Belt protection from the existing continuous belt of currently undeveloped land located North Eastwards of the M53 and stretching for nearly half of this Wirral peninsula's length. The reasons for my objections are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) The removal of this protective status from this belt of land is contrary to the accepted principals of Town and Country Planning. Removal of this protection will irrevocably alter North Eastward Wirral's overall character by replacing what has been, until now, a number of longstanding separate individual localities with a continuous urban sprawl concentrated along one side of this peninsula. 2) The area of land involved includes areas currently used for recreational activities e.g. Public and Private Golf Courses, Forest, Public Parks together with some mixed agricultural land. These uses lower the overall density of existing urban developments, contribute to the maintenance of separate established localities, as well as providing some protection for native fauna and wildlife. In this region, some of the Green Field sites in question may also be of a currently unknown historical significance, which when revealed would restrict their development. 3) An urban development on the scale and at the locations proposed would place additional strains on the urban infrastructure i.e. public utilities, roads, primary and secondary Schools, Health Centres, Hospitals, Police, etc. 4) The removal of this protective status will be detrimental to the redevelopment and a more balanced regeneration of currently vacant, or underutilised, Brown Field sites in Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry. Given the opportunity, a developer will always chose undeveloped land, in preference to a Brown Field site, because of the likelihood of the former's inherently lower on costs. The question also arises of the current relationship between Peel Holdings and Wirral Council, the latter having already granted Peel Holdings planning permission for a mixed residential, light industrial and commercial redevelopment of a central Brown Field site, which does not intrude into Wirral's Green Belt and which already, includes the required scale of residential development. What are the existing terms of this planning permission, will this proposed redevelopment be completed over the next 15 years or, would in effect, the removal of this Green Belt's protected status create a land bank for Peel Holdings' future developments? 5) As a part of this exercise, has Wirral Council been required to produce an Estate Terrier recording all of its existing assets, whether owned or leased, including land/site boundaries recorded at 1:1250 scale on OS maps, rights of access, easements, wayleaves, the utilisation, or underutilisation, of each of its building and the restrictions imposed on all buildings and land (Golf Courses, Park Land?) gifted to this council? This information is required if the Council is to prove that it is not holding any surplus, or underutilised, land or buildings, which could alternatively be utilised for residential development.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02674	<p>SP040 North of Clatterbridge Road, SP042 North of Poulton Hall Road, Spital, SP043 East of Poulton Road and SP044, West of Dibbinsdale Road. I strongly object to Wirral Council's proposed removal of Green Belt protection specifically from the above identified parcels of currently undeveloped land located between the M53, Brimstage Road, Poulton Lancelyn Estate including Brotherton Park, Dibbinsdale LNR and Dibbinsdale SSSI on the following basis:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) This overall area has been classified as "not enclosed", having a durable non-urban boundary, incorporating rural farmland and high quality agricultural land as defined in recent local area studies. I consider the removal of this protective status from this belt of open land would be contrary to the accepted principals of Town and Country Planning in being contributory to urban sprawl and the destruction of existing separate urban identities. 2) Existing road traffic routes serving this area are already congested at peak times of traffic flow, including that being generated by the M53, cross Wirral traffic accessing and egressing Bromborough, Birkenhead and Liverpool, primary and secondary schools etc. The junction at Spital crossroads would become even further congested from the resultant increase in traffic. Any possible use of the existing Poulton Road/Dibbinsdale Road as a secondary route leading towards Bromborough would result in at least one new accident blackspot together with further congestion along this already restricted, historical route. 3) Existing local primary schools are already oversubscribed, GP Surgeries and Dentists are busy. Further development at this locality on the scale envisaged would place additional immediate, and long term, strains on the neighbouring urban infrastructure i.e. public utilities, roads, primary and secondary Schools, GP Surgeries, Health Centres, Police, etc. 4) The natural drainage route from the south of this currently undeveloped site leads partly into Dibbinsdale SSSI, which is already a known flood risk area. This area is largely low lying and the envisaged residential development would, in part, require the resultant additional surface and foul sewage water to be pumped uphill to discharge into the existing public sewerage system. A failure of this pumping system could therefore potentially result in the flooding of Dibbinsdale SSSI with sewage. 5) This overall area includes the Dibbinsdale SSSI, which is bounded by "official" core biodiversity zones. There are 4 large areas with tree conservation orders. It has several landscape types valuable to wildlife and is classified as "environmentally sensitive" by Natural England. 6) Whilst undeveloped, this area has a mix of landscape types conducive to recreational activities, including Brotherton Park and Dibbinsdale LNR, is served with access paths, includes a mature fishing lake and protected woodland. The conclusion of Wirral Council Landscape Character Study for Clatterbrook and Dibbin Valley is to "maintain and enhance". 7) The site is located at the southern end of the Brunanburh battle site and, as such, is likely to be subject to further investigation. 8) A removal of Green Belt protection from this area, and on this scale, will be detrimental to the redevelopment, as well as there being a more balanced regeneration of currently vacant, or underutilised, Brown Field sites in Birkenhead, Wallasey and New Ferry.
DOR02675	Why is there no indication whether the proposed housing built by the Council will be for rent or presumably taken over by Magenta under the guise of "Affordability" and Jeff Greens expanding Enforcement Team.
DOR02676	Surely there are other sites better suited than Bromborough village. Acre Lane , the old Lyndale school site and plenty more along the far end of Eastham Rake by the old tip for example!
DOR02677	<p>I strongly object to the proposal to build housing on the green belt land numbered 0879 bordered by Rigby Drive and Arrowe Road for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - This is productive farm land supporting arable and livestock farming and employment - This land is not enclosed and is only bordered by 50% - This land acts as a valuable soak to prevent flooding. There have already been flooding problems with surrounding residential areas and buildings on this land would only increase the flooding problems - This land has areas of valuable wildlife habitats including a large natural wood and several ponds - This land is on a hill and building housing would create a viable eyesore and have a high visual impact on all the areas around - By designating this green belt land for building it would act as a domino effect for further building to take place (e.g. parcel 1959) which would see urban sprawl taking place between Greasby, Irby and Arrowe Park Hospital until there was no separation - This land is not in the councils designated areas of greatest housing need - This land is directly next to two schools and would have a detrimental impact on children including walking to school, noise and air quality
DOR02678	Wirral does not need houses on green belt sites when there are many brown field sites that already have planning permission (16000 planning applications already granted) also 6000 empty properties waiting to be brought back into Housing stock, it's social housing that is required for Wirral ,not housing on Green belt which will only encourage major house builders to build 3,4 and 5 bedroom detached houses , that people on low incomes that need affordable housing just won't be able to afford ,and in certain areas the infrastructure (roads ,schools ,doctors ,dentists etc) will all have to be improved by the Council, NHS, and Utility Companies ,to cope ,so Wirral Council be savvy and look at the real problems and improve what you have , and help people who need affordable housing and not destroy our and future generations Green belt

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02679	<p>We would like to set out our objections to the proposals for Eastham. We live on Ferry Road and the traffic since the building on Carlett Park site is intolerable, just trying to get on and off our drive is a danger. The pollution and congestion is ridiculous and at weekends when there is more traffic with people going to Eastham Woods, especially the motor bikes. We have grandchildren and when they visit at weekends just trying to get them out of the car with the amount of traffic is dangerous. There has already been fatal accidents on this road in the past year. More houses will only increase the danger on this road and the congestion in and out of the village, when there has been an accident or a problem at the oil site the whole village comes to a standstill. The schools in the area will not be able to cope with more children and the GP surgeries will not be able to accommodate all the increase of families. We bought our home in a greenbelt for a reason and now this is being eroded by Wirral council wanting to build more houses. The government laid out 5 purposes for green belt and that was to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. To prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. If the Eastham Green Belt is turned into housing and industry do you think that the urban sprawl will increase. Ellesmere Port will start to merge with Eastham. There will be severe encroachment on the local countryside. The setting of historic, medieval Eastham Village will be damaged. Eastham Country Park is there for everyone on the Wirral to enjoy and if you build anymore houses on Ferry road and the surrounding area the traffic will be so congested nobody will be able to access the country park. You have already put parking charges into operation which has also had an impact on parking on Ferry Road, people can't afford the charges so they are now parking on the road instead of the car park. The roads around Eastham Village cannot cope with the traffic, more people are going to be killed. What was once a quite village is now like a race track at busy times of the day i.e. morning and evening when people are going and coming from work or school and the weekends are just ridiculous. Will the council only take notice when people are killed or seriously injured. The turning by the public house on the corner of Ferry road and Village road is a blind corner and very narrow and with people parking there is only room enough for single line traffic but some motorists just carry on and i myself have nearly been hit on many occasions by motorists who will just not wait. Family member visiting relatives on Ferry Road and the surrounding roads around the village are in danger trying to get out of their cars. PEOPLE WILL BE KILLED. Please look at alternative plots of land around the Wirral that will not be a danger to lives and not impact on the people the schools and GP surgeries in the area. You do not have the infrastructure in place to cope with all this housing and the people who will live in these properties. You would need to alter all the access roads in and out of the village, because as it is it will not be able to cope with the extra traffic people are entitled to live quietly in their homes and not be in danger. I hope the council will see sense.</p>
DOR02680	<p>I would like to object in the strongest terms concerning the plans to re-designate some Wirral green belt to allow residential development. There are brown field sites on Wirral that remain undeveloped, e.g. Peel Holdings plans for Wirral Waters. There remains controversy as to realistically how much further new housing will be required on Wirral with a diminishing population: - there is evidence that the actual requirement is 200-300 houses per annum, not 800. Greenfield sites may be cheaper for developers, but once lost this land cannot be converted back to Greenfield. There will then continue to be the problem of undeveloped Brownfield sites as an eyesore and public hazard. I am particularly concerned about the adverse effect on the wildlife of in building on the Land between Stapledon Woods, Caldý Rd and Column Rd. This open agricultural land provides a wildlife corridor between the National Trust Wood on Caldý Hill, the land around Birch Hey Farm on the other side of Column Rd., Thurstaston Common and Royden Park. With the recent tendency of home owners to fence off their properties with high close boarded fences, such open land wildlife corridors are of increasing importance. Development of this area will isolate wildlife populations on Caldý Hill Woods and Stapledon Woods. Badgers, Foxes, Hedgehogs, Adders, Grass-snakes and Voles are all found in Stapledon & Caldý Woods and are dependent on this land for access and gene pool diversity. I would urge you to reject removing Greenfield protection from this land.</p>
DOR02681	<p>Having read the information about proposed building on Wirral Greenbelt in the Barnston area, I was surprised to see no indication of how many new schools would be required and the proposed site of any new facilities to accommodate the additional increase of children we would see. I am also concerned as to the increased pressure we would see at our local doctors surgery (The Warrens) whilst they find it difficult to accommodate the existing patient numbers at present. Can you please confirm that these issues will be addressed and let me know the outcome from any decisions. I would also like you to address the problems that would be seen with the additional traffic through the Barnston dip (accident blackspot at Fox & Hounds pub) as I think this would be a major problem if your plans are carried out.</p>
DOR02682	<p>Developing Irby and Pensby would result in increase in traffic and pressure on the local communities. Traffic is already extremely busy in the morning and evening on Thingwall Road, Pensby Road and Arrowe Park Road due to the heavy volume of traffic using it as a cut through from parts of the Wirral to the motor way. There is no railway or rapid transport in the area. I understand under current legislation the council can't develop land which would end up merging two areas into one i.e.. Pensby, Irby and Heswall. The area around Harrock Wood and Limbo Lane are liable to flooding and any increase on development would put pressure on the local environment. Harrock Wood is owned by the National Trust and is an area of outstanding beauty and natural habitat. Any increase in housing would put pressure on local health services, schools and transport. I personally already have problems getting GP appointments at the Warrens. To support new homes and businesses you will need to invest in more infrastructure. Wirral is a peninsular surrounded 3 sides by water with only 3 main roads in and out of the borough, this puts intolerable pressure on the roads in the morning and evenings. New roads would be need to be built effecting the environment and causing more pollution. Government need to change the law to ensure more home are built on brown fill sites e.g. Peel Holdings should be forced to build more affordable homes on Wirral Waters Site before Green belt land is considered to be used as this was agreed when the land was purchased. I understand the demand for new houses on the Wirral as a whole is not as high as the government dictates and the actual demand is not as much as in other areas of the country i.e.. London and the South East. Wirral should not have to find the same level housing as larger and more wealthier areas of the country.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02683	<p>Objection to Green Belt Amendment Heswall An essential characteristic of Green Belts is their openness and the fundamental aim of Green Belts is to prevent urban sprawl by keeping land permanently open. The stated sites are located close to the River Dee Estuary, designated as a Special Area of Conservation and Scientific Interest and could have a detrimental effect on all bird and wildlife within this area. This apart from the fact no account seems to have been thought of or taken of the limited infrastructure in the area. We strongly object the proposals to reclassify land parcels in the Lower Village to an Infill Village within the Green Belt category.</p>
DOR02684	<p>Do the numbers add up? A case was presented showing an increased demand for more housing in the Wirral which may require some adjustments to the areas currently protected by Green Belt over the coming years. However, I was shocked to discover the potential scale and impact of what might be proposed to the full Wirral Council as the numbers seemed so out of proportion regarding the expectations for fresh development land. Why make blanket changes without considering the impact? Why does the consultation being undertaken by the Wirral Council think it is acceptable to treat citizens who live to the east of the M53 as undeserving of open space and unworthy of keeping at least some of the existing green belt surrounding their homes? Why is there no proposal to listen to environmental reports upon the effects of traffic pollution and at least preserve a small green lung on both sides of the motorway? Could link Green Belt areas via the shoreline and water surrounding the Wirral. Elsewhere in the country, councils seem to have a different interpretation of what can make a green belt to that being put forward at the recent public meetings. Why has Wirral a fixation that all the green belt areas have to touch each other? Surely when the Wirral has only one land border to the south and water on all the other three sides of the peninsula it makes more sense to also propose the idea of bringing green lungs into the Wirral that help to differentiate and separate the urban, commercial and industrial areas. The patches of green belt at Eastham woods, Dibbinsdale, etc. could then be thought of as contiguous by attaching them to the river and sea water lapping our shore lands. Staggered by size and location of land at risk to loose Green Belt protection: I was deeply shocked to listen to consultation members talking up as acceptable the idea that the proposal to the full Wirral Council would be simplified if all Green Belt protections from the entire eastern side of the Wirral were removed. A blanket removal of green belt to the east of the M53 would “simplify” for whom? Politicians? Planners? Agricultural land owners freed of restrictions to then make large profits from housing development? Very disappointed in the staff involved who seemed to show a predetermined position or self-interest. Effect proposal may have on existing infrastructure: And where have we seen any serious attention to the impact such large increases in housing will have upon the existing infrastructure?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Not in the presentations, • Not in the formal questions and answers where it was always sidestepped as being for planning, or the NHS, or somebody else to sort out at a later date, • And, definitely it was not a topic for discussion around the table maps where there was an even more defensive attitude and that they knew best. Maximisation of Existing Non Green Belt Housing Development: I was also hoping to hear more in the consultation about what the Wirral Council could do to force the development of brown lands that have been identified as suitable for housing whether planning consented or not. There is plenty of brownfield land available and Wirral just seem unprepared to make the moves to get it used again. Why was there no mention of using compulsory purchase? Following the like of the recent car parking charges and dog ban proposals, it is clear that the Wirral Council has little interest to promote the health benefits of the existing green space already open to the public. Perhaps the Wirral Council secretly hope bits of playing fields, and the like can be sold off piecemeal to raise money under the excuse of providing homes. Environmental Impact of Any Future Development: It felt the consultation process lacked an integrated and imaginative attitude where the proposal to the Wirral Council could state that currently protected green belt lands should only be released for future new housing development if any schemes for subsequent development conform to the ideas of creating at least some new publicly valued existing green spaces within them; be they parks, playing fields, footpaths, woodland, cemeteries, wide open roadside verges, etc. This consultation process has been too narrow in the vision and shown to ignore how for example, the removal of the current Green Belt protection will effect existing natural areas like the river Dibbin. If ever more housing encroaches on the headwaters, and/or other development takes place more directly along the River Dibbin’s course, then how will the Wirral Council ensure the Local Nature Reserves and SSIs downstream are unaffected? And finally – with all this proposed loss of farmland what is the effect upon the wildlife. Have the consultation body even troubled to see how many known Barn Owl nesting sites for example will be lost?
DOR02685	<p>Why are the local council going against their own agreed policies and national policies to protect the green belt? What research is the seemingly extreme demand for additional housing based on, where will the influx of population be coming from? Why is high end expensive housing being targeted when the real need is for affordable housing or starter homes at the lower end of the “ladder”? Why is there not more focus on derelict or brownfield sites, such as Wirral waters? Why is there a seeming intent to obliterate character villages such as Storeton, Barnston, Eastham, Irby etc.? Has the provision of infrastructure been duly considered i.e. energy supply, sewerage, fresh water, transport links cars, buses, trains, are there adequate amenities for health care? I would like to state that land grab of the green belt is in no ones interests and goes against morality that stems right back to the original creation of this amenity the intent of which was to preserve future benefit for society and was therefore protected and should remain so!!</p>
DOR02686	<p>Seems odd that wbc are reluctant to consult their own document/Wirral Compendium of statistics 2017.They would note that between 1996 /2016 the population of Wirral has fallen by 1500 persons with a projection to 2030 showing a fall 6544.This alone would seem to point out that there should be little if any pressure on Greenbelt land .By destroying large areas of the Greenbelt for what surely will be luxury housing and of course this will be unaffordable to most of the local population. Nothing will be done to rejuvenate parts of Wirral such as Rock/New ferry, Tranmere, Seacombe and other areas that must benefit from civic help. How can we consider encroaching on Greenbelt land while Brownbelt sites are ignored. The obvious remains the obvious, that once this beauty has gone, it is gone to detriment of future generations.</p>
DOR02687	<p>Have no confidence in Wirral Council to progress this plan in the interests of current and future Wirral residents/tax payers</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02688	I understand the figures for housing requirements are very suspect. However I strongly object to a special part of Bebington, will be forever spoilt/destroyed by possible development plans will ruin the area, and all the country lanes there. It is a beautiful area, rather special in the memories of older people in the area, and good for taking children on their first walks. I do not think there can be any excuse for using this area of land.
DOR02689	I strongly object to the Local Plan as the site is a land mark and is at the heart of West Kirby. The view from Grange Road as you come into the town is what gives West Kirby its identity. The 2 new properties at the mouth of Darmonds Green have already been allowed which has ruined the history of the area by removing extremely old trees and the junction is now extremely dangerous. More houses in and around this area will only continue this deterioration of the character and local history. The sandstone walls built by Degrouchy also continue to be removed and access to the main road from this proposed site would continue to make Grange Road evermore dangerous. St Bridgets Primary would also suffer from extra children needing school access when there is a current limit of 60 students per year group. The extra council tax that is made by adding new housing never seems to get spent on improving the existing facilities in West Kirby with poor pavements, increased antisocial behaviour and the removal of the fire station and local policing. Putting new housing on any piece of spare land is not the way to make West Kirby great again. These sites should be maintained and areas further outside of the heart of the village should be investigated instead.
DOR02690	Peel holdings - won't build 13000 houses they promised. Why are the Council not insisting that they build or release the land for others to build homes? Wirral will lose the attraction of its historic village identity as urban sprawl will result in built-up areas merging. These generally more affluent parts of Wirral will be far less attractive places to live and less income will be generated on Wirral. Loss of woodlands and open spaces for the benefit of all. Wildlife habitat destroyed. Why so many houses? What about jobs for new residents. No evidence that there will be a growth in jobs here to support increased population. Inadequate infrastructure to support increased population - shops, schools, transport etc Damage to tourism There is enough brownfield sites on Wirral to meet housing requirements There are over 3000 empty houses on Wirral
DOR02691	It's a huge concern to me as a Higher Bebington resident, I have severe asthma and the air quality will be greatly affected along with our beautiful wildlife! Wirral has beautiful so called Green belt which isn't supposed to be touched. Please keep our area this way and don't build in Storeton and Brackenwood please!!
DOR02692	I feel that there are enough brown field sites and unused properties to be used rather than green belt land.
DOR02693	About the proposed housing allocations under site reference SHLAA 1507. This proposed site is in Egerton Park which is an unadopted road; property owners each pay £5 per month/£60 per year for the upkeep of the road - my point is, that if the council are building properties in Egerton Park (this is not the only site in Egerton Park), are they going to adopt the road; if not, then the council will need to pay the committee the park fees for each property that they build until they sell those properties - if they are rented, the owner (council) still have to pay. I would also like to know if the sewage pipes are going to be upgraded as they are old and already backing up in places around the park especially right outside another of your proposed sites in the park! The road is paid for by the residents so it would need to be repaired by the council if any damage occurred during construction and original walls and trees must be kept on all sites. I have no objections to houses being built in the Park as it's more appropriate to the area than flats.
DOR02694	I realise the Council has to comply with the requirements of National Government by providing enough land to build 12,000 homes over the next 15 years. The thing that concerns me most is the disposal of the additional refuse that will be generated when these new homes are occupied. Wirral is lagging behind in the disposal of plastic waste such as yogurt pots, plastic bags & drinks cartons, and in the collection of food waste and I feel this should be addressed as a priority issue now. In Norfolk, for example, virtually nothing goes into non-recyclable rubbish.
DOR02695	I object strongly to proposals to build on Wirral's green belt. Our green belt is an integral & vital part of Wirral's unique character. This plan would lead to the ruination of our countryside & impact on nature, conservation & biodiversity. It most certainly should not be considered until all the brown field sites are utilised. People need green spaces for recreation & to reconnect with nature. We need to protect & preserve our precious green spaces on Wirral.
DOR02696	West Wirral provides green space and recreation for Liverpool and the Mersey coast of Wirral. Building on it would reduce this amenity. Building dwellings would require the provision of infrastructure - schools, GP provision, hospital beds, water, gas, electricity, sewage works, better triad junctions and parking for cars. All of this would put. Further pressure on space and reduce Wirral to an urban environment.
DOR02697	I am really unhappy about the plans to build on greenbelt land. I feel that brown field land should be used for housing development. As a resident of Wirral I am unhappy at the further loss of green field and feel this is a very short sighted plan. It is wrong that the government are imposing their targets on house building when this should be a local issue.
DOR02698	I am horrified at the plans to build on Greenbelt land when there is absolutely no need for it. The revised requirement for affordable housing can easily be covered by the renovation of empty properties, building on Brownfield sites and the completion of already approved planning applications. I also want to register my strong objection to the Hoylake Golf Complex.. I am in the process of writing more fully on both subjects
DOR02699	SHLAA2024 and SHLAA2025 Strongly object to proposed plan effecting Bromborough civic centre and library. Allport lane car park. We should all be working to retain local villages and community. Bringing people together. It's a disgrace the way we are destroying the community. Shame on you. There are more than enough housing projects in the area. We do not need anymore. I still have my Drs surgery and banking and use local amenities regularly.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02700	After attending a local plan consultation meeting I was appalled to see the Green belt areas being considered for development, mostly alongside properties of mid to high value ,suggesting , confirming! that new developments would be aimed at that market.. An area of housing that only benefits the owner of the land sold and the acquiring developer!! Wirral needs housing that is affordable for first time buyers only, the only market in short supply. Wirral's population is NOT growing as many younger people after leaving Education are choosing to live elsewhere in rented accommodation . Peel holdings have agreed to start stimulating Birkenhead's Waterfront an area of great potential as the great example of the regeneration of Liverpool's waterfront, dock area has shown. We must not lose the opportunity to do the same...BE FORWARD THINKING! Wirral is renowned for its green open areas and coastline attracting many visitors who spend money supporting business and providing employment! We MUST not lose that appeal it's what attracts people and business's to WIRRAL.. A GREEN place to live and visit I strongly object to losing our GREEN CORRIDOR for unsuitable housing and look forward to hopefully seeing a regenerated Birkenhead .
DOR02701	Prior to green belt areas being provided for housing, i would expect to receive confirmation that: The housing numbers calculated, using a Government formula is accurate for Wirral. That all brownfield sites are used for housing to the maximum potential. That the meetings between the Council and Peel Ports culminate in the maximum number of housing units are included in the Wirral Waters Scheme, reducing the quantity required from areas of green belt land. I understand that West Wirral has been defined, by the Council, as a Zone 4. If this is the case developers will have less obstruction towards new builds than in areas designated Zone 1-3. Green spaces are a major reason why people move to the Wirral, currently long lines of standing traffic, emitting vast amounts of exhausts fumes are a major issue. The infrastructure is not adequate therefore air quality would be a major issue.
DOR02702	I do not think full consideration has been made to the actual needs of the county. I am totally opposed to any building on greenbelt land, I feel it is a total destruction to the area in which I have chosen to live, and I have chosen to live here because it is so peaceful and surrounded by the countryside. I fear for the wildlife. I do not want to see Irby, Pensby, and Thingwall merged together. I do not believe Irby could cope with the extra amount of traffic that would be created. The village already struggles with parking and trying to cross the roads on the walk to school is already hard enough. Whilst I have raised concerns about the area where I live, I also do not agree with the building on greenbelt in any area, such as near Raby Mere etc. It's not solving the social housing needs or providing affordable homes, or redeveloping the areas of the Wirral that desperately need it!
DOR02703	<p>I feel compelled to express strongly my views that the Green Belt in Wirral should NOT be built upon. 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. As a Wirral resident for the whole of my life I have chosen to remain in the local area, to work in the local community and have my family here. I chose to live in Irby with my family as it is a small close-knit community, 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 bought my house in the Irby area solely, and NOT as part of a larger local area. If I had wanted to live in any of the other separate areas I would have bought a house there. 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 and with a religious based entrance criteria. Neither schools 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. 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.</p> <p>As such, it's 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). 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</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	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.
DOR02704	I received a flyer a few days ago, and was pleased to see that some action was being organised to challenge our local council from selling off copious amounts of Wirral Greenbelt to make way for housing. I feel that Heswall and Barnston in particular are becoming 'built-up concrete jungles' of flats, squashed into small pockets of land which previously gave a nice break to the landscape from the otherwise continuous buildings. Prior to the new buildings being built it was a pleasant place to motor or walk through but now it has become a sea of large and ugly new buildings and it feels very claustrophobic. Heswall has always had a village-like atmosphere, but now it is changing into a large and extremely busy place, but with the drawback of insufficient parking and high parking charges. This leads me to address the proposed building on the greenbelt land in Barnston I travel frequently down towards the Barnston Church area, and either turn right into Storeton Road or head straight on down to Barnston dip. The problems that I am aware of frequently is the volume of traffic that builds up. It's not on an occasional basis that this happens, but every day. The worst times are between 7.45am and 9.45am as well as 4.00pm to 6.30pm. I can sometimes queue for up to forty minutes to get through the T junction. The matter is compounded if a bus is coming from Storeton Road, as this exacerbates the problem greatly. Potentially, should there be traffic travelling from an additional housing estate, whether the entrance/exit be situated on either Barnston Road or Storeton Road then the problems will compound to a preposterous and dangerous level. In my view if further housing is approved in the Barnston area then I can't imagine how the additional amount of vehicles and people will be able to negotiate these small country lanes. It will be chaos and a risk to human life. In addition to this when there is a downpour of rain the water flows down from the fields and the drains are unable to cope with the volume, and thus overflows onto Barnston Road. This causes mayhem, as the water is too deep for a 'normal' height car to negotiate through and means that people have to turn round to find an alternative route, which in turn causes further chaos. I have known people to abandon their cars as the vehicles fail to function with that amount of water. I have lived in this area all of my life and this problem has never ever been solved, even with the addition of drains. Should additional families and vehicles be brought to the Barnston area (usually 2 cars per home, plus business vans) these particular roads are not designed sufficiently to accommodate all of the aforementioned problems. They are very much like country lanes. My worry also is that once one/two estates are built then they set a precedence, and before you know it the lovely green landscape that we previously had will become a mass of housing estates (just as in the case of Heswall centre). Barnston Road presently is a lovely road to walk down with its fields and wildlife forever present, and the diversity of the styles of properties that line Barnston Road adds to the enjoyment. I stayed within this area to take advantage of the greenery and the feeling of space that it gives, and I will be sorely disappointed, if not angered, if the fields are turned into a mass of multiple modern 'boxes'. I received a flyer a few days ago, and was pleased to see that some action was being organised to challenge our local council from selling off copious amounts of Wirral Greenbelt to make way for housing. I feel that Heswall and Barnston in particular are becoming 'built-up I hear the Government always saying that they want to provide first time buyer homes to help the younger generation to get on the housing ladder, however homes built in Heswall/Barnston will not reflect the price that a first time buyer could afford. The area is renowned for inflated housing prices, so this defeats the Government's objectives. There is no advantage for homes to be built on the green belt land in Barnston. I can only see negatives. Furthermore, I am devastated that working farms are being closed down, therefore taking family's livelihood's away and leaving them with no future. Farms have always been renowned for creating a community spirit, and we have sadly lost this in Barnston! I am wholly opposed to these proposed building plans, and object strongly to any plans being put forward for the Barnston/Heswall area. The whole area seems to be against these plans, and I have spoken to many, many, people about the proposals.
DOR02705	To whom it may concern I am writing to express my concerns and sadness after reading the local plans and attending the meetings arranged concerning the proposed green belt use. As a resident of Wirral all my life I have grown up with the beauty of the Wirral with its open areas, parks and wildlife. Whilst living on the Wirral over the years i have seen a lot of changes whereby more and more open spaces have been used for housing. It is therefore important that we safeguard the areas that remain in order to ensure Wirral does continue to be a truly beautiful place to live, not just turning into a concrete jungle. As a parent I feel my children have benefited from living playing and growing up on the Wirral and its countryside and hope that this will continue for my grandchildren too. It is with sadness that I see the local plans are planning to change the open spaces we have to use for housing rather than find alternative solutions The plans show that one of the areas greatly affected appears to be the areas close to the M53 Eastham Bromborough Bebington Storeton etc which currently is farm land open fields would greatly effect wildlife and having a damaging effect on conservation of the areas I therefore strongly object to the local planned ask that the plans are amended and alternative solutions sought
DOR02706	There are plenty of 'Brown sites ' to be developed on the Wirral and I know Peel Hlds own a lot of the water fronts. Why can't the council issue a CPO and develop the water front around Wallasey/B'head so it mirrors Liverpool waterfront.? By selling off Wirral's green belt to developers, it will affect our wildlife, the natural drainage of water, destroy trees and shrubbery, which will then have a knock effect on the climate. The Council needs to look at the long term effects, not just 'quick fixes' now. It's our Great, Great Grandchildren that will have no fields, not know what local wildlife is and have health issues.
DOR02707	I am against building houses on Green Belt land. Green Belt land should remain undeveloped apart from farming, we should be looking after it for future generations.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02708	<p>I would like to raise my objections to the potential building on Lever Causeway Green Belt land. My reasons for this are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. 2.) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. 3.) It will spoil the character of the area. 4.) Lever Causeway and its open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. 5.) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6.) Increased traffic and major congestion. 7.) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost. 8.) Damage to Mountwood Conservation area. 9.) The sites either side of Lever Causeway are huge. Once released from Green Belt, building could extend to Storeton, causing unrestricted sprawl, with historic Storeton and Bebington Merging. 10.) Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes
DOR02709	<p>I am extremely concerned regarding the plans to build extensively on green belt land. Notwithstanding guidance from central government to build more housing, the nature of Wirral will be forever destroyed by this disgraceful plan to build on what should be protected land. There will be greenbelt left if it is deemed to be acceptable to build on it year after year. Please reconsider. There are many brownsites which can be built on.</p>
DOR02710	<p>The building of new houses should be kept to brown sites. We need to keep Wirral a beautiful play to live and leave our green belt sites alone. Keep the Wirral beautiful.</p>
DOR02711	<p>Please keep our lovely Wirral as green as possible. Extra buildings on greenbelt areas would be so devastating for all Wirral residents. Please, if extra housing is needed, use brownfield land. Wirralians do not want to be deprived of their current environment ie countryside, vistas, landscape etc etc</p>
DOR02712	<p>I am concerned that there will be no Green Belt east of the M53. The Assistant Director said that in a consultation meeting at Hulme Hall. There are many small areas of woodland designated as green belt east of the M53 that would lose their status under the current proposals. I am concerned that they will be picked off by developers over the years. These are areas of high amenity value. We need these mature trees to mitigate air quality. Development would throw more vehicles onto already overloaded routes to reduce air quality where the "cleaners" used to be. If we must have new development, we have run out of brownfield sites and Peel have let us all down, then build a new settlement between Willaston and the M53, along the B5151.</p>
DOR02713	<p>I am writing to object to Wirral Council's plans to release Green Belt for housing. My reasons for objecting are:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The new revised figures from the Office of National Statistics indicating a lower target of housing required for the Wirral means the Local Plan should be revisited and amended. 2. Wirral has a large number of unused urban sites. I believe a better way of creating new housing is to develop these sites with a regeneration plan for these areas. 3. Releasing Green Belt land would be an easy, quick fix approach for the council to create housing but would lose the Green Belt and detrimentally alter the Wirral forever. 4. The council has no plan to co-ordinate the packages of land sold to the developers. The developers would be allowed to apply for planning permission on any released plot thereby having a patchwork of developments. 5. The council have given no assurance that the type of housing to be built will be a variety of housing for all potential homeowners and the fear is that the developers will go for the higher profit '5 bedroom executive housing' style of house which doesn't seem to resolve the housing situation. 6. One of the sites of particular interest to me is the land either side of Lever's Causeway. Any development on these sites would mean the loss of the unrestricted view from Mount Road, as per attached photo, over the Wirral to Wales. 7. The loss of this view would have a detrimental effect not only on residents in this area but all users of Mount Road. Instead there would be a view of urban sprawl. 8. Any new housing estates either side of 'Lever's Causeway', a local iconic landmark, would have a big negative impact to this landmark and a loss to the area. 9. Mount Road doesn't have the capacity to cope with the increased traffic and congestion.
DOR02714	<p>I wish to strongly object to the proposals to release green belt land for development. In particular, I object to the release of land in the vicinity of Barnston Village. Barnston Village is one of the oldest and most historic villages in Wirral, and its character as a rural village would be wholly destroyed. There are also often significant problems with flooding and water logging on the fields proposed for release. In addition, the roads, particularly Station Road/Storeton Lane could not cope with the increased traffic. This junction is gridlocked every morning and evening for extensive periods as it is, as is Gills Lane. The Arrowe Park junction has similar delays. There is no direct train service and buses are infrequent. There are insufficient School and GP services as it is, without an additional influx of hundreds of residents. The effect on wildlife would also be catastrophic. There is sufficient brownfield land and development should take place there first.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02715	<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 development . 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 a long 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.
DOR02716	Have you looked at Banks Road? Also the Prom - the unsightly NEW build ????
DOR02717	Building on our green belt land is outrageous. The whole Wirral peninsular will change and not for the better. Our infrastructure will not be able to cope. I condone your Plan to take away our open spaces, fields and wildlife that make Wirral what it is, to build houses that are not wanted or required.
DOR02718	No need to build on green belt land as brownfield sites available. Certainly no building should be done at Claremont Farm fields as this will cause even more traffic chaos on Brimstage Road, Clatterbridge roundabout and Three Stays traffic lights. Local primary school is already oversubscribed and couldn't get my grandson into Poulton Lancelyn school last year and he is now attending Thornton Hough. Cannot see any builders providing social housing in this area as they would obviously be upmarket homes in order to make a profit. I therefore feel that the fields at Claremont Farm should be left alone.
DOR02719	<p>I'm unhappy with the plans to build on the land on Oakdale Road, the area as it is congested with traffic and cars parked on each side of the road. Plus the area is rife with fly tipping and overflowing bins, extra homes will increase the amount of rubbish and parked cars bringing the area down and increasing anti-social behaviour. There's not much space as it is, more homes will make it worse. My second worry is the proposal to build houses on the annexes next to the Wallasey town hall as well on the car park, this will crush local businesses on Brighton Street and King Street who rely on staff from the town hall for business the people who would move into the houses would be more likely to go out of town to buy their shopping as newsagents such as the one on Brighton Street simply cannot compete with supermarkets prices. Also it will increase the amount of traffic and parking will be a nightmare with everyone fighting for spaces, Rappart Road at the moment is like this especially with most families now having more than one car or the houses on Kenilworth Road being converted to bedsits it would make finding a parking space a nightmare. Not to mention the amount of overflowing between ns and fly tipping, it will put people off wanting to get married in the town hall as well as increasing anti-social behaviour with the lack of space. Please don't go ahead with these changes</p>
DOR02720	In the local plan I totally disagree with the proposal to build on green land and green spaces. The road system on the Wirral is already highly congested, and this density will only intensify to the detriment of those currently living here. Existing brownfield sites should be used, and it has been confirmed at local planning meetings that I have attended, that there are more than enough of these available to meet the criteria. I have lived on Irby Road for the last 18 years, and unfortunately the traffic on this road, as one of the main roads in the village has only increased during this time. Current planning proposals will increase the traffic flow, and this in turn will not help those suffering with respiratory conditions such as myself with Asthma, and this in turn will put an added burden on an NHS service that is already splitting at the seams.
DOR02721	<p>I wish to object to the proposed plans, by Wirral Borough Council (WBC) to release 8sq miles of GREEN BELT land on which to build homes on Wirral. There is space for 18,000 houses on BROWN FIELD sites on the Wirral currently, more than enough to meet even inflated targets. The Government has stated that Wirral "is not an area of high housing pressure " but one where over 80% of the house moves involve Wirral residents relocating within Wirral. WBC's exaggerated 'objectively assessed housing need' which has led to the misconception that it cannot be met without some release of Greenbelt, stems directly from a wholly unrealistic projection of future economic & population growth & displays a staggering lack of recognition of local knowledge & historic trends. W.B.C's figures show glaring omissions, errors & admitted failure to take into account higher densities of modern development which require a smaller land-take & can provide more homes without GREEN BELT being released for at least a generation. Development is most desperately needed in the run-down & declining parts of Birkenhead, Wallasey & New Ferry & should be 'affordable housing' built on the BROWNFIELD sites, NOT expensive executive homes built on Greenbelt. There are 6,000 unoccupied properties on Wirral, vast numbers of unused Planning Consents & Outline Planning Approval at Wirral Waters for dwellings to be built by Peel Holdings, all of which should be pursue by W.B.C before using our precious Greenbelt land! The Greenbelt is our Green Lungs which mitigates against Climate Change. Greenbelt development increases traffic & pollution & increases populations in areas without adequate infrastructure & services to cope. Our precious wildlife & woodlands will be lost forever! One proposed development local to me is the land on the north side of Thingwall Road between Limbo Lane & Arrowe Park. There are woodland copses here that are home to bats & owls, seen hunting over the fields where there are plans for building to take place. There are also newts & toads present in the ponds on the edges & in these fields. Once our Greenbelt is gone it is gone e for good!!!!!! W.B.C figures have now been proved wrong by new Office for National Statistics indicating a new target of 500 rather than 800 homes per year will be needed. WHAT ELSE HAVE WBC GOT WRONG?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02722	Building on green belt land in West and South Wirral will create an horrendous Urban Sprawl. Wirral has many beautiful open green spaces which should be saved. Roads around these greenbelt areas are not fit to take the amount of traffic that more properties will bring, and public transport is limited, also more pressure will be created on Schools which are already oversubscribed around these areas. There are many Brown field sites and derelict properties around North Wirral, the Docks and Birkenhead Town, Birkenhead is a commuter friendly town, just one stop to Liverpool. Build up communities again around Birkenhead and entice investment to create confidence in population growth around these areas as Birkenhead town centre is decaying and dying.
DOR02723	When is the infrastructure being put into place in order for these houses to be built: e.g. Roads which are already congested, schools which are already full, GP surgeries which are also full, hospitals, policing, fire services, drainage of any land where necessary and so on. As most families start off with 2 adults, then 2.5 children, who in turn grow up and eventually start driving which means even more cars on already congested roads in the area.
DOR02724	Please don't build on our Green belt I have lived here all my life and have always called it 'Gods little acre' don't turn it into a hell hole. I have always loved that we are only minutes' walk away from the countryside. Use the brown belt land first. Stop filling the pockets of the developers.
DOR02725	Why are brownfield sites not being used? It makes no sense tearing up beautiful and natural areas of Greenbelt land, that separate one town from another. Then building houses in these prime sites which will have expensive rates and not where first time buyers or those who just want to get onto the property ladder could afford to buy. These areas of previously protected sites will be lost along with the wildlife we so treasure. Do we really need more houses when the ONS has already admitted the original projections for population and economic growth in Wirral were over estimated.
DOR02726	I consider that Wirral should preserve the Green Belt if at all possible. It should only built on as a last resort. It is vital that green areas are retained for the enjoyment of the residents and visitors, both now and in the future. It is good that we have green fields and parks between are local towns and villages, it is part of the attraction and reason for choosing to live here. More effort should be put into finding brown field sites, and also liaising with Peel Holdings and other developers. The population on the Wirral is declining, the estimate of the numbers of new houses required needs to be scrutinised to ensure that this figure is realistic and based on local factors.
DOR02727	I am dismayed that the council intends to give planning permission to build on the car park & civic centre sites in Bromborough. Until & unless decent public transport is provided, members of the public need car parking facilities, not only to access shops, but for doctors, dentists, podiatrists & opticians too. Without the library too, the village will die, if no one is able to access the facilities. Many elderly people will be unable to travel further, thereby making them effectually housebound, with all the knock-on social & health problems that arise from this. Please consider the bigger picture before granting this planning permission.
DOR02728	It would be dreadful to lose our green belt area's for housing development Why not build on the grotty places, there are plenty of those around the area. Birkenhead town centre is more like a ghost town full of charity shops, the market also these days is not as busy as it used to be, maybe houses could be built in these places. Please keep our green area's for leisure, beauty and the history of Wirral. It would be such a shame to lose them.
DOR02729	I am vehemently opposed to any loss of Green Belt for housing (or any other development) as proposed in the Local Plan. This is an attempt by greedy landlords and developers to make a vast, instant profit at the expense of the wishes of local residents. In respect of proposed green belt sites SPO60, SPO19B, SPO59B, SPO59E, SPO61 and SPO62, loss of these sites to development would create one huge area of urban sprawl and amalgamate Heswall, Irby, Thingwall, Pensby and Barnston, taking away their unique characteristics and separation. This goes against all the 5 principles set down in the National Planning Policy Framework, Sect9 (Protecting Green Belt Land) para 80. I would add that this consultation is based upon flawed housing requirement statistics which, since the inception of the consultation, have been updated. This consultation should now be scrapped and a new one proposed on newly acquired housing requirement figures.
DOR02730	There is enough land and property available in Wirral for regeneration, which also stop the eyesores in the area, without taking our Green spaces, Stop Taking our Green Belt
DOR02731	Object to the building on the site previously known as Pensby Park Primary School
DOR02732	I object to the Bebington/ Storeton green belt development proposals. The area around Storeton should be protected, not only is there historic value and the area should remain rural and untouched. Especially since it surrounds the backdrop to the woods and is widely explored as a green area by the surrounding communities. Further development would shatter this.
DOR02733	I do not agree with the plans to develop on greenbelt land in Wirral or in particular in my local area of Barnston/Heswall for the following reasons: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - the projected figures for housing do not appear to be accurate. - there is sufficient brownfield land to develop on before even considering greenbelt. - the Wirral is known for its outstanding natural beauty and tourism related to the wildlife and nature of the area which would be destroyed through large developments that are proposed. - if we leave the EU we will need good farmland to produce sufficient crops for the local area and the rest if the country in a single market. - we do not have the provisions in terms of schools, medical care, transport link to sustain a higher population in Barnston / Heswall. - traffic is congested through Heswall as it is without adding to that. - The population is declining in Wirral rather than increasing so the projected figures are incorrect. - the pollution, noise levels and inconvenience for locals will be lengthy if the 500 houses are built that are being proposed on land close to Barnston / Heswall. - the majority of houses built will not be suitable for first time buyers. In summary, I disagree that there is any need for Wirral Council to redesignate any Green Belt land for the development

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>purposes. This is based upon the view that their incorrect figures and methodology has been used to establish that a shortfall. The baseline figures are incorrect, the population is shrinking not growing and the buffer added for additional houses should have 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.</p>
DOR02734	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to respond to the local plan proposals. I hope the current local plan proposals will be dramatically revised in light of the consultation responses. My responses to the proposals are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The figure of 12000 over 15 years for the minimum number dwellings required for Wirral is wrong: - The latest (2016) ONS based projections just published and, using the Government Standard Method, recalculates the minimum number of dwellings required as 7320 over 15 years. - The July Cabinet report estimates a supply of 8735 new dwellings over the plan period. Using the demand figure of 7320 from above, this would make a surplus of 1415. 2. Even using higher required dwelling figures, release of greenbelt is unnecessary because: - the Council has not taken sufficient account of the potential from Wirral Waters. - over and above Wirral Waters, there is a huge amount of brownfield infill land in the Birkenhead area. Regeneration of the brownfield and infill areas around Birkenhead would result in additional housing delivered, would provide an opportunity to improve the areas for existing households and would stimulate demand for retail and other amenities in the Birkenhead town centre. - reuse of empty properties has greater potential (and for more social benefit) and needs to be better accounted for. - based on history, the Council figures for windfall development are insufficient. 3. The current proposals conflict with the principle of greenbelt - The NPPF2 states "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans." The Council's Review does not meet this or other requirements in NPPF2 4. The Secretary of State (then Sajid Javid) said in his letter to Wirral Council on 23rd March 2018 about the delay in producing a Local Plan; he wrote "This is not an area of high housing pressure" 5. As final general points, - I don't believe a local plan can be finalised without a local transport strategy. - given the Council wishes to regenerate the shops and amenities in Birkenhead we need to focus residential development and public transport offering on Birkenhead. Let's attract and keep more money in east Wirral. - given we attract people, money and investment because of the Wirral countryside, the development of greenbelt contradicts the Council's visitor economy strategy. And now to the Heswall area where I live - <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council's identifies locations between the Wirral Way and the Estuary where "potential infill opportunities currently appear to exist." The Wirral Way is an important recreational amenity for local people and visitors. 2. NPPF2 states that "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use". The area between Davenport Road and the estuary is largely undeveloped and it remains a key part of the Wirral Way. 3. The Local Plan should take into account the proposed Birkenhead to Welsh Border section of the proposed English Coast Path. 4. Regarding three specific sites towards the end of Pipers Lane identified for further investigation for Green Belt revision: - as mother whose son walks and cycles along Pipers Lane (daily to school and weekly for leisure), as someone who is trying to live without a car and as an active promoter of others to walk and cycle, I don't believe Pipers Lane can safely support the additional traffic that additional development would create. - the Council should consider the principles of a quiet lane strategy.
DOR02735	<p>I can see plans for taking most of the Greenland from Rivacre Road. Firstly I have lived here for 12 years, we have breeding Hawks that nest every year and produce their off spring, we also have Stag Beetles and Stag Beetle larvae in all the tree roots. I believe these are an endangered species, we also have bats. These fields are a source for wildlife that is dying out, it's their habitats and without these they will die out. There are stoats also in the ditches which run down the water ditches to Eastham Village. Also aside from the wildlife, the road would not take any more traffic, there are weekly crashes on the junction of Rivacre Road and School lane. The road is a national speed limit road and its already a nightmare for residents children to play safely on Dudley Crescent, Merton Road without then adding way more traffic. Rivacre road has no lights, no public footpath, narrow bends, potholes and it floods with heavy rain. You would need to consider solving all the problems it already has and I can only see it as a money pit for the council if you are doubling the traffic that uses it.</p>
DOR02736	<p>Please leave the green belts alone, use the brown belts as required. The green spaces are vital for our wellbeing and existence. Do not convert Wirral into another concrete jungle.</p>
DOR02737	<p>You give central government figure for no of homes needed but not your own? What about a compulsory purchase order if Peel holdings don't improve their housing offer? Wirral is already becoming a conurbation- the plan appears to make this worse!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02738	<p>I am not only strongly against the proposal, but I'm also very concerned (appalled) at the way planners/the council have readily concluded that developing Wirral Green Belt land is acceptable & the only route to meet the statutory Local Plan. Why choose to develop green belt land over: 1. Redevelopment of extensive Wirral 'brown field' sites? 2. Urban land, residences/properties? 3. Land owned by Wirral builder/developers with outline planning (if they aren't prepared to build the required houses then they should be forced)? to meet any required government driven statutory plan? Any suggestion that Green Belt is the only solution remaining, is both short sighted & unacceptable to the majority of Wirral residence. The whole proposal makes no sense at all! Wirral's beautiful Green Belt land & green spaces are critical to the borough, they are its heart & lungs! Not only essential for the health & well-being of all its residents, but also to the natural flora & fauna of the region (such as rare owls, bats, hedgehogs, to name a few), all of which will be lost upon destruction of the green belt. It's not an exaggeration to say that ONCE GONE, IT WILL BE LOST FOREVER! No society is sustainable or can remain healthy without its heart & lungs! There is no justifiable need for the proposed development of the green belt land for housing on the Wirral. Borough population growth is slow & there are no large multinational companies relocating to the Wirral. As such, current needs could actually be met by developing the current brown field sites, etc. with a bit of effort by all parties concerned. Any calculations or assumptions to contrary are just that & at worst, just plain nonsense! In this proposal no evidence has been put forward to justify the figure of 7000 extra homes required between now & 2035. The decision to develop Green Belt land on the Wirral should only be as a very, very, very last resort when there is a clear local need or to ensure it remains green for generations to come (i.e. a park, given to National Trust, etc.). It should not be profit driven or because the right thing to do is more challenging!</p>
DOR02739	<p>I completely object to the use of green belt land being used for any other reason than why it was originally chosen as Green belt in the Wirral. This has been a very rushed implementation of this house planning. The council have had 5 years to come up with a plan and this is being forced on residents in a consultancy period of a few months. Not the residents fault but the lack of council planning. Currently property developers are trying to buy green belt land to build large homes for profit which are not needed in the area. This area is full of landlords with houses being rented out leading to people not being able to buy their own home. More of this is not needed. The government figures which have been used in predicting the amount of housing required do not meet with the need of this area. According to council statistics there are more deaths than births in this area, there is not a need for housing. I feel that this area is already over built and the current roads and facilities in the area sometime are inadequate for the current population with huge numbers of homes being built there is no money to upgrade the roads.</p>
DOR02740	<p>There should be no release of green belt for development. Instead priority should be given to the redevelopment of existing brown field land and making the substantial number of existing empty properties habitable.</p>
DOR02741	<p>I would like to register my objections to the release of green belt land and have the following comments: Projected Population Growth No Government has determined how many homes are to be built by Councils since Labour's Housing Targets were abolished. All Wirral Borough Council's (WBC's) figures stem from the Office of National Statistics (ONS, a non-ministerial department, independent of Government, reporting directly to the UK Parliament). It is the ONS who have published revised figures recently, which are very helpful to the case against release of Green Belt and they should be correctly considered. WBC's own projections of Growth (of population and local economy) and those of their Consultants, together with ONS figures were applied to a Standard Formula (agreed by Parliament for all councils). WBC's Growth Predictions are exaggerated, a contention supported by the latest published data. There is flexibility around the methodology of arriving at an 'Objectively Assessed Housing Need' (OAN) and Councils are urged by Government to challenge the 'formula' results in order that local and 'Exceptional Circumstances' are taken into account. WBC has NOT challenged Wirral's results in any meaningful way nor taken up the opportunities offered to discuss and develop the standard methodology, this should be carried out as a matter of course. Options for using inherent flexibility and arguing modification of the scale of Housing Need, though encouraged by national policy and the Secretary of State, had NOT been taken up meaningfully. 'Exceptional Circumstances' and historic Local Factors had NOT been pushed. WBC's past and current approach has led to widespread belief of a determination to release Green Belt to show some development is occurring and reap a financial benefit. This concern was heightened by the WBC Officer Presentations at recent Public Meetings and suggestions since the much lower ONS figures were released that some Green Belt will STILL be released. The Council has continued to argue its case (of inevitable and "enforced" release of Green Belt) even when there was updated data available (before the latest reductions) showing that their Growth assumptions were far too high, especially as the Local Plan process is required to keep up-to-date with relevant input figures. It did not keep up-to-date, this should be addressed. Brownfield Register Errors pointed out during WBC's Brownfield Register Consultation process have led to reductions of availability but few, if any, additions, with the Officer statement that those identified as additional would be reviewed/appraised next time ... i.e. in 15+ years. This approach is flawed and should be corrected. Wirral Waters WBC's response to enquiries why only 1,100 'Wirral Waters' homes were in WBC's Brownfield Site capacity figures was that detailed Planning Consent is necessary before schemes can be included. This is fundamentally incorrect and runs counter to the 2017 Appeal Court Ruling which made it clear to Councils, developers and others that developments only need to be "reasonably possible", not even "probable" and definitely not "certain" or of proven deliverability. This Ruling not applied as it will significantly tip balance towards NIL release of Green Belt?</p> <p>ITPAS had provided the Council with its detailed appraisal of ALL Green Belt Sites within its Area (Irby, Thurstaston, Pensby, Thingwall, parts of Greasby, Barnston, Heswall), using Criteria for exclusion from consideration publically consulted upon by WBC and used in their Consultants' own Appraisals, plus the 5 Principles of Green Belt and other key factors in WBC publications. ITPAS's assessments (representing over 600 residents) and WBC's own Criteria for exclusion of Sites were almost completely ignored in the rushed and flawed shortlisting of 48 Green Belt Sites. This should be correctly reviewed and the shortlisting of the site re appraised. Generally Were the Council determined to protect Green Belt (as now claimed), why did it keep quiet for 2 years about its Consultants' conclusion in 2016 that Release of Green Belt land was inevitable? Surely, the Consultants would have been required to find circumstances where this was NOT inevitable, arguing a more reasonable, lower Growth Rate. 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</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>even in the wake of much lower Growth Forecasts, from national and local sources. 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, this approach should be corrected to reflect the potential of 6450 units. 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 such, whilst Officers appear happy to state that developers and the Council see greenfield development as simple, quick and lucrative. Their approach is unacceptable and needs to be corrected. The isolated nature of Green Field sites and access to facilities e.g. regular public transport, shops etc. has not been considered. The roads in and out of Irby, Pensby and Thingwall and the Arrowe Park traffic light junction will be incapable of accommodating any significant rise in road traffic densities. The impact upon core services such as schools, doctors will be severe if any extensive green belt development is carried out.</p>
DOR02742	<p>Now that the ONS has downgraded its predictions of population growth for the Wirral, we have been made aware that supposed housing needs have been drastically reduced if not halved....hence an approximate 5-6000 houses to be created by 2035. I have also read that Peel homes are still promising 13000 homes in that period at Wirral waters not to mention other brownfield sites still available for development. I therefore fail to see why ANY green belt needs to be developed on our precious Wirral - unless of course there is some monetary gain for WBC. Not sure how councillors voting on these proposals could live with the responsibility of taking away this beautiful green space forever - removing the distinction between historic villages such as Irby, Thingwall & Pensby to name but a few & taking away the very essence of the peninsular - a tourist attraction for that very reason. PLEASE THINK BEFORE YOU ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN PLEASE.</p>
DOR02743	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The recent revision to the ONS demand calculation appear to have taken the Council by surprise and cast considerable doubt on the accuracy and reliability of Council demand estimates. 2. Wirral Council have provided no quantified reasons for why so many houses are needed in Green Belt areas as compared to other locations. How many potential sites are available in non-Green belt locations? 3. Wirral Council have blamed "The Tories" and Peel Group for their apparent predicament, but seem unable to accept that their own long-term delays in submitting a Local Plan have played the major part in generating this situation. 4. Most of the current anger is directed not at Council policies but at the apparent incompetence of the Council in carrying these out.
DOR02744	<p>Firstly, there is no demand in the area for the additional housing and if the green belt land was to be released only executive style houses would be built in these locations, making the objective of this land release pointless. The infrastructure cannot cope now, the traffic and delays at Thingwall Junction / Landican Road during peak times is already unbearable. Loss of open green space will influence people's health, we already have an obesity endemic affecting the NHS service, no natural free space for walking and other leisure activities will increase this burden. My objections to the council releasing Green Belt land for development include the following points:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local population growth figures do not match the projected housing targets identified by the council/DCLG • A true examination would reveal the population of Wirral is declining. • Large number of empty premises and brownfield sites. • Planning applications that have been approved but not started because of harvesting by developers / agents. • Planning applications that are being delays, i.e., Wirral Waters (Peel). • Lack of local and central government funding for infrastructure to maintain and upgrade the current infrastructure. • Lack employment opportunities and dwindling industry in area to provide employment for influx of population. • Limited employment opportunities for current population of Wirral. Only service industries which are low paid and underfunded available in local area. • Lack of investment by local and central government in local facilities, availability of which is declining. • Land values in my local area and others will not be sufficiently profitable to enable development of affordable houses, hence, executive more expensive homes will be built. • Isolated and remote nature of Greenfield sites and access to facilities, i.e., no regular transport routes and lack of local shops and amenities. • Total Loss of biodiversity and public access to open areas / spaces, e.g., access to natural habitats, woodland, footpaths, and bridleways. • Impact on wildlife in Green Belt areas. The Green Belt areas on Wirral are a precious commodity and under no circumstances should they be considered for release for housing that has been proven as NOT required. Should these plans be approved then my family and I will have to consider migrating from the Wirral area, this is the consensus of others that have been consulted. This is a once in a lifetime decision that if allowed to go ahead will destroy the borough of Wirral for our future generations. PLEASE REJECT THE PLANS AND DO NOT LET IT HAPPEN.
DOR02745	<p>I think that it is very important to preserve all greenbelt areas on the Wirral. Especially due to the fact that there is large amounts of underutilised brown field sites, in the Birkenhead area. Which are well connected by public transport. Therefore less need for the dependence of cars. Redeveloped areas in Birkenhead i.e.. apartments with help to buy schemes for young people are often cheaper than renting. If Birkenhead's issues are not tackled NOW they never will be!</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02746	1. From the Wirral Council communications about the challenge we all need to rise to, to develop our Local Plan & deliver our share of increased housing stock and the availability of affordable housing for those looking to get on to or start to climb the housing ladder, it would seem that at least a major part of the solution should be for Peel Holdings to deliver on their previous commitments for Wirral Waters. How can we pressure Peel Holdings to deliver on their promise to build 13,000 new homes on the Wirral Waters land? If they're back-tracking, shouldn't compulsory purchase an option? 2. What "red lines" will be applied to ensure that the unique beauty & appeal of the Wirral peninsula will not be materially harmed by green belt development - our stunning coastline, woodland, dales, fields & pasture land, and the stunning views we & our visitors enjoy from our country parks, footpaths, cycle trails & bridleways, and from our towns & homes all over the Wirral? What are the principles that the Council Planners are using to decide what green belt land should be made available for development, and what rules will be applied to ensure development is sympathetic to the surrounding environment, flora & fauna? 3. What logic is behind the proposal to develop on the greenbelt land to the East & West of Piper's Lane, Heswall - in an area of high nature conservation interest, adjoining the beautiful Wirral Way country park, and with very limited road & services connections? If development was to be approved, what restrictions would be made to the type of housing that would be allowed, to ensure limited impact on the beauty of the environment and on the fauna & flora that live there? 4. For land in private ownership, is the Council proposing compulsory purchase as an available option to free up current greenbelt land for development - and how will local homeowners be compensated for impact on house prices as a result?
DOR02747	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02748	I am totally outraged at the very thought of Wirral Council even contemplated using our beautiful Green Belt Land for housing. The 'then' Council Leader who made the 'deal' with Peel Group should be held to account for obviously NOT making a good deal with them, as they appear to be accountable to no one for their failure to honour the agreement for their housing plan. I hope you are all thoroughly ashamed of yourselves for being responsible for the loss of our beautiful Wirral Peninsula of Leisure. I hope you remember tell your children, and their children, that you are responsible. We once lived in the most beautiful part of the UK, but now it will just be a huge housing estate, courtesy of Wirral Borough Council. Please rethink your strategy.
DOR02749	I find the idea of building on green belt land in the Caldys West Kirby area, mindless. We have so many traffic problems there ...look what Birkenhead corporation did to Noctorum...please leave our green belt and countryside areas alone ,we don't want extra housing in this area!
DOR02750	I oppose local government plans to build on green belt area between Pensby and Whitfield lane. Typical laziness from Wirral borough council. Probably the most unimaginative council in Britain. Whether it's cycle lanes, recycling or house building they are always behind the times
DOR02751	No building on greenbelt! Plenty of brownfield sites. Build social housing as opposed to letting developers inflate housing costs. Force developers to cease land banking. It's not rocket science.
DOR02752	I am wholly against the decimation of Wirral's Greenbelt. This must not be allowed to happen! Our green areas are part of what make The Wirral unique. The council act on our behalf and regardless of the threats from Westminster they MUST listen to us. DO NOT DESTROY OUR GREENBELT.
DOR02753	We absolutely need to keep out green lands , far too many commercial planning applications being allowed
DOR02754	My comments relate to the area on the Birkenhead/Bebington side of the M53. If those remaining areas are taken out of green belt and developed on there will be hardly any green space on this side of the M53 while plenty still remains on the Heswall side. Part of the purpose of green belt is to "stop large built-up areas from growing in an uncontrolled way" and to "stop neighbouring towns merging into one another". Birkenhead, Bebington and Bromborough are already completely merged with no green belt protection and little countryside access. Please protect the remaining green spaces on this side of the M53 for the enjoyment of people and wildlife. Liverpool has had great success redeveloping the dock areas and I think that Wirral could do the same, providing housing, jobs and attractions for visitors and local people. Also focus on regenerating areas of Birkenhead to provide more jobs and suitable housing.
DOR02755	SHLAA2024 - Bromborough Civil Centre and SHLAA2025 - Allport Lane Car Park. I object to the proposed change of use on this land. Both the library, civil centre and car park are used on a daily use by all of Bromborough, Eastham and wide communities of Wirral. The car park is full on a daily basis with people visiting the local amenities. Bromborough is a thriving village and requires the amenities it has. I believe that a charter was granted back in 1278 for a market to be held every Monday by Edward 1. Obviously, since the late 1930s Bromborough has expanded to what we now know to be Bromborough Village and is used constantly. By taking the car park, civic centre and library away this will cause detrimental issues to the wider community and the various groups that use these amenities. I do believe that the original owner of this land, Charles Frances Kynaston Wainwaring wanted the residents of Bromborough to be able to use this land as a community. Thereby, you are going against his wishes on the covenant that was given with this land.
DOR02756	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02757	I have concerns in general over the proposals to develop green belt sits on Wirral and favour massive effort to utilise all brownfield options. I favour allowing time for progress to be demonstrated with the Wirral Waters project which I believe will have an enormously positive effect on north Wirral and it's economy. I have concerns that the vast majority of green belt development proposals would be for executive homes, the only people to benefit would be the land owners and developers! I have concerns in particular over parcel SP013 where in the assessment summary September 2018 there has been no comment on the fact that this area provides the habitat for barn owls (frequently witnessed flying and hunting over the Column Rd Fields), bats, woodpeckers and many other creatures such as Canadian geese and recently a heron. Preserving habitat for such wildlife is crucially important. A petition set up by local residents demonstrates the strength of feeling about this piece of land which provides for biodiversity, but also for the pleasure of the local population and visitors in terms of walking, dog walking, views from Thurstaston Common and from Telegraph road, and contributes significantly to the character of this part of the Wirral. https://www.change.org/p/councillor-phil-davies-wirral-borough-council-say-no-to-development-of-column-

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	road-fields-and-caldy-woods-save-our-greenbelt. Please do not sacrifice the green belt- we need it for our generation and for future generations. It is what makes Wirral the hidden gem that it is. Please do not let urbanization take over the green peninsula.
DOR02758	I wish to complain about resent proposals to build more houses in Irby. You propose to allow an increase of our village population by 61%, with no infrastructure support, this will put pressure on our local schools, healthcare and roads, we already have issues in the village daily with congestion with the one way system and also at the T junction by the Anchor public house, the village and surrounding roads cannot absorb this ridiculous proposal. This will also affect the loss of high quality agricultural land, affecting wild life habitats. Logic and local surveillance to protect Irby needed to be enforced, as a local resident for most of my adult life I strong object to your future plans, you will destroy everything that is good about our local community and environment.
DOR02759	Having just received a letter from the Council Leader. I would like to ask, what measures are being taken to make the "beast" that is Peel Holdings into building the houses it originally promised back in 2010? Perhaps the Government should be involved to force this issue.
DOR02760	As a resident of Wirral I strongly oppose the use of greenbelt land for housing
DOR02761	I am totally against proposals to build on any greenfield sites, in particular the area in the vicinity of/adjacent to Claremont Farm, Poulton Royd Drive Spital. This is a natural break between the curse of the M53 motorway (which fortuitously is situated in a cutting at this point) and the existing housing. With most households in the area already possessing at least two cars - the addition of any further housing will only further exacerbate the traffic congestion currently obtaining at Spital Cross Roads and Clatterbridge Roundabout. I note throughout the Wirral - that there are many shop premises - with two to three stories above them totally vacant. These areas should be utilised for housing accommodation - as indeed they would have been in the 1950s. The government's new housing targets are totally unrealistic as far as the Wirral peninsular is concerned - and the Labour run council needs to show some metal in opposing these so called compulsory targets. If the council fails on this issue - I for one will never be voting Labour again - and will ensure that friends and colleagues are suitably appraised of their inability to protect Wirral's precious green belt spaces. Take heed !.
DOR02762	This peninsula of ours by its very geographical nature has only so much land and greenbelt to go round. I can think of no other local authority in the country which is confined as we are. It's well known that Greenbelt was set up to prevent urban sprawl, these 49 identified sites if built upon would go against that philosophy and accelerate that sprawl. No one apart from land greedy developers are in favour, we don't have a desperate housing shortage as in the South East, we are an aging population and have more than enough brown field sites in private ownership to meet the current demand. In short if this current council fails to deliver a positive outcome on this issue will go down in posterity as the most incompetent and corrosive of all time. Let's not end up with a scenario that the only green spaces left on the Wirral are the odd site of SSSI ,parks, gardens, golf courses and aptly cemeteries.
DOR02763	I came to live on the Wirral over 35 years ago and was attracted to it by the lovely countryside that everyone is able to freely visit and breathe some fresh air. Why, therefore, use Green Belts to serve the need for more housing? I understand that eventually finding land will be a problem and that beautiful apartment blocks would then have to be built, safe, with parks or gardens and amenities like shops, pubs and places of entertainment, around them on much smaller pieces of land. So why wait for that time when we will be forced to do the right thing and not start now doing the right thing to minimize that future problem? Think now of our children and grandchildren!... Please do not use Green Belts for building houses!
DOR02764	I don't believe that the proposed local plan is suitable for Wirral. The proposed extent of development is excessive. There is not a need on the Wirral for the number of new homes outlined in the plan. There are more than enough ongoing and available development opportunities to meet demand without building on green belt areas. Wirral's green areas are its biggest attraction. Reducing these areas through development would have the negative impact of decreasing the attraction of living in the area and property construction in these areas is unlikely to be of the affordable nature so often talked about. I feel that the population growth figures in the plan are unrealistic and population is more likely to be stagnant or even in decline. The volume of proposed development needs to be revised to more realistic levels and any developments on green belt disregarded. It is disappointing that after all the years that have been available to come up with a local plan a last minute effort has been proposed that is so inappropriate for the area. In summary, the local plan is entirely unacceptable.
DOR02765	I am horrified & dismayed that [the Council Leader] saying earlier in the year that you would not be building on The Greenbelt, that you are now considering just that. Wirral is such a beautiful area to live in that if your ridiculous plans go ahead we are in great danger of losing our important green open spaces & more importantly farmland. Yes the borough needs affordable housing, although it now transpires that your figures are grossly inaccurate, but use the existing brownfield sites instead, use the empty council properties, use the houses Peel Holdings are to build but DO NOT touch The greenbelt. We need our open spaces, we need The greenbelt, we need our farms & farmers need their livelihoods. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02766	I feel I must write to express my deep concern over the proposed plans to build thousands of new properties in Wirral's greenbelt. Wirral does not need thousands more properties, Wirral does not have the thousands of new jobs!! Building on greenbelt should not be an option. The damage this will do will be catastrophic and irreversible. Wirral is a beautiful green county with diverse wildlife and residents have decided to live on the Wirral because of this. Wirral is a peninsula and therefore traffic is restricted on how it leaves and enters the County. The M53 is at a standstill during peak hours during the daily commute to and from work. Queues to get off the M53 tail back onto the motorways at several junctions including Bebington which is extremely dangerous. The A41 and Chester High road are heavily congested along with both Mersey tunnels. Clatterbridge roundabout and surrounding areas, Clatterbridge Hospital, Brimstage Road and down towards the Croft retail park, are also very congested. Building houses on the greenbelt land around this area would result in gridlock. New developments around Clatterbridge/Storeton would be devastating for the area. The greenbelt and wildlife would disappear for ever and the chaos it would cause would be catastrophic. Building more houses would lead to more cars, more congestion, more standing traffic resulting in higher pollution levels that the government is trying to reduce!! Wirral does not have the capacity to provide jobs for thousands more residents therefore they would have to commute. Wirral does not have the road structure or public transport capacity to cope with this increase. It already struggles. Liverpool, Deeside, Chester and Manchester are all areas of major employment. Don't let Wirral become a commuter belt for these areas. Local hospitals are unable to cope at present with the numbers of patients building more houses would be irresponsible. Say no to all building on greenbelt and any new developments be affordable housing and on a much smaller scale be built on brownfield. Don't build on Wirral's Greenbelt
DOR02767	I am deeply concerned about any release of Greenbelt land for building. The whole nature of Wirral would be changed if the 'green heart' of Wirral were to be reduced or to disappear. Is there an even distribution of land earmarked for housing on both sides of the peninsula? I fully support house-building on brownfield sites.
DOR02768	I am totally opposed to the plan of using Wirral green belt for housing. My concerns are as follows: Is there a need for 800 houses per year when the population on Wirral is not increasing. Has WBC opposed the Government's requirements on the land restrictions due to Wirral being a peninsula. Who would want to live in the proximity of the M53 where the air quality would not be environmentally friendly. our roads at present can't handle the amount of traffic.
DOR02769	Four key comments to make;- Should be investing more in bringing into use derelict, multi-ownership and brownfield sites. It is bad to completely build over the last green space in an area, and totally remove the amenity of it. Cannot at least a large percentage of it be left as green space? Single occupancy housing, and housing for older people are much needed in this area. More needs to be done to provide attractive small dwellings as an option, without forcing people out of their houses. Coastal green belt is of extreme importance to the exceptionally large number of wild birds, which use Wirral to feed and roost, and it needs to be preserved.
DOR02770	Do not destroy our green and pleasant Wirral use derelict land or land previously used for housing in towns. Avoid greenbelt land. In no way should Bromborough lose its car parks where will people park? Businesses will lose out as well as residents. Remove parking machines on the Mersey side of Wirral why did they remain when other areas of Wirral had them scrapped. Suggest doing Way with Wirral View a complete waste of money, leave it on line or take a page in the local paper use the money saved to improve parking facilities and pot holes.
DOR02771	Please not the green belt. You really really don't need it.
DOR02772	I would like to register my objection to the "grabbing" of yet more green belt land for the following reasons:- 1. There are so many brown field sites around the Wirral that have been an eyesore for years that could be used. 2. Eastham is a coastal area that should be kept as such and not built up so much that as a village it loses its identity (the Birkenhead & Wallasey driven council forgets that Eastham is an ancient village and as such should not be "lost" amongst hundreds of new houses which these days all look the same! 3. The infra structure will struggle as the roads, transport and schools are totally inadequate now and this end of the Wirral gets very little in the way of amenities.
DOR02773	Thank you for a comprehensive presentation on the options and challenges faced by the Council, and for describing the efforts being made to regenerate brownfield sites. Our concern is the amount of traffic already on the A540 through Heswall, at most times of day, causing holdups and queues. If additional houses were to be built on the land adjacent to the A540, south of the Premier Inn/ Glegg Arms, we imagine this would exacerbate this problem. It is difficult to see what road improvements could be made to overcome such additional traffic.
DOR02774	I attended the meeting at West Kirby on the 18/9 with a number of questions many of which are still unanswered. My main concern is the controversy in regard to the number of homes required and the questionable statistics suggesting that 12,000 homes are required within Wirral. Before any development is agreed on brown or greenbelt land the public need to be made aware of the true facts to support the decisions being made. Recent figures from the ONS as reported in the press suggest that the statistics to which the council are working are incorrect and that we do not need anything like 12,000 homes. My other concern is in regard to the infrastructure as roads are often grid locked now especially at peak times of the day. Local schools are oversubscribed at both primary and senior level, what are the plans for roads and increasing the number of schools to support additional housing? On the other end of the scale is care for the elderly and infirm can the social services and hospitals cope with the prospect of additional demand or will these vulnerable groups suffer? I have read several letters in response to the proposals being considered by the council and share the concerns for our ecology and food stream with the loss of farm land and of course jobs Peel Holdings are appalled at the public letter sent by [the Council Leader] which suggests they are reneging on their original plans. I would welcome an open meeting with the council and Peel Holdings in a public forum which allows for an open and honest discussion. If we can have some definitive figures from Peel on their intentions and the council can support them there might be a workable solution without taking away what makes Wirral the leisure peninsula- our green spaces. I vehemently oppose the plans to build homes on greenbelt on the basis of the above.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02775	<p>No Government has determined how many homes are to be built by councils since Labours Housing Targets were abolished. All Wirral's figures stem from the Office of national Statistics. it is the Office of national Statistics (ONS , a non-ministerial dept.) who have published figures recently, which are very helpful to the case against release of Green belt and should prompt a change in our councils course. The Council Leaders latest contention , that his pressure brought this about, is both misleading and unnecessary. There is wide acceptance that WBC's Growth Predictions are exaggerated , a contention supported by the latest published data. WBC must challenge Wirral's results in a meaningful way and not succumb to any devious minded people who have only their self-interest . I do not agree with Green Belt being released. ITPAS has provided the Council with its own detailed appraisal of all Green Belt Sites within its area and were ignored in the rushed and flawed shortlisting of 48 Green Belt Sites. Why ??</p>
DOR02776	<p>I would like to ask why there is so much green belt potentially being designated for housing. It is my view that it would be better to refurbish the considerable amount of houses that are currently unoccupied first. Also, brownfield land has been earmarked for housing and industrial development, why are those areas not being built upon first? It is my opinion that consideration has not been given to the impact on local areas should greenbelt land be used, our roads are already congested, with many accident black spots. Local amenities are already oversubscribed, the schools, doctors and dentists to name but a few. We will also lose the character of the area, with historical sites being lost for future generations to enjoy. Can we really justify that, I don't think so. With the change in climate that we have seen over the last few years, has consideration been given to flooding? More concrete less drainage!! We would also lose valuable farming and grazing land, we, the UK currently struggle to produce enough home grown food for our own consumption, more air miles importing food. Has consideration been given to the increase in pollution from the high volume of cars that will come along with the increase in housing? Surely that is going to impact on our local, already stretched to breaking point health services with respiratory conditions to name but one condition that will increase. Are there plans to build more hospitals, we already have to wait quite a while for hospital appointments? Have you tried to park at Arrowepark hospital lately, it is like wacky races, with people trailing around the site looking for a place to park.</p>
DOR02777	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my wife to register our heartfelt objection to the release of greenbelt land. As such we stand to be greatly affected by any development proposals. However I write first and foremost as a lifelong Wirral resident. I was born and brought up on the Wirral and I have always been proud to be referred to as a Wirralian. I believe that peninsula is a beautiful and unique place. To release the greenbelt as proposed is will our view do untold damage to the heart of the Wirral.</p> <p>GENERAL: I would challenge why it is necessary to release any greenbelt at all. I am aware of the requirement to produce the local plan. However I am also aware that under the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 83) "Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances" Whilst I am no planning expert I do find it difficult to identify exceptional circumstances in this case given the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no unusual pressures on housing on the Wirral. That appears to be accepted by all concerned including central government. 2. There is the question of Wirral Waters. This appears to have become a political issue which it should not be. Peel Holdings have recently restated that they are committed to the scheme. Indeed their web site (as confirmed by a recent press release) indicates that they are targeting 2,900 to 6,450 houses within the 15 years of the local plan. My reading of the plan is that it only allows for 1,100 houses built on Wirral Waters in that period. The plan (if its projections are correct) also sets a requirement of 4,794 houses from greenbelt. Accordingly if Peel commit 5,894 houses in the 15 year period then the need to build on greenbelt is removed completely. Surely the way forward is to negotiate with Peel to seek that commitment. 3. The local plan does include large areas of brownfield land which are designated for commercial or employment use. The amount of this land contained in the proposed local plan appears to be more than is reasonably required to satisfy commercial requirements. Wirral has a wealth of commercial land along the A41. There appears to be a number of sites (in Birkenhead in particular) which could be re-assigned for residential use. This land can then further reduce the need for building on greenbelt. <p>STORETON AREA - It appears from the local plan that Storeton and its surrounding area is being hit particularly hard by the plan. This has to be considered by reference to paragraph 80 of the NPPF which states " Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas 2. To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another 3. To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment 4. To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns 5. To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land" <p>In my view Storeton Village continues to tick all those boxes. So far as a) and b) are concerned Storeton is an entirely separate village surrounded by agricultural land. The proposals would remove not just some but all of that land from greenbelt. By doing so Storeton would be merged to the North and East into the Birkenhead conurbation thereby assisting urban sprawl and causing Storeton to merge into the residential areas of Prenton and Higher Bebington. The individual nature of the village would be lost. So far as c) is concerned this is obvious. The loss of greenbelt would mean the loss of large areas of Wirral countryside. And very beautiful countryside at that. Without embarking on a history lesson in relation to d) there is no doubt about Storeton's rich history. It has a strong Viking connection and was mentioned in the Domesday book of 1085. Storeton Hall dates back to the 14th Century. Much of the village's character remains preserved to this day. To infill and surround the village with modern residential housing would ruin its character. At this point can I also bring into play the unique nature of Lever Causeway itself. Its history can of course be traced back to the first Lord Leverhulme. Visitors to the Wirral never cease to be impressed by its tree lined setting. The present proposals would mean the loss of greenbelt on both sides of the Causeway.</p> <p>Residential housing on either side would again ruin its character. Wirral BC has only recently spent good money on building the new track to the North side of the Causeway. I am well placed to</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>confirm how well used it is by walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders. It is a popular local resource. I have no doubt that it would not be so popular if it ran through a housing estate ! There is also and importantly the ongoing investigation as to whether the fields around Storeton were the site of the Battle of Brunanburh. There are others who can give much more detail about this but if this were confirmed then this is of the utmost historic significance. If there is any possibility that this is the site then it would be foolish in the extreme to build on it. Returning to NPPF e) is linked back to my comments under Wirral Greenbelt generally. We have brownfield options which must be encouraged. So all boxes in paragraph 80 are ticked. And that is without touching on the lack of infrastructure. Storeton has no rail link and a very sparse bus service. There are no schools in the immediate vicinity and the nearest doctor's surgery is in Higher Bebington. All matters to be taken into account in my view. FINALLY When it is gone, it is gone. If we get this wrong now generations to come will quite fairly blame those who are making these decisions. I am opposed to the proposal to re-designate Green Belt land for house building. For many years my husband and I have enjoyed Wirral's green belt and we owe it to our children, grandchildren and future generations that the green belt countryside we have enjoyed will be there for them as well. Once the green belt is gone it is gone forever. I believe the basis for the projected housing need the council has used is flawed, uses out of date data and does not take account of historical population and household numbers and trends, the recent lack of economic growth and the uncertain economic prospects for Wirral following BREXIT. There is compelling evidence to adopt an alternative approach to the calculation of housing needs. If applied this would dramatically reduce the anticipated housing needs for Wirral and therefore eliminate the need to build on green belt land. The government has recently announced a lifting of the borrowing cap on local authorities for social house building. The council should fully explore the possibility of building much needed social housing on brown field sites. Where these sites are owned by a reluctant land owner the council should consider compulsory purchase. I have in mind Peel Holdings in particular. I am particularly concerned about your proposal to use the M53 motorway as a high level strategic boundary. Much of the M53 motorway from Eastham to Clatterbridge is in a cutting and, in my view, is not a recognisable boundary. It would be wrong to include the open countryside to the east of the M53 motorway for further investigation using the rational that the motorway is a natural boundary or that the land is highly enclosed. Within the proposed de-listed green belt land you have certain areas that would be protected. However, this protected status would only last for 5 years before another review. I'm concerned that it would be much easier to de-protect these areas once they are out of the green belt and then they could be open for development. In conclusion, I don't believe the Council has made the case that "exceptional circumstances" exist to justify changing the existing Green Belt boundaries and so I oppose any change.</p>
DOR02778	<p>Representation on the Wirral Borough Council Local Plan proposals I have attended one of Wirral Council's consultation meetings on its proposed local plan and read some of your online information as well as newspaper articles. I am opposed to the proposal to re-designate Green Belt land for house building. For many years my husband and I have enjoyed Wirral's green belt and we owe it to our children, grandchildren and future generations that the green belt countryside we have enjoyed will be there for them as well. Once the green belt is gone it is gone forever. I believe the basis for the projected housing need the council has used is flawed, uses out of date data and does not take account of historical population and household numbers and trends, the recent lack of economic growth and the uncertain economic prospects for Wirral following BREXIT. There is compelling evidence to adopt an alternative approach to the calculation of housing needs. If applied this would dramatically reduce the anticipated housing needs for Wirral and therefore eliminate the need to build on green belt land. The government has recently announced a lifting of the borrowing cap on local authorities for social house building. The council should fully explore the possibility of building much needed social housing on brown field sites. Where these sites are owned by a reluctant land owner the council should consider compulsory purchase. I have in mind Peel Holdings in particular. I am particularly concerned about your proposal to use the M53 motorway as a high level strategic boundary. Much of the M53 motorway from Eastham to Clatterbridge is in a cutting and, in my view, is not a recognisable boundary. It would be wrong to include the open countryside to the east of the M53 motorway for further investigation using the rational that the motorway is a natural boundary or that the land is highly enclosed. Within the proposed de-listed green belt land you have certain areas that would be protected. However, this protected status would only last for 5 years before another review. I'm concerned that it would be much easier to de-protect these areas once they are out of the green belt and then they could be open for development. In conclusion, I don't believe the Council has made the case that "exceptional circumstances" exist to justify changing the existing Green Belt boundaries and so I oppose any change.</p>
DOR02779	<p>I object strongly to the development of Bromborough Village car park. This car park is very well used every day and if it is not available to shoppers it will have a severe effect on local businesses. Many locals rely on these shops locally and enjoy the village community which I fear will be placed in jeopardy. I object very strongly to the plans to get rid of Bromborough Civic centre. This is a valuable space for dance classes, fitness classes, meetings, party functions, fairs and other public events. Without this availability again this will have an adverse effect on the local community of all ages. We do not want to have to travel to Birkenhead to shop or use facilities, we want them to remain locally. Please protect Bromborough Village, keep it local and vibrant.</p>
DOR02780	<p>I have lived on the Wirral all of my life. I am flabbergasted that you as a council are willing to start building houses on our green land. So many of our green spaces have already gone, surely you are able I to utilise empty homes and buildings more effectively. Our services can only cope with so many people, our elderly population is set to rise so this is only going to cause more problems. I have never spoken up before but this concerns me greatly</p>
DOR02781	<p>I strongly object to ANY Green Belt Land being developed. The Green Belt is a precious asset which once developed can never be replaced ! The purpose of the Green Belt is to avoid urban sprawl, to provide opportunities for leisure and exercise, and to enhance the quality of life by retaining the rural character of the Wirral. If there is indeed a shortage of land for housing needs, I think that there should be greater emphasis on increasing housing densities and in particular the provision of apartments and multi-storey developments within the existing urban areas.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02782	I wish to raise my strong objections to recently disclosed proposals to "in fill" land in the lower Heswall area (SP099 - SP104 Inclusive) with housing. The proposed infill plan would nearly double the number of houses in the area affected and have a major impact on the residents already living here. It will put intolerable strain on the local facilities schools, roads, & drainage in particular. There will be no benefit from this development to the local residents, no increased employment opportunities, no improvement of access to facilities (quite the opposite). The location of the proposed development will in no way contribute to the provision of affordable housing as due to its position the homes built will attract a significant premium to their value. It is likely that it will only serve to raise local property prices ever higher. I understand that the council has significant obligations in protecting the natural environment, I am not alone in not understanding why land held by Peel Holdings ostensibly already agreed for development into affordable housing is yet to have any development at all. It is surely perverse to plan to develop on prime green field agricultural land, abutting an internationally important SSI rather than building on land already agreed to be developed. This proposed development will close wildlife corridors and reduce Wirral residents access to the natural environment. You will be aware that the "Wirral Way" actually runs on Davenport road, the large numbers of pedestrians, cyclists, dog walkers and horse riders using it will be at risk as a significant increase in vehicle traffic here is inevitable with the proposed development. The only people who will benefit from this proposed scheme to build on the greenbelt are the land owners and the developers, this will be at the cost of major degradation of the natural environment for wildlife and the physical environment for the residents of Wirral.
DOR02783	there is no need to use green belt land --there are 6000 empty properties in Wirral plus brownfield sites --Wirral waters also have permissions for thousands of houses -and you overestimated the number of houses needed so did Tories
DOR02784	Stop this flawed and exaggerated plan. Do the labour council really believe that the deliberately confusing, misleading and inaccurate information will be accepted by the residents of Wirral. It has now been proven that there is no need for any green belt land to be built upon.
DOR02785	This Local Plan is a total outrage. It is based on outdated data, and fuelled by cherry-picking the most profitable Green Belt sites to maximize monies generated. It seems astonishing that only a fraction of Peel Holdings' Outline Planning Approval for 13,500 new homes have been included in this plan. Quite apart from this, I have chosen to live in Irby so that my family can grow up in rural Green Belt, where we can see livestock grazing from our windows, and appreciate the countryside. So many people use the network of footpaths for exercise, dog walking, and general wellbeing. Whilst this may seem whimsical, a lack of exercise is a major contributor to obesity and other related diseases such as diabetes and heart disease. Take away this access and you will increase the burden on health care. The WBC cannot simply keep dismissing THEIR OWN approval for Peel Holdings housing plans on Brownfield Sites to suit their own, money-generating ends at the cost of our cherished Green Belt.
DOR02786	I don't want any green belt land to be built on. Wirral is a nice place let's not mess it up. Better to support reducing immigration then we would have plenty of houses to go round.
DOR02787	Building on the green belt is unnecessary, an act of institutional vandalism, and detrimental both to tourism in Wirral and to the standard of life
DOR02788	Concerns over how busy junction 4 of the M53 will be, poor air quality, no open spaced which was a selling point for the area and lifestyle of children, limited open spaces for children and animals to thrive, schools and public services already massively strained and oversubscribed in the area, west of the M53 remains untouched
DOR02789	I strongly object to any proposed reclassification of greenbelt land in Wirral. Such a policy is not supported by any of the arguments regarding housing need, especially now that the new statistics from ONS have been released. Many objectors have been offering evidence for some weeks now that the population growth and housing-need statistics which have been used to formulate this plan are obsolete, arbitrary and flawed. It is beyond ridiculous that highly-paid council officers cannot access the same information, and make decisions and recommendations accordingly. Much of the Green Belt land under scrutiny is unsuitable for housing use, being topographically inappropriate, or on protected conservation sites. Only when Wirral Council have ensured that all brownfield sites are properly developed, and all empty properties in the borough are occupied should there be any consideration of re-designating greenfield sites, and even then, non-greenbelt land should always be targeted before greenbelt.
DOR02790	I am writing to object to the proposed building on the green belt land : SP010A East of Rigby Drive, Greasby. Greasby is too populated in that area with school children and traffic. There are too many near misses as it is and illegal parking takes place at the top of Rigby Drive all the time. We do not need more cars, more illegal parking and near traffic accidents involving children. The land is home to cattle and a variety of birds and we need the clean air around our schools. We are a village that has grown enough.
DOR02791	<p>I'm so totally opposed to this local plan. The primary purpose of the greenbelt - to stop urban sprawl.</p> <p>1. These plans are actively progressing urban sprawl, sweeping aside greenbelt designations with it. This is wrong on every level. In February 2018 council leader said "I am not prepared to allow Green Belt land to be built on. I am resolute about that commitment. It is the jewel the Wirral's crown and greatly valued by our residents". Yet here we are in September 2018 looking at a plan which proposes to remove 54% of the greenbelt on the Wirral. 54% - that is outrageous. Council Leader was right in one regard - it is greatly valued by residents. The greenbelt protects the Wirral from becoming a sprawling Greater Liverpool area. Losing this land to development would be an outrage. No, no, no.</p> <p>2. My next thought is regarding the brownfield and unused housing stock. Clearly there is a vast amount of brownfield development available on the Wirral. Not just at the vast Wirral Waters site</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>but elsewhere too. There is barely a week goes by without the Our View local newspaper informing us about all the wonderful advancements the Labour party is doing for the Wirral, yet lo and behold it seems that none of the schemes have actually started. Where the journalists get their "facts" from I don't know. It is unacceptable though to bulldoze greenbelt whilst idling watching "no progress" on Wirral's brownfield sites. Both central and local government state their position as "brownfield first". This local plan flies in the face of that. It is a greenfield first approach. Disgraceful. In addition there are 6000 unused homes on Wirral. Why are we looking to build 13500 new homes when we have 6000 unused ones. Wrong, wrong, wrong.</p> <p>3. The housing target of 13,500 homes on Wirral over the next 15 years seems to me very high indeed. At the national average of 2.3 per household that's 31,050 people. To put that in perspective that's over 3 times the size of West Kirby currently, over twice the size of Heswall, Gayton and Barnston combined, and over twice the size of Eastham & surrounding areas. This is a huge increase. Where is the demand for the level of new housing? It simply doesn't stack up. The targets must be amended to a realistic level.</p> <p>4. The local plan removes greenbelt designation from all of the land to the East of the M53, and huge swathes to the west. The east side of the Wirral would become one continuous conurbation from New Brighton to Eastham. The fundamental purpose of the green belt is simply being ignored. That can't be allowed to happen.</p> <p>5. The large proposed sites around West Kirby and Hoylake would increase the traffic loading on the small roads that lead out of those towns toward the M53, and the main route through Heswall toward Chester Road for those travelling south out of the peninsular. These roads already struggle during peak times. They will not be able to support the increased demand.</p> <p>6. The land off Chester Road, and the huge areas between Heswall, Barnston and Thingwall are earmarked for some of the largest developments. Aside from making one large urban area from 3 distinct villages, this plan would result in a massive increase in the traffic on 3 high risk routes (A551, A540 and A5137) - in particular the A551 and A5137 are restricted by their geography, there is no possibility of improving these roads. Adding large settlements onto them will surely result in more deaths on these roads. Shameful.</p> <p>7. The recreation grounds around Heswall squash club and Gayton Park are scheduled to be built upon. How can this be right?</p> <p>The grounds are well used by children, joggers, dog walkers, as well as being an excellent resource for local wildlife. We need our green spaces! In summary then: Point 1: Greenbelt is there for a purpose. That must be upheld.</p> <p>Point 2: Brownfield and disused housing must be completely exhausted first.</p> <p>Point 3: The housing targets grotesquely overstate local needs.</p> <p>Point 4: All of the land east of the M53 would become urban - this is wrong</p> <p>Point 5: The small roads from West Kirby to the M53 will not become gridlocked in the morning and evening peaks</p> <p>Point 6: Barnston Road (A551), Chester Road (A540) and Brimstage Road (A5137) are all high risk collision routes and are incapable of taking increased traffic safely. Put simply - people will die as a result of this.</p> <p>Point 7: Recreation grounds cannot be wasted especially when there is an ongoing public health crisis around obesity and poor fitness.</p>
DOR02792	I am concerned about the green belt site for further investigation which suggests building on both sides of Lever's Causeway. This would turn Higher Bebington into little more than a continuous housing estate, destroying its character and seriously limiting its inhabitants the opportunity to enjoy nearby countryside.
DOR02793	Most of us don't realise what we have until it's gone and the young generations that follow won't realise what they could have had for lack of the experience
DOR02794	The proposal to build new properties on the car park and civic centre area of Bromborough Village will not only take away a much needed resource for parking and a central location for community activities, it will damage the look and feel of the village as well as be entirely out of place and character for the area. Please do not build in this area.
DOR02795	<p>I wish to register our total objection to the strategic housing land availability assessment for the areas consisting of Riverbank Road, Manners Lane, and Wittering Lane within the Lower Heswall coastal and greenbelt land. These proposals are ill conceived with no thought or consideration of Wirral Green belt, coastal land, environmental impact, or the requirement of current infrastructure. Housing in theses area, will not contribute to local employment or affordable housing. It is beyond any logical reasoning as to why these areas are being assessed for 'strategic land' development when clearly these areas are totally unsuitable on the following grounds: Firstly, I am astonished why these areas are being considered for 'Strategic Housing' when, clearly, land in these areas would not have the slightest contribution towards 'Strategic Housing'. The area is largely occupied by wealthy people, and an increasing number of retirees, who are not dependent on the very poor transport links, road infrastructure and lack of employment opportunities that currently exist in a small area of Heswall which consists of conservation, greenbelt, and coastal land. There are also no real employment prospects, or sustainable technical local business, other than shops which would not generate the kind of sustainable, or meaningful, jobs and skills for the development of Wirral in which Wirral LSP (Local Strategic Partnership) has long committed to do in its drive for equality in all parts of the Wirral - especially in those areas of social deprivation. Therefore any strategic land assessments should concentrate on areas of Wirral that need, and already have, good transport links to encourage manufacturing and technological businesses to either move to areas of social deprivation, or develop further in areas they are already established but are still short of such strategic and social housing required to sustain and encourage new innovation. Strategic Housing is desperately needed in the areas of Wirral in which the LSP is committed to developing social equality. Further housing developments in the already affluent areas of Heswall would only line the pockets of wealthy landowners and developers only interested in high value housing in areas where a large majority of Wirral residents would never be able to afford it. Allowing housing to be built in this area would, therefore, not contribute to any development of equality in areas of social deprivation Wirral Borough Council, and its LSP, have committed to. Housing developments in the area of Heswall would, simply, not offer employment opportunities or promote social equality in an area which already has some of the highest socio-economic factors in the country. As a former member of the Local Strategic Partnership, I am fully aware of the need for social strategic housing and employment opportunities in areas of social deprivation.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>However that is something that housing developments in areas of outstanding beauty, coastal, and greenbelt land, such as Lower Heswall, would never be able to offer without totally changing the face of an area of outstanding beauty into some sort of industrial mall! Secondly, these are areas of natural beauty that attract numerous visitors to the area for health, well-being and eco-leisure pursuits that WBC places a huge emphasis on. Housing developments would surely discourage those visitors and inevitably lead to a loss of attraction of any eco-tourism in to these areas of natural beauty, something WBC promotes extensively in its many campaigns.</p> <p>The proposed land is set between the coastal beaches and the Wirral Way which will undoubtedly have a massive impact on the wildlife and flora and fauna. Large housing developments would lead to huge environmental damage and contamination to the coastal areas, the surrounding natural beauty of the Wirral Way, and other greenbelt land in the proximity. Furthermore, the proposed areas are landlocked between the beach and the Wirral Way meaning they do not have the infrastructure to support large developments, without the inclusion of a major road development which would have further, and significant, environmental, health and well-being impact on the area. The effects would be felt by the community's very many, well established and hard-working residents who have chosen to settle in the area, paying a premium for housing in an area that offers outstanding beauty. That impact on residents would create worry and stress with such developments impacting on house prices in the area. I am also sure you will be well aware of the impact such developments would have on the Lower Heswall Conservation area. They would create a domino effect adding to an increased traffic pressure within an already very congested area of Heswall town centre and the connecting roads leading to Lower Heswall Conservation Area. Especially so between Gayton Road and Village Road, an area consisting of the schools of Gayton Primary and St Peters Primary, less than a mile apart which currently have high volumes of traffic during term times. Any development would increase this traffic, thereby increasing road risk, and endangering children further in notorious start and finish school times. With further regard to infrastructure, if proposals are realised then the increased demand for school places, in an already very popular and oversubscribed schools in such an affluent area, would outstrip supply. Existing schools would simply not be able to accommodate the undoubted higher demand for extra places. However there would be increased demand and strain on all services, such as doctors surgeries, where it is common knowledge that Heswall practices are at already at saturation points, especially when trying to park at these facilities. The proposed strategic housing developments, if realised, would also impact on the need for dealing with increased sewerage and drainage requirements impacting on land which has longstanding, and well documented, environmental issues and flooding risks in the proposed areas. Further to this, I am frankly staggered as to why these areas would be considered for housing when they lead directly on to coastal areas. The environmental concerns in such areas are well documented, such as the Target Road area already being named as at risk in Wirral Borough Council's own Flood Risk Management Plan. WBC was named Lead Local Flood Authority in accordance with the 2007 Pitt Report, and its recommendations included the protection of coastal erosion, and the Environment Agency flood map covering the identified strategic housing areas. Any development in the areas leading directly to the coast line would conflict WBC LLFA, and its Flood Management plans, which highlight a lack of thought and co-ordination from those within WBC responsible for identifying areas for strategic housing. Finally, I must also register concerns that Wirral Borough Council have, seemingly, tried to propose such plans without any well-advertised public consultation and have used an 'under the radar' stealth approach in not notifying local residents directly of such plans.</p>
DOR02796	Not challenging Government intervention or allowing their determining Wirral strategy is unacceptable both in terms of housing policy and indeed re local governments role. The green belt in Wirral defines the peninsula's attractions to me as a scouse import. It should be defended and brownfield use maximised.
DOR02797	Wirral is a relatively small area much of which is already built on . The countryside within the greenbelt is an amenity for all which once built on can never be replaced . The statutory requirement imposed by central government for building houses is a "one shoe size fits all" approach which if implemented will remove a high percentage of our precious greenbelt with far reaching negative consequences for the local population . I would also strongly challenge the underlying assumption that very large numbers of new houses are needed in Wirral . I have just moved back to Wirral after 26 years away . Did I encounter a "hot " property market ?- not at all ! There was (and is) a plentiful supply of available housing at all levels of the market much of which seems to sit on the market for months unsold . This is not the case in other areas of the country . Harrogate from where we have just moved back for example has far too few houses to satisfy demand .In summary I am vehemently opposed to any erosion at all of Wirral's precious greenbelt which should be preserved in its entirety for the benefit of all
DOR02798	While understanding the requirement to build further homes on the Wirral to fulfil future requirements it is important that a balance is made between the number of new housing being built to take into account the impact of increasing local populations on the local infrastructure. Already urban areas on The Wirral are struggling with traffic, schools, doctors, hospital, policing, public transport etc all suffering from an increase in demand - further increases in population will further increase the pressure on these services. Wirral MBC need to take this fully into account when approving new developments and consider developers potentially funding new services where required as part of the planning applications. It is also vitally important that the balance between housing and green belt is fully considered. Wirral's green spaces are of vital importance to the health and well-being of residents, and provide a vital economic benefit to the region. Consideration needs to be made to the amount of urban green space being lost as this is as important as green belt land, particularly in the more deprived communities where the ability to travel to other parts of the borough is limited. Green spaces are our biggest asset and they should be protected at all cost, with the main focus on regenerating many of the brownfield sites on Wirral, and also regeneration of older housing stock.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02799	<p>SP010A I'm totally against this plan for a number of reasons -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are plenty of other NON greenbelt sites across the Wirral that need development way way before green belt sites are even considered. i.e.....waste land, land near the docks etc...that will create more affordable housing for the residents that need it 2. This proposal will endanger and NOT Protect the local wildlife and greenery 3. This proposed site will increase traffic volumes on Rigby drive and surrounding areas and the roads will not be able to cope and this will increase the safety risk to children who attend the local schools in the area which will not be able to cope with the extra pupils 4. Support the local farmer by not building on the land and encourage organic natural farming and not force him out of a livelihood that we all appreciate 5. The houses on backing onto the field of Rigby drive will be more at risk from flooding from the development onto their land as it's bad enough as it is now in the very wet autumn/winters we have 6. This will have a negative effect on the housing values within the area of Rigby drive as Greasby will become saturated with characterless new build houses that are not in keeping with the local area. 7. The noise pollution levels will increase and disturb any local protected species of animals, birds, reptiles etc... 8. These proposed sites are purely for the greed of the council to make more money from the developers and the developers to line their pockets even more as the sites are prime locations for expensive housing developments which have nothing to do with the shortage of affordable housing as most residents will not be able to afford these new houses. NO TO THE PROPOSED SITE ABOVE!!!!☹️
DOR02800	<p>In 2001 the population of Wirral was 314,700 and in 2018 the population is 321,238, an increase of 6,538. The average household unit contains 2.3 persons. Therefore, the required increase in units over the past 17 years is calculated as $6538/2.3 = 2842$. Assuming that the population of Wirral will increase by a similar number, say 7,000, over the next 17 years, up to 2035, the number of units required would be $7,000/2.3 = 3,043$. On that basis, the figure of 12,000 units, suggested by Wirral B.C., would seem to be a serious over estimation. Furthermore, 3,043 units could quite easily be accommodated by 2035 using brownfield sites thereby avoiding the use of green belt land.</p>
DOR02801	<p>This is a short sighted profit motivated scheme which will not benefit anyone other than the developers and no doubt the council. It will do nothing to alleviate the housing shortage for those who really need it. But for the developers, building nice 4 bedroomed detached houses in Caldby, Irby, West Kirby and Greasby equals lots of profit, but developing brown field sites with smaller affordable houses doesn't. So, it does not take a genius to work out where they will be built. This is nothing short of disgraceful and will rob future generations of what little and very valuable green space that we have.</p>
DOR02802	<p>I consider the council should explore all brownfield site options prior to considering allowing the building of homes on green belt land, Green belt land forms the basis of making the Wirral such a pleasant environment to live and also attracts a huge level of tourism to the area, bringing much needed revenue to local business and supporting the overall Wirral community. Consequently I propose the council adopt a compulsory purchase of brownfield site(s) up to that required to facilitate building the number of houses required. This includes the brownfield site identified for the Wirral waters development, the compulsory purchase of which will more than cover the number of houses required, thus totally removing the potential impact on green belt. It is well within the compulsory purchase guidelines for this to be a viable option. It is extremely disappointing that Peel Group are effectively 'moth balling' a huge amount of land and not building the number of homes committed to. This action and strategy is directly impacting the whole of the Wirral and it's green belt. The council has the power to affect a strategy that saves the green belt and should, in my opinion, take whatever action is necessary to protect the environment and beauty of the Wirral.</p>
DOR02803	<p>I believe that Green Belt Land should be preserved at all costs. The Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. For example companies such as Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be pursued, before throwing the baby out with the bathwater. Deforestation and wildlife displacement are significant consequences of Green Belt development particularly on a peninsula!</p>
DOR02804	<p>I believe that the forecasts of need for new housing are grossly overstated and that there is no need to use any green belt land for housing development. In Bebington the green belt boundary should stay in the existing position along Mount Road (Storeton Ridge) and not be shifted over to the M53 corridor in order to free up green belt land in between for housing development.</p>
DOR02805	<p>I object to the planning proposals with regards the following green belt areas: SP040 SP041 SP042 SP043 SP044 East of the M53 has very little green belt land left. It is essential this is maintained to ensure the character of the area persists and that a sprawl of housing/industry doesn't re-define all areas east of the M53. In particular with reference to the sites listed I'd like to highlight that these areas are primarily local farms(and people's homes!), providing not only jobs and welcome environmental benefits to the local area, but also attracting local tourism from neighbouring Cheshire villages and towns. It would be ill-considered to build upon the sites listed. In addition to these factors, local planning should be aware of the issues with regards highways in this area. Spital crossroads is a 'Blackspot' for accidents, whilst the Poulton Road is wholly unsuitable for even a modest increase in traffic. Building on site SP043 for example would have an extremely negative impact upon wildlife in Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve for example; with nature from the reserve also using farming land that sits to the south of it. The destruction of local rural</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	amenities; that cannot be replaced should not be considered when other sites in Wirral are clearly better suited to additional development. Local schools in this area are already oversubscribed, with parents resorting to using false/relatives addresses to try and get their children in a school rather than have them attend schools more local to their homes. West Wirral has superior selection of schools with less issues in this regard; making it considerably more appropriate for developments. Government policy is such that councils should be looking to focus upon brownfield developments; whilst ensuring maximum density within these areas. The plan set out doesn't appear to do this. Recent communications from Peel Holdings suggest that much of the housing stock requirement, that's a government requirement - not what Wirral actually wants or needs, could be met by Peel themselves using brownfield sites. I ask that these ill-considered plans are re-thought and considerably revised; failure to do so will be to the detriment of Wirral as a whole.
DOR02806	My particular concerns (although I have concerns about the requirement to use any of the greenbelt at all) are regarding any development of Brackenwood Golf Course and adjoining land (known as the Rec). This is shown as SP039 on the Proposed Greenbelt Site document. I currently live on Wirral Gardens and travel to my daughter's school (Poulton Lancelyn) from Wirral Gardens, along Needwood Drive and then onto Brimstage Road. The traffic levels are horrendous most of the day but particularly busy in the mornings. There simply isn't the road infrastructure to allow any developments in this area. Also, there is no suitable infrastructure on Brackenwood Road or Peter Prices Lane. This land is owned by us (held by the Council) and should not be sold off, at the expense of current and future generations, for profit by a Council that is simply the guardian of our greenbelt. You have a requirement to promote health and leisure and this is both morally and politically wrong. You seem to promote your participation in this process as not being the holder of the land and not being the party who will make any profit. This is clearly not the case here. Leave our greenbelt for future generations.
DOR02807	The volume of traffic through Greasby is already at breaking point. I am surprised that there haven't been more accidents here and in Saughall Massie with those heading to and from the motorway. The proposal will certainly increase the risks we run every day! I am opposed to the greenbelt being developed here.
DOR02808	Wirral's housing is at crisis point. The current lack of homes from every level from first time buyers to executive homes is currently resulting in a market whereby :- House prices are at a record high Buyers are often forced to pay the full asking price as they find themselves competing with several other interested parties whilst knowing full well they are paying well over the ceiling price. Lower Heswall is currently experiencing problems whereby developers are snapping up tiny pieces of land and squeezing as many homes as they possibly can on to it. Whilst I have lived in Bebington for over 17 years and enjoy the open green space, I am aware that it has enjoyed a long period of having undergone little or no development and am aware that house prices vary from £150k to £350k but then leaps to £800k with nothing in between, resulting in people who want to move up from £350k having to move to another area even though they don't want to. I would like to see more executive housing in Higher Bebington as I feel there is definitely a demand for it and would support a plan which would enable this to happen even though it would mean building on green belt.
DOR02809	Do not think that this is necessary, the population of Wirral is decreasing and there is no need for any more housing. Against the building on green belt land, there are locations within the towns (brown sites) that could be better used for building houses.
DOR02810	To close both the Civic Centre complex and the car park In Bromborough will effectively kill shopping and the village. The Civic Centre is used every day and the library would be used more if the Council had not decided to restrict opening hours.
DOR02811	It is totally unnecessary to build on our green belt land when there are plenty of brown field sites which should be utilised. Wirral is noted for its beautiful open spaces and this council seems determined to ruin this due to not implementing a local plan. Has anyone considered the impact on our already busy roads and our oversubscribed doctors surgeries and local schools. Have this council got a plan to provide more surgeries, hospitals and schools if their ridiculous notion to use our green belt goes ahead. The council with all their overpaid executives can surely come up with more sustainable sites for house building. Apparently new figures from the Office of National Statistics have now proved that Wirral's housing needs is half what the government are claiming. Surely this will mean if the house building goes ahead Wirral will be left with housing that can't be sold resulting in a huge drop in house prices and possibly negative equity for many people. Maybe some of the councillors would like to try driving out of one of the side roads onto Pensby Road which is already horrendous at the best of times.
DOR02812	I moved to the Wirral from Liverpool twenty years ago. I was then a keen walker and I found the Wirral to have many lovely footpaths and bridleways together with woodland and farmland. I particularly liked Irby because of its semi-rural nature and this is where I chose to settle. I fully understand the need for housing but I feel that building on the green belt would inevitably lead to more and more of it being eaten up by developers. If we are to encourage tourism on the Wirral, which I understand is what the council is keen to do, we should be conserving, as far as possible, the natural beauty which visitors come to see. I sincerely hope that the council will consider other ways of providing housing before encroaching on a precious resource which, once lost, can never be recovered.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02813	I object to the intention to release parcels of greenbelt land for housing development. I do not agree this will be a solution to the housing need or provide affordable housing. I understand there are brownfield sites which may better achieve this in areas where transport links are also better. I PARTICULARLY OBJECT TO PLANS FOR SP060 to be considered for release from the greenbelt for housing. This remaining open land between Irby and Pensby is high quality agricultural land which would be lost forever. I am particularly worried as to the impact on flora and fauna in the locality, the merging of small villages and increased traffic along already narrow roads. I AM UNSURE OF THE REASON FOR THE BOUNDARY CORRECTION PROPOSED IN SP60C. THESE ARE A MIX OF NEW AND 1940S HOUSES. If this is only to place the boundary firmly along the road, then I understand, if however moving the boundary in some way better facilitates inclusion of the parcel of land for development (as there is now some precedent for housing having been built on the land) then I object. Please retain the greenbelt !
DOR02814	This would completely ruin our area, our beautiful views and closeness to the countryside is why we chose to live in Bebington. Building on Lever Causeway would be devastating, to lose all the open space for walking and relaxing apart from the increased traffic and congestion. Please don't do it.
DOR02815	Why would you consider building in Eastham, particularly on Green Belt land when Eastham has such limited resources and lacks the infrastructure to accommodate new housing estates. We have one secondary school and two primary schools, a walk in centre under the threat of closure and GP practices stretched to their limit. The idea of building on green belt land in the vicinity of the Mill Park Estate is ridiculous. For years the estate has been in a state of neglect. The roads are poor and narrow and the amount of congestion a new building estate would cause is unthinkable let alone the rush hour traffic on the A41 around the M53 roundabout. In addition, just across the boundary line on Hooton Road at Rofton Works building has already commenced on a huge housing estate. What schools, doctor's, shops and roads will the residents of that estate use?
DOR02816	Please keep the green belt free from buildings, particularly Lever Causeway which provides an area of outstanding beauty for people to exercise and enjoy.
DOR02817	We object to the building of houses on green belt land , as 1) We do not think that there is a need for more houses, as the population of Wirral has fallen since the figures were compiled. There are plenty of brownfield sites and unoccupied housing available. 2) Peel Holdings should be made to build on their brownfield sites, without pay-outs from the council. 3) The empty housing should be made available to fulfil some of the supposed housing shortages.
DOR02818	1) We consider the Council plans , based on the criteria outlined flawed in that it was based on Government guidelines that produced a requirement for over 22,000 new houses on the Wirral in the next 15+ years, totally ignoring current trends that the population on the Wirral is falling with deaths exceeding births, or that the population of Liverpool has decreased significantly since the Second World War. Deprived areas on the Wirral, Wallasey, Birkenhead and Rock Ferry et al, have many empty/dilapidated housing stock which should be addressed before Council makes any move consider Green Belt land for housing. 2) One of the objectors to the Council proposals read out a letter from a Peel Holdings Director which cast considerable doubt on recent press reports/ Council Leader's comments that the Company was 'reneging ' on its undertaking to build a considerable number of properties on Wirral Waters site. 3) Many other comments at the meeting gave the strong impression that the Council presentation documents were unreliable and need to be scrutinised and redrafted, and should not be submitted in their present form.
DOR02819	Under your development options review all that i can see are plans to build on land that has no need to be consumed under concrete and brick when we have so many brown sites to consider. We have so little green belt left for our children to look forward to and observe the natural habitat.
DOR02820	I'm totally opposed to any development on Green Belt land in Wirral. Some of the proposals are outrageous e.g. next to Lever Causeway - a beautiful site and of historic and archaeological value. There is plenty of space on brownfield sites, but there is no need for that much housing in the first place.
DOR02821	Re SP071: This land is situated adjacent to the A540 at Chester Road, Heswall/Gayton. This is an extremely busy road and indeed is a major transport artery on the Wirral. Traffic volume is already extremely heavy at most times of the day in both directions and any housing development of this working farmland will inevitably cause significantly more traffic on a fast road, leading to further risk of traffic accidents. A further concern is the inevitable pressure that a housing development would place on local service including already hard pressed schools and doctors' surgeries.
DOR02822	Green belt should be left alone. Council should be focussing on peel holdings and brownfield sites for redevelopment. Planners are not thinking of the impact that once Green belt has gone it's gone and it's one if the gems with people live on the Wirral. I for one would consider moving to a more rural area if the Wirral starts to lose Green belt and becomes over developed. There are enough brownfield opportunities to consider.
DOR02823	Competence of Councillors and Council Officers involved in producing Local Plan Wirral Council has failed to produce a local plan since 2000 and has been much criticised by successive senior government figures over the intervening 18 years for this failing. Local councillors and the WMBC CEO(s) have taken no steps to correct this failing until threatened with having the Local Plan produced by others. Why, when the council elected representatives and the council officers they have appointed have failed spectacularly to carry out their statutory duties in this regard, can anyone have confidence in the accuracy a plan which they produce over just a few months? Specifically this behaviour undermines the validity of, not only work done by council officers, but also the supervision and critical assessment of work done by others on behalf of the council. Accuracy of Objective Assessment of Housing Need An Objective Assessment of Housing Need is

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>necessarily a key indicator to any assessment of the amount of land needed for new housing. However the 2016 Objective Assessment used in preparing the Local Plan is itself based upon an number of factors for which values have been assumed or taken from national trends. There is no attempt at calibration with actual conditions existing on the Wirral now and realistic conditions that may exist in the future. As a consequence of this lack of challenge / proven links with reality the Objective Assessment gives an over optimistic assessment of need and a corresponding excessive requirement for building land. The nominal number of housing units identified through this assessment is then treated in the Local Plan as if it is a solid guaranteed requirement rather than a mean value of a range of possible outcomes. This means the Local Plan is not responsive if the assumptions made in arriving at the Objective Assessment figures turn out to be very different in reality. There is also little or no attempt in the Objective Assessment of need to identify what type of housing is required. For example there is no attempt to classify how many of the housing units needed according to the Objective Assessment are to be affordable housing, suitable accommodation for young families etc etc. Without this information any plan produced may meet the overall housing unit target figure while at the same time completely failing to meet actual housing needs of the borough. Output of Objective Assessment should include suggested percentages of the target figure in different types of housing. I am certain this will reveal that what is needed is affordable housing for young families and not 4 bed executive homes. This has significant implications for Local Plan since it means that while existing developments (especially infill), may include large executive type homes, the Plan should focus on areas and developments which will support the types of homes needed by the population rather than those which will maximise developers and builders profits. Brownfield Development It is supported by both national and local politicians and planning guidelines that development should take place on so called brownfield sites before use of greenbelt land. Key therefore to assessing how much brownfield land is available is to have an up to date brownfield site register. In principle this should be updated at least every 5 years. The council has not maintained an up to date brownfield site register and by its own admission, when errors are pointed out, it has said it will next review the register in 15 yrs time. This lack of realistic accurate data on which to make decisions is another indicator of the (lack of) competence of local councillors and council officials. Given the common consensus that brown field sites should form a major part of fulfilling future need for housing land, then without an accurate register it is impossible to make any proper assessment if there is any need to release of any greenbelt land for housing. During the local consultation meeting in West Kirby the council planning officer giving the presentation made great play of the need for potential developments to be "practical" and "feasible". He explained that the inevitable possible downsides of brownfield sites e.g. soil contamination, lack of sewerage, mains water, electricity, road connections meant these sites would not attract development because of the higher development costs. By contrast greenbelt sites would have much lower enabling development costs and hence much more attractive / likely to be developed. The strong impression was given is that without additional funding, virtually no brownfield sites would be developed. Hence although there is more than sufficient brownfield sites available for housing development, their development could not be counted upon in meeting the Local Plan housing need. As an example the plan assumes only half the number of homes which Peel Holdings say they will build on Wirral Waters initial development. Peel Holdings are also on record as asking the local Councillors to stop making misleading and incorrect statements about their intentions. Effectively the Plan accepts that developers / builders must continue to make obscene levels of profit at the expense of the public good.</p> <p>It should be the case that the excess profits from any greenfield development should be channelled into supporting the cost of brownfield developments. For example a developer would have to take on or be part of a consortium taking on brownfield site development before any application for greenbelt land development would be entertained. Further the actual grant of planning permission on a greenfield site would be dependent on a minimum of say 60% of development of the brownfield site has been achieved. There is no mention in the Local Plan of how development of brownfield sites will be facilitated nor any indication that completion of brownfield developments are a pre-condition of any greenbelt land being released i.e. enforcing brownfield development first approach. On the contrary following the councils attitude and approach we can expect any greenfield sites released to be developed and few or none of the brownfield sites to be developed. This is in direct contradiction to national planning policies.</p> <p>Recommendations :</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The factors used in Objective Assessment of need should be individually re-assessed against local conditions using realistic values. This assessment should give a range of figures for each factor with a range of minimum, most likely and maximum. These factors should then be combined in arriving at an overall Objective assessment giving a minimum, most likely and maximum overall number ideally also highlighting what factor or factors have the most impact on the number. Purpose of this is to provide a method of regularly checking the validity of the Objective Assessment and making adjustments if necessary. 2. The Local Plan target overall figures should also be provided with estimates of the percentages of different types of housing required within the target number of housing units. This will then be reflected in areas chosen for development. Only areas which are suitable for providing the assessed housing need will be considered. For example if what is needed is high density low cost starter homes then greenbelt land will not be released for large 4 bed executive homes. 3. The Local Plan should be developed to meet the minimum figure coming from the revised Objective Assessment. There should be an annual review of the target to show if the target numbers remain correct and if it should be raised e.g. to most likely level. It is accepted this may mean the Plan is reactive i.e. always behind needs but as we are considering release of greenbelt land which is limited and irreplaceable then it make sense only to release such land when the need is proven rather than estimated.
DOR02824	I think that so called Green belt land should be used for building houses in the Wirral .200000 thousand houses could be built in Wirral without making much of a dent in the areas of unused Greenbelt land in the Wirral. Everyone has the right to live in a nice area of the Wirral. Not just Brownfield land

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02825	I am totally opposed to the building of houses on any of our green belt sites, regardless of where they are! There seems to be 3 areas mentioned consistently as areas for development around the Brimstage Rd and Barnston Rd area. These are extremely busy roads at the best of times and I believe the building of further houses in this area would only lead to appalling traffic problems. Even now its commonplace to wait 15 to 20 minutes to get onto Clatterbridge roundabout from Brimstage Rd. The areas of green belt are what make Wirral such a special place to live and they offer free recreational space for all residents of Wirral to enjoy. I think the local council should concentrate on trying to make existing plans come to fruition, like the dock lands, rather than plundering the green belt. I hope the Council will reconsider their plans to snatch green belt land and concentrate their efforts on brown field sites and regenerating urban areas.
DOR02826	The local plan in no way shape or form takes into account the pressure on local services. In Eastham, it is incredibly difficult to get a doctor's appt due to the intense number of patients, schools are full to brimming whilst not rated outstanding and parking causes significant issues. A high influx of residents is not going to improve either situation. It seems South Wirral is becoming a cash generator for the other 75% of the Wirral i.e. closing Lyndale School, indifference towards New Ferry, selling off of Acre Lane, the threat of Eastham Library closing. It seems that whilst the aforementioned generates cash/savings none of the money is spent in the local area, instead it seems the council is hell bent on destroying any green space, leisure areas or picturesque parts of Eastham that make it worth living in. Blaming central government is a poor excuse for selling off the land that developers will pay a premium for instead of the council creating a housing plan of their own using brownfield sites or less appealing sites. I do not accept there are no brownfield sites that can be developed, any costs incurred for clean up or even giving the land away would be recouped through your exorbitant council taxes. The council need to remember that WE the electorate should decide what happens in our area by voting in people who say they will look after our interests, NOT make their hair-brained, money-sucking schemes a priority over all other areas. The money spent on this ridiculous golf resort could be used for social housing, brownfield development or if there is really no other option to the concreting over Eastham and surrounding areas then it could be used on improving services and infrastructure.
DOR02827	Should use all brownfield sites first before even considering green belt
DOR02828	Object to SP001-SP109
DOR02829	The plans to build on a playground at Egerton street New Brighton are inappropriate. The playground is only unused because the play equipment was never maintained and then removed. The play equipment on Tower Grounds is nearby but is also badly maintained and does not cater for smaller children. This is one of the less affluent areas of New Brighton and they should have more play facilities, not less. A similar playground in West Wirral would never be neglected then built on in this way.
DOR02830	E council is proposing here simply tears the heart out of the community, will impact residents and businesses severely, and seems to show scant regard for the area. Develop on brownfield sites owned by Peel Holdings instead. They have plenty.
DOR02831	Get peel waters developed first, Wirral is famous as the leisure peninsula, just destroy that & visitors will abandon The Wirral for Wales. Especially with the new transport links for Wales.
DOR02832	WBC will not be forgiven by the voters if ANY green belt land is used if any other options are available. The government's estimates of the number of homes required seems to be ridiculously high compared with all estimates I have seen.
DOR02833	Wirral is a particularly pleasant peninsula with its mix of green spaces between delightful villages and townships. There appears to be an increasing number of reports suggesting the number of new builds required to support housing needs has been over estimated by the council. Local organisations, including ITMAS (Irby Thurstaston & Pensby Amenity Society) have already submitted their views and objections to the council. There are substantial areas of existing brownfield sites and the Wirral Waters developments available to develop housing without the need to be developing green belt land between conurbations. I wish to record my agreement with the view of ITPAS and other organisations in overturning the plans.
DOR02834	Just like to register my objection to the proposed council plan to release green belt for development. From your own council figures there has been no increase in population on Wirral over last 20 years. 10 of boom and 10 of bust. There is no council, EU (after exit) or government investment planned for Wirral, so why the need for so many houses? Presently a Wirral housing association is trying to combine with Liverpool housing trust, because it has 250 empty homes for rent, which it can't afford to keep on its books. Looks like the council is just trying to destroy Wirral.
DOR02835	I am totally opposed to the green belt violation proposed in the local plan. Previously defined green spaces should not be redefined as development needs change. They should remain safe for future generations to enjoy - not to be pillaged for commercial gain. The local development plan should focus only on brown field sites - once these are fully used and built upon, then no more development should be undertaken on the Wirral. The office for national statistics in mid-2017 gives the average English population density (people per square km) as 427. Cheshire is 449, while the Wirral is already significantly overcrowded at 2,055, with a density approaching that of some cities. I strongly question the validity of the large number of houses proposed for Wirral in the plan. Over the last 10 years I have seen Wirral roads, Hospitals/Doctors surgeries, and amenities become more and more congested, to the detriment of the people already living here. Litter, vandalism, graffiti, crime typically increase with increasing population density. The local plan looks as though it will make this worse - not better.
DOR02836	Why are we eating into green belt land instead of developing brown field sites? Are the developers backhanders too lucrative?
DOR02837	Do not build on any green belt. Compulsory purchase Peel Holdings land and build social/affordable housing on it.
DOR02838	What has been considered / planned for with regards to school, GP, Dentist capacities. Do we have sufficient infrastructure to cater for a significant increase in local population. Will there be investment in facilities for children such play areas, football pitches etc. Unless all of these are in place I would oppose any builds on green belt land in my area.
DOR02839	Please regenerate town centres with housing before proposing to sacrifice green space. Our town centres are dying and can no longer rely on retail for them to survive.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02840	Having been a lifelong resident of Irby, I have enjoyed its semi-rural environment and being able to walk from my house to beautiful countryside and rolling fields. The latest proposals to destroy this environment will destroy Irby's uniqueness of being the last village on the Wirral to be surrounded by Greenbelt and be swallowed up by adjacent villages. The decision to lump Irby, Pensby and Thingwall together to make one settlement so the council can conveniently say that Irby does not have to have a green buffet around it. This major change and it's major implications was not mentioned in any propaganda at local elections or any consultation buffer the local people. I want to know which councillors voted this through. This change to Irby's boundary disregards any of its uniqueness and identity and done just to conveniently grab its green land for development and it's lucrative council taxes. This change should have been openly debated with local residents. I am not against any development but the mass building over of all land around Irby and making the area one huge housing sprawl will destroy the areas character, create even more car congestion and put more strain on local services and destroy one of the main reasons people have moved to or stayed in the area. I for one am very against the latest proposals.
DOR02841	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02842	There should be no need to free up green belt land if pressure is applied to Peel holdings to get on with what they promised to do also there is no shortage of brownfield sites that could be utilised. Has there been any comeback from the Government on the revised lower estimate for housing need as per the report in the press earlier in October?
DOR02843	After the confusion over Peel Holdings house build plans, I find it worrying that the council seems to be going from bad to worse by sending out a blanket proposal of over 60 sites of green belt land coloured in red. This smacks of confusion or an effort to bury earmarked sites within a plethora of sites, in an effort to disable concentrated debate. Add to this the planning proposal for Bromborough Village which will certainly be the end of most businesses and subsequent closure of some if not all the banks. The long awaited building on Acre Lane and Brookhurst Avenue sites seems to be going nowhere. There does not seem to be any proposals to improve infrastructure to cater for increase in homes/people. I find it hard to see where the word 'Planning' actually comes into all this?
DOR02844	I am completely opposed to building on Green Belt land on the Wirral as there is already sufficient land on brownfield sites to accommodate the 12000 new homes required by Central Government. Peel Holdings have said on their website which was recently updated on 7th August, "Locally we recognise the role Wirral Waters can play in the delivery of any local housing strategy and the importance of brownfield developments in reducing the pressure to build new homes on Wirral's green spaces. We and our partners remain absolutely committed to house building on the Wirral Waters site." The Core Strategy Local Plan indicates that we are short of land to build 4700 houses, but with negotiations with Peel Holdings, Wirral Council should be able to come to some arrangement with them to build sufficient homes on these urban sites to avoid building on Green Belt. Driving around the Wirral there are also many urban sites that have not been included on the Local Plan and do not have planning permission, so a comprehensive survey of available brownfield sites has not been done. The council therefore falls foul of paragraph 119 of NPPF which says that the council should be proactive in identifying land that may be suitable for meeting development needs. Green Belt land is designated as such for 5 reasons. The first one is to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. I am particularly concerned about sites SP030, SP033 and SP035 in Bebington. If building takes place on this land, Bebington will just become one large housing estate and the quality of life & environment of this area would change for the worse forever. The second reason for Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. If these sites are built on, Bebington would merge into Storeton. This would also go against the fourth reason for Green Belt which is preserving the historic setting and special character of historic towns or areas. Storeton is a small village with its own identity. Lever Causeway also has historical significance as a route built by Lord Leverhulme from Thornton Manor towards his factory in Port Sunlight. Sites SP030, SP033 and SP035 are each side of this road. The third reason for Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. If all of the proposed sites are developed, the Bebington Ward area which presently has 50% of its land as Green Belt, will have no Green Belt whatsoever i.e. 100% reduction and Wirral South constituency would lose 33% of its Green Belt land. These are totally unacceptable figures. The fifth reason for Green Belt is to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict urban land. Peel Holdings have outline planning permission to build 13521 homes on Wirral Waters. They have said that they are committed to building on this site. The Local Plan indicates that Green Belt needs to be built on because of a shortage of urban sites, but there is, in fact, plenty of land to build on this site alone. If you add to this the brownfield sites identified plus the sites that do exist but are not included on the Local Plan, there is absolutely no need to build on Green Belt land. If Wirral Council decide to adopt this Core Strategy Local Plan as it stands, they WILL find that they will be legally challenged.
DOR02845	Do not cave in to the Government. It hopefully won't be here for too long. The Green Belt should be sacrosanct - never build on it. There are plenty of brownfield sites available in towns - gaps where individual houses once stood or whole streets now grassed over. Use that instead. Compulsory purchase land from Peel and build truly affordable housing in it.
DOR02846	I object strongly to the loss of green space in west Kirby and the further urbanisation of our open areas. . There are opportunities to develop brown field sites and this is clearly a cash driven option.
DOR02847	No green belt land should be used for housing development. There is enough brownfield land in the Wirral to satisfy needs. Also using green belt land will not produce significant affordable homes whereas developers would find it harder to justify not providing the quota of affordable home on brownfield sites.
DOR02848	Against any further development on land surrounding Greasby. It would destroy its identity as a village & would merge into surrounding towns & villages. There are sufficient brown spaces that need building on in other parts of the Wirral before green spaces are built on.
DOR02849	I'm totally against all building in green belt land. It seems the council had just sat on this issue thinking that the public will sit back and take it. Thing is now its blown up in their face. Peel holding should release the brown field site and the council should be looking into ways of buying up housing stock

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02850	<p>SP019B - West of Glenwood, Irby SP060 - South of Thingwall Road, Irby I moved to Irby for a particular reason. Its semi-rural feel and a place I could raise a family. Using the surrounding green belt to its maximum with walks each evening breathing the fresh air and away from built up suburbs. There is NO shortage for homes in Irby at all. In fact you only have to see the Estate agents to see that. The council who we place our trust in have NO council homes to meet demand. That is a big and clear fundamental difference. There is no desire for £200-£400k priced properties in Irby. There is a demand from a council perspective to build council homes which should be in the affordable market and located in the more than vacant brownfield sites. The council will not make the money selling those less desirable sites to developers. Therefore the council debt remains. Therefore lets exploit hardworking people who aspire to live in and around Irby. That land is very desirable and will generate money for the council. That is the plain and simple agenda. Develop on the brownfield sites available and leave Irby and surrounding areas alone. We the voting public will not have any greenbelt left to enjoy as will our future generations of which I have now have a 7week old boy. Push Peel to develop or invoke a government intervention to buy back the land they purchased and then sell onto willing developers. I will be intrigued to see where the council members live and there green belt being attacked by developers. I am also very aware of the money being offered to local people in the Irby vicinity to sell their land to the council approved developers. £13million was offered to landowner around Landican towards Barnston dip. Develop your brownfield sites. Make those areas desirable with affordable housing. LEAVE IRBY ALONE.</p>
DOR02851	<p>I object to any proposals to reduce the Wirral Green Belt on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Wirral is a unique peninsula with water on three sides it must be given special consideration, given the falling population in the area, there is no requirement to threaten Green Belt land. 2. The Wirral is already developed to saturation point with 40% of land developed, which is far greater than the national average. 3. The remaining Green Belt land protects the peninsula villages from becoming just one continuous urban sprawl. 4. There are numerous brownfield sites that are suitable for redevelopment, that are already in the hands of developers without the need to consider developing Green Belt land. 5. The housing data provided by Wirral MBC seems inaccurate compared with the number of small developments evident in Heswall, completed over the last 5 years. 6. The attractiveness of the Wirral as a destination is due to the small remaining areas of countryside in basically an urban area, between two cities. Any loss of open space would be detrimental to the environment. 7. The specific proposal to develop sites SP062 (Barnston Village) and SP064E (Whitehouse Lane) will lead to major traffic congestion in the area as Acre Lane and Whitehouse Lane currently do not cope with the rush hour traffic moving to and from the M53 at Clatterbridge Junction. Traffic on Barnston Road regularly backs up about 250m at the Barnston Church due to the junction with Storeton Lane and is a danger passing through Barnston Dale. 8. Two Green Belt areas of land have already been lost recently at Saughall and Thingwall, whilst allegedly protected by Green Belt status. If the land is not protected the unique character of the Wirral will be lost forever.
DOR02852	<p>SP013 – West of Column Road I wish to object most strongly to the proposed declassification and possible development of this area. On the contrary the whole area should be designated as a valuable public resource because of its cultural and historical heritage as well as its high quality of mature natural environment. It should maintaining its Greenbelt status at the highest level permanently. Olaf Stapledon, the famous science fiction author, bequeathed Stapledon Woods to the public in perpetuity, with covenants to prevent the encroachment of building development and to provide a nature heath and woodland park with permanent public access. The proposed declassification and the subsequent loss of protection directly contravene this bequest and its covenants and may be illegal. It is certainly a travesty of the authors. Olaf Stapledon is a world famous author and people come from all parts of the world to see the site of inspiration for novels such as ‘Start Maker’, which explicitly mentions the rural vistas to be had from the Woods, as well as the woods themselves. This is a valuable cultural heritage asset as well as a natural one. Declassification of the surrounding area, for example the open agricultural land that connects Stapledon Woods to Column Road, would also seriously compromise the Woods themselves, and Stapledon’s legacy, by significantly damaging the open aspect of the woods connecting them by a wide natural corridor to Royden Park and Thurstaston Common, essential to enjoyment of the views by the public and the free passage of wildlife.</p>
DOR02853	<p>We feel that all green belt sites should be preserved, particularly the coastal region. Brown fill sites should be utilised first. Consideration needs to be made for the infrastructure, school etc as outlined in your documents.</p>
DOR02854	<p>There are significant areas of derelict buildings and brown field sites that require use before we take the simple option of using a "clean" green field option. The use of the green belt in the Wirral is not required at this time.</p>
DOR02855	<p>Key issues are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The estimated population growth, in terms of the posited increase in housing demand, is unrealistic and inaccurate. Between 2001 and 2016, the population increased by 6,800 (315,000 to 321,800), or by 453 residents each year. Average household size on the Wirral in 2007 was 2.27 (below the national average) and this has continued to fall in subsequent years. If it is assumed that average household size over the 15 years covered by the Local Plan will be approximately 2.1, then the creation of a minimum of 12,045 new housing units would reflect an increase in total population of 25,294 (or 1,686 per annum). The Government’s projection of housing need is therefore unrealistic and inaccurate. It is inconceivable that Wirral’s population post-Brexit will increase at four times the rate registered between 2001 and 2016. If it continues to grow at the existing rate, then only an additional 4,000 houses will be needed to meet demand. 2. The Council has rightly taken steps to reduce the number of empty properties which still stands at around 4,500. By 2020, only 1,250 properties are expected to be brought back into use, so a

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>further 3,399 will still be available to fulfil a high proportion of the actual need. The current policy is very welcome, but reducing the number of empty properties to a very low figure by increasing the financial disadvantages of failing to use them for accommodation purposes would go a significant way in meeting the (re-estimated) Government target.</p> <p>3. The consultation document fails to justify the estimated increase in housing demand on the basis of a coherent analysis of future employment prospects. The overall structure of Wirral's economy has hardly changed in recent years. There are far too few large enterprises (only 0.3% of the total) and there is no likelihood that this will alter. The national projections for economic growth are not encouraging, forecasting a continuing reduction in annual growth at a time when private debt is unsustainable and public finances still weak. Brexit, particularly if it is a 'no deal' variant, will almost certainly have a negative impact on the national and local economy, with a concomitant decline in the demand for new housing.</p> <p>4. The Green Belt is one of the most important attractive features of the Wirral and an asset that has underpinned tourism and marketing strategies in the past. In 2000, 45% of the land was part of the Green Belt. After the construction of a minimum of almost 13,000 new houses, its area will have been reduced considerably (by 25-30%). The net cost to the local authority will be significant in terms of Wirral's attractiveness for tourists, residents, and new employees on Merseyside who might otherwise consider locating elsewhere. The damage to areas such as Storeton Village or Saughall Massey would be immense and land within the boundaries of conservation areas should only be used for new housing purposes in very exceptional circumstances.</p> <p>5. The commitment to using 'vacant' sites on the East of the peninsula is to be welcomed, but the precise selection of land for new housing is worrying and shows no evidence of adequate research or analysis. For example: St John's Church, Egremont, was built in 1832-33 and is Grade II listed. An alternative use must be found for the Church because of its historic and architectural significance. The land 'opposite' Park Road East is currently used by HIVE working with young people. It is within the Birkenhead Park Conservation Area and plans to develop the site for housing have failed in the past because of their failure to provide the quality needed to enhance the park. At a time when the Council is making excellent progress in putting together the Nomination Dossier for an application for World Heritage Site, a new plan for housing would not be helpful. In a wider context, it is unfortunate to see play areas, green space, community and youth centres, Claremont Farm, as well as The Royal Liverpool Golf Club and the Bromborough Golf Course, included in the list of potential housing development sites. Has any attention been paid to the social and economic consequences of such a policy? Are you satisfied that sufficient facilities for all age groups will continue to be met and that urban areas, including some of the most deprived wards on the Wirral, will not suffer from a loss of greenspace which is so important for leisure, exercise and health?</p>
DOR02856	<p>I take a view of these things based on facts and figures. I am convinced that this is an effort to meet targets for targets sake, and not as a result of actual meaningful figures. I don't believe the Wirral has a housing crisis. Indeed quite the opposite. Peel Holdings want to build numerous living quarters in east Wirral yet the consultation suggests that large scale housing is required in west Wirral. This simply isn't the case. The net population of the Wirral has hardly changed, and indeed in recent years has at times reduced, over the past decade. To consider the use of greenfield sites in an area of natural beauty is baffling as it is wrong. I, like everyone I have spoken to, are reasonable people who are not NIMBY types. If there was a genuine need then I would support it, without question. The response from my own wife was informative. She takes very little interest in local or national politics. Her immediate response when I told her about this last year was "why, we don't need any housing?". That sums it up for me and many others. If you go ahead with this then I suspect a lot of mild mannered, usually apathetic people who just go about their lives will become very very angry. When that happens you have a problem. Indeed you may have even less of a housing requirement when people move away from the area. The reason many live here is because of the green spaces, schooling and roads (whilst poorly maintained) that not overly clogged with traffic. Each village/town has their own distinct boundary and cultural activities. That will disappear. Myself, my family and friends are all motivated and angry about what is proposed. The government is applying targets for targets sake that are south east centric and not applicable to Wirral. Utter nonsense, waste of money and I don't want to see the beautiful area of the Wirral changed forever so my own children cannot enjoy what I have grown up with and continue to enjoy. Stop the madness!</p>
DOR02857	No building on green belt land
DOR02858	<p>"I disagree that there is any need for Wirral Council to consider the re-designation of ANY green belt land for development purposes. This is based upon the view that incorrect data and methodology has been used to establish the shortfall in the housing pipeline, specifically: The use of wholly incorrect 'baseline' figures. The recently published ONS figures for population growth dramatically reduces the volume of properties requires in Wirral. The misinterpretation of the 'buffer' referred to in the NPPF2 - this buffer is clearly part of the required number NOT additional to and does not increase the baseline number - it simply alters the timing of the delivery of properties. The disagreement with the headline figures also relates to the understatement of the figures relating to the number of properties available from the redevelopment of brownfield sites and the understatement of the figures relating to previously empty properties brought back into use during the local plan period and the understatement of 'windfall' sites. Comments re: Strategic Parcel 062 Green Belt Land has 5 purposes and the recent review of green belt land has assessed each strategic parcel against each of these purposes. The background report - section 5.2- states that: '.....individual Parcels and sites could only be preferred on the basis of having least harm to the purposes of including land within the green belt'. The following comments clearly prove that the development of SP062 is far more harmful than the development of almost all other sites identified for further investigation. SP062 continues to serve each of these purposes as follows and there are many sites contained on the 'List of sites recommended for further investigation' that serve these purposes to a significantly lesser degree. Unpalatable as it is for any green belt parcels to be developed there are many sites on which development would be significantly less damaging and which are therefore more appropriate for development than SP062. I make the following comments:</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas Along with 19 other sites recommended for further investigation, SP062 is described as partially enclosed whilst 4 sites - with a combined potential for 1,099 to 1,649 properties are 'highly enclosed' and are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. Indeed, when one looks at each of the 5 SHLAA sites that compose SP062 they have a low proportion (%) of land adjacent to urban areas and are either individually: 'Poorly enclosed': - SHLAA884 (25%) and SHLAA1956 (42%); 'Not Enclosed' - SHLAA1881</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>(10%) or 'Rural' - SHLAA1955 (0%). This has led the council to define SP062 as serving the purpose of checking unrestricted sprawl in appendix 3 'Greenbelt Parcels Initial Background Data'. There are 12 sites - with a capacity for up to 1,989 properties - that the council determine identify in Appendix 3 as not serving the purpose of preventing urban sprawl and would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062.</p> <p>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another The council has adopted the methodology of to assess SPs against this purpose of considering whether the development of a green belt site would join up ""Core Strategy Settlement Areas'. I would argue strongly that this is a very arbitrary and wholly unrealistic manner in which to assess whether neighbouring towns will merge into one another. "</p> <p>There is little chance of any 'Core Strategy Settlement Areas' merging into each other and protection against this was never the intended purpose behind the designation of Wirral's green belt areas in 1983 - partly because the definition of 'Core Strategy Settlement Areas' did not occur until 2016. The purpose if the creation of the green belt in 1983 was manifold including to ensure that towns and villages retained their individual character - and that purpose still stands in relation to the separate and distinct areas of Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Thingwall which would be merged if SP062 was developed. The document accompanying the establishment of the Merseyside Green Belt specifically refers to the separation of individual towns and villages rather than the monolithic 'Core Settlement Areas'. The document states that the Green Belt is necessary to 'check the outward spread of the built up area' - not to simply avoid the joining up of 'Core Settlement Areas'. Therefore the true purpose of SP 062 in relationships to this factor is to prevent the merging of the very distinct towns/villages of Pensby, Heswall and Barnston. The development of SP062 will have the highest level of impact - not the 'lowest impact' which is currently erroneously assigned to SP062. In Appendix 6, the council quite rightly state that the development of SP062 would both reduce the physical separation and remove the physical separation of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston. The council recognises this fact in Appendix 6 'Green Belt Parcels Initial Separation Commentary' it states: 'would remove the physical separation between Pensby and Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston, which could affect the character, appearance and distinctiveness of Barnston Village Conservation Area'. And in the 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment': 'would merge and ENCLOSE(!) Barnston Village from the West'. Furthermore, Appendix 12 'Initial Separation Commentary' makes the following comments re: SHLAAs that compose SP062 SHLAA884 ...would reduce the physical separation between Pensby (SA7) and the rural village of Pensby and between Pensby (SA7) and the existing developed areas in the Green Belt at Woodlands Drive SHLAA1946 ...would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the East of Pensby, that would reduce the physical separation between Pensby (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston and could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation area SLAA1955 would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the south and west of the rural village of Barnston, that would reduce the physical separation between Pensby and Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston and could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. SHLAA1956would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the north of Heswall, that would reduce the physical separation between Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. Despite accurately noting in Appendix 6 that the development of SP062 would both reduce and remove the physical separation between the towns of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston, the council then assess SP062 in appendix 3 not serving purpose 2 and acting as preventing the merging of neighbouring towns.</p> <p>"This is an error which needs rectifying. However, even accepting the council's (erroneous) criteria for assessing purpose 2, and (erroneous) classification of SP062 as not serving the purpose of preventing the merger of neighbouring towns there are 28 other sites within this category. However, unlike 14 sites in this category - which do not border conservation areas-, SP062 borders on and would impact upon a designated conservation area - Barnston Village. These sites therefore would be more suitable for development than SP062.</p> <p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment The single land use of SP062 is as agricultural land and therefore any new development would intrude discordantly into the open countryside. This land is currently used for the growing of crops and the rearing of sheep and cattle. In the council's own document it clearly states that 'where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, (councils) should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality'. An analysis if the 'Sites for Further Investigation' and the 'Map of High Quality Agricultural Land' shows that much of SP062 is high quality agricultural land. Of the site recommended for further investigation, 17 strategic parcels - with combines capacity for 1,041 to 1,563 properties have NO 'Best and most versatile agricultural land' and would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062. Furthermore, of the sites recommended for further investigation which includes BMV agricultural land, SP062 has one of the highest % of agricultural land. In terms of actual BMV lost through development, at 70 HAs, SP062 represents the second greatest loss of BMV - and only 2 HAs less than the greatest loss at SP042. In addition to the 17 sites with NO BMV, there are further 34 sites which contain a lesser area of BMV - with combined capacity for 6,726 to 10,092 properties - and would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062. However, SP062 is unusual as it is the only SP about which the council have commented in the 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' that it is only developable id another neighbouring parcel -SP061 - is also developed: 'Would not be suitable for release from the Green Belt independently of SP061, to the immediate north' Therefore any development of SP062 would also see the de facto development of SP061 and the loss of 23.32 HAs of BMV at that location. Therefore the combined loss of BMV in the development of SP062 (and SP061) would be 91.3 HAs - over 20 As more than the next site with the greatest concentration of BMV. ALL other sites for further investigation site - with combined capacity for 7,767 to 11,655 properties - have lesser area of/NO area of BMV than the combined SP061/062 and would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062.</p> <p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns As none of the site considered for further investigation impact upon historic towns, one must look at the impact of the proposed sites on related factors to determine which best serve purpose 4. The consolation document explicitly states that one of the reasons for the establishment and retention of green belt is the protection of designated conservation areas. The development of SP062 would permanently alter the special character of the designated conservation area of Barnston Village whilst ironically</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>the council has defined the 'landscape strategy for the area containing SP062 and Barnston Village as 'Enhance'. "</p> <p>"The council recognises this fact in Appendix 6 ""Green Belt Parcels Initial Separation Commentary' it states"" 'would remove the physical separation between Pensby and Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston, which could affect the character, appearance and distinctiveness of Barnston Village Conservation Area'. Furthermore, Appendix 12 'Initial Separation Commentary' makes the following comments re: SHLAAs that compose SP062: SHLAA884Would reduce the physical separation between Pensby (SA7) and the rural village of Pensby and between Pensby (SA7) and the existing developed areas of Green Belt at Woodlands Drive. SHLAA1946.... Would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the East of Pensby, that would reduce the physical separation between Pensby (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston and could affect the rural character and distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. SHLAA1955...Would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the South and West of the rural village of Barnston, that would reduce the physical separation between Pensby and Heswall (SA7) band the rural village of Barnston and could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. SHLAA1956....Would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the North of Heswall, that would reduce the physical separation between Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston and could affect the rural character and distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. Despite accurately noting in Appendix 6 that the development of SP062 would both reduce and remove the physical separation between the towns of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston, the council the assesses SP062 in Appendix 3 not serving purpose 2 and acting as preventing the merging of neighbouring towns. This is an error which needs rectifying. However, even accepting the council's (erroneous) criteria for assessing purpose 2, and (erroneous) classification of SP062 as not serving the purpose of preventing the merger of neighbouring towns there are 28 other sites in this category. However, unlike 14 sites in this category - which do not border conservation areas - SP062 borders on and would impact upon a designated conservation area - Barnston Village. The 14 sites which do not prevent the merger of core settlement areas and would impact not upon designated conservation areas have a combined capacity of 2,048 to 3,073 properties. These sites would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062.</p> <p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land and other urban land The 'Initial Review of the Green Belt - Revised Methodology' states that under assessment of purpose 5 'the proximity to areas of greatest news will also be taken into account as part of the initial assessment' Not only does SP062 play a role in encouraging the development of brownfield and urban areas but it is a great distance from the areas of greatest need shown on the map at Appendix 19 and therefore development on SP062 would have the least impact on the recycling of derelict land and other urban land. An analysis of the 'Sites for Further Investigation' and the 'Areas of Greatest Need' shows that SP062 is probably the site considered for further investigation which id furthest from an area of greatest need and almost every other site is nearer. "</p> <p>It is wholly inappropriate and erroneous to consider developing the highest number of properties (up to 1,800 on SP062 alone and up to 2,153 if combined with SP061) in the area which is furthest away from where the council has determined the need to be. Furthermore the nature of the properties that will inevitably be developed on SP062 are completely the wrong type of property. Developers will build 3 and 4 bedroom executive properties on SP062. The council's SHLAA states that there is already an oversupply if these properties in Wirral and the need is for 1 and 2 bedroom properties. The 52 sites which are (often substantially) closer to the areas of greatest need have a combine capacity of 7,944 to 11,926 properties. These sites would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062. Comments on factors other than the 5 purposes of Green Belt: Boundary strength - which considers the 'strength' of the perimeter of each green belt SHLAA site that may be used to form a new boundary to the Green Belt and is presented at Appendix 9 'SHLAA Green Belt Sites Initial Background Data' An error has been made in the classification of SHLAA884 SP062 having a 'strong' boundary. The methodology clearly states that only Strategic Parcels with a boundary strength OVER three quarters are to be classed as 'strong'. SHLAA884 SP062 is assessed to have a boundary strength of 75% (three quarters) which is NOT over three quarters. Therefore SHLAA884 SP062 needs to be reclassified as 'moderate'. All other SHLAA sites within SP062 (SHLAAs 1946, 1955, 1981) are correctly assessed as having a weak boundary. Flood Risk - Analysis of the sites considered for further investigation against Appendix 7 'Green Belt Parcels Initial Constraints' and Appendix 13 'SHLAA Green Belt Initial Constraint Analysis' shows SP062 to be one of a small number of sites which includes a flood zone 3 or above. There are 36 SP/SHLAA sites - with capacity for between 4,636 and 6,995 properties - which do not include a flood zone and which are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. Furthermore, of the SPs and SHLAAs which contain a flood zone, there are 5 sites with capacity of 67 to 102 properties which contain a lesser area of flood zone than SP062 and which are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. LCR Core Biodiversity Area Analysis of sites considered for further investigation against Appendix 7 'Green Belt Parcels Initial Constraints' and Appendix 13 'SHLAA Green Belt Sites Initial Constraint Analysis' shows SP062 to be one of the sites which is classified as a LCR Core Biodiversity Area. There are 13 SP/SHLAA sites - with capacity between 828 and 1,249 properties - which are not classified as a LCR Core Biodiversity Area and which are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. Furthermore, of the SPs and SHLAAs which are classified as LCR Core Biodiversity Areas, there are 28 sites with capacity for 3,511 to 5,270 properties which contain a lesser biodiversity area than SP062 and which are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. Public Rights of Way There are 3 public rights of way within SP062 - one of the highest number of footpaths on a single SP site. There are 25 SP sites - with capacity for between 3,038 and 4,561 properties - which do not include public rights of way and are therefore more suitable for development than SP062. Wirral NEEDS affordable housing in areas where it is required. Green Belt will not be used for affordable housing, it will be used to build executive homes in areas of beauty with huge price tags that only people 'out of the area' can afford. By using Green Belt we are not looking after the people who need help and housing, we are driving them away from their homes and into further poverty. Wirral Council need to regenerate the run down areas, to make them inhabitable, which in turn will increase the likely hood of businesses trading in the area and increase jobs. Before Green Belt is even considered, the council need to concentrate on revamping disused properties and building on derelict land in the areas where housing is required, concentrating on areas where there is the best transport, not driving people to Green Belt areas where they have to have a car to enable them to work, where schools and nurseries are accessible by foot and the Hospital is just a bus ride away.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02859	SHLAA 3040 - These plans are completely unworkable there is no adequate access around the site to deal with the increase in traffic, traffic already comes to single file the majority of the time and being in an area near schools and other children's activities poses a grave danger. The local schools doctors and other service are already oversubscribed and are not in position to accommodate any increase. not to mention the potential disruption to traffic, schooling and health from a long term building site in an already crowded area.
DOR02860	What a ridiculous waste of money - how much did it cost to send a "project fear" letter to every household, quoting out of date figures that were revised down by the ONS mere days later? Instead FAR more effort should be put into pressure on Peel to increase the AFFORDABLE home building on Wirral Waters. Their current figures are a pathetic fraction of their outline residential planning consent. If the demand is for affordable housing, it will not be achieved by the inevitable expensive homes on west Wirral green belt land. It needs decent infrastructure put into all the many brownfield sites on east Wirral. There the home building will enhance and not detract from the land. If clean-up is needed, can there not be access to funding to help with this and therefore encourage developers there?
DOR02861	I completely object to the building of houses on green belt land in particular near store ton woods and Bebington areas. Affordable housing for first time buyers should be made available on brown belt land. I am disappointed that the Council are even willing to discuss selling green belt when the Wirral is such a beautiful part of the country.
DOR02862	I am against proposed plan to make enough land available. Do NOT want green belt sites to be disrupted, it is not good for the community and environment.
DOR02863	I do not have any issue about the use of green belt land for future housing. The need for new housing is so desperate that makes the protect the green belt argument very trivial.
DOR02864	The building of 12,000 new houses on a relatively small part of the Wirral peninsular particularly the Green Belt will create many problems with the infrastructure i.e. roads, overload on drainage, schools, medical services etc. 12,000 homes will create around 30,000 more people, 20,000 more cars. The loss of Green Belt will have an effect on farming and other rural activities, roads will become more congested and cause more pollution, Children will have to be driven to school, People will need to use their cars to go to work if there is any jobs for them to do on the Wirral. I feel that the Peninsular with be changed irreversible and have a negative effect on the People of the Wirral.
DOR02865	I am opposed to the planned developments to the green belt land in and around Irby village. We are Irby residents and regularly walk our dog on the woodland area Limbo Lane as well and Harrock Wood. There is a lot of wildlife that I am concerned would be driven out if such plans were to become reality. Also our local school where my son attends (and in due course my daughter too hopefully) is already oversubscribed therefore I do not feel there would be adequate space in the local schools if developments were to go ahead on this land.
DOR02866	<p>I am writing as a concerned Wirral resident about the Local Plan and its impact on the Green Belt. Wirral's Green Belt, with its splendid views, walks and wildlife was the major factor in choosing to live and raise a family here. It appears that all of this is now at risk and at a time when it is widely broadcast that our natural habitats and the life within them have never been more under pressure due to the actions of man. I have attended several meetings and am disappointed by the absence of [the Council Leader], the lack of imagination shown by the council planners and the unsubstantiated numbers being used as the premise on which to release Green Belt land. I am very concerned that there appears to be a determination to release Green Belt and reap short term rewards rather than consider the actual needs of current and future Wirral residents. In August 2018, [the Council Leader] sent a letter to households across Wirral, including my own, which said that he had challenged the housing needs target of 12,000 new homes by 2035 and that he would do everything he could to 'protect the special character of Wirral' – fantastic news, one would think. Unfortunately he hadn't challenged the number – he didn't write to the Secretary of State until the 7th of September and I'm not aware of any actions taken since to protect the Green Belt. Despite the ONS producing much lower revised figures I have not seen any further documentation from the council showing how they would in turn reduce the peninsula's housing requirements. On the contrary, at a recent constituency meeting, [a council officer] stated that he thought it unlikely that these values would decrease but that personnel from the University of Liverpool would be inspecting the figures. I will admit to being naïve about various aspects of the Local Plan but common sense would suggest that you begin the process with accurate figures rather than those which are the most lucrative for developers and possibly councillors alike. Common sense would also suggest that you review other available options first before turning to the Green Belt. These would include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • 6450 homes to be built by Peel Holdings (a figure confirmed by [the Director of Peel Holdings] in his letter to [the Council Leader] on the 10th of September) • commencing building of at least 2000 homes which have already been given planning permission but on which work has yet to begin (It is well known that many developers land bank and, as it is unlikely that developers would deny themselves the profits that would be released from building, this would suggest that maybe there is not quite the demand for housing that has been assumed.) • bringing up to 6000 empty homes back into use • redeveloping brownfield sites (where there is the potential to build up to 18000 homes) including derelict shops and businesses The housing White Paper states that "Green Belt boundaries should be amended only in exceptional circumstances when local authorities can demonstrate that they have fully examined all other reasonable options for meeting their identified housing requirements". I would suggest that Wirral Borough Council has not fulfilled this obligation and as such needs to reconsider its current position and devise a Local Plan that properly meets the needs of the communities across the peninsular.
DOR02867	Do NOT allow building on any green belt sites.
DOR02868	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.
DOR02869	Destroying the car park and civic Centre in Bromborough will kill the shopping centre and deprive MANY people of so many activities that take place in the Civic Centre, This village is vital to all the local community but especially to older people who don't want to travel to shops and amenities.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02870	I object to the proposed local plan and in particular to the proposals to release green belt for housing development. My objections are based upon the following reasons: Firstly, there is sufficient brownfield land on the Wirral to meet the borough's housing needs and green belt should not be utilised until all the brownfield land has been used. Secondly, the release of green belt will result in the creeping urbanisation of the Wirral, making it a less pleasant place to live for everyone. Local villages such as Barnston will lose their identity. Also, considering green belt which has existing development on three sides as "enclosed" and therefore earmarked for development is patently flawed, resulting in more urbanisation. Thirdly, many of the proposed sites are rich in wildlife, with ancient hedgerows, many bird species, and foraging areas for protected species such as badgers. Allowing development is contrary to the council's obligations to protect wildlife and the natural environment. Finally, the projected housing need is based upon questionable data, as evidenced by the sudden amendment to the number of houses predicted to be required by the ONS.
DOR02871	I am extremely concerned at the loss of green belt land that surrounds the area we live on the West of Wirral. Part of decision making in buying a house is based on the surrounding area which it is located - particularly green belt as it should not be built on. This is not a heavily built up area and this will spoil the surroundings, open space and beautiful views. There is no evidence the population in Wirral is growing, so there is no demand. Housing in West Wirral is unlikely to be affordable housing either. What consideration has been given to the infrastructure - roads, schools, hospitals? It is poorly thought though, however no doubt the council will claim they have listened by conceding some land but the proposals were overstated in the first place. Peel have plenty of brownfield land. The whole suggestion is a disgrace,
DOR02872	The Local Plan needs to provide the basis from which the Wirral will continue to be the extraordinary place it is today and one which will meet the needs of its existing residents and communities. This can best be achieved by protecting the things that are beautiful and repairing those which are not. I strongly object to the loss of any Greenbelt land - this is our most precious and valuable resource. It cannot be sacrificed on the whim of some dubious calculations handed down from Manderins in Whitehall. The Urban Renaissance has yet to take hold on the Wirral, decades after it has in many other places. The focus must therefore be placed on how to repair Birkenhead and Wallasey, to make these places attractive destinations and thriving workplaces. That is what will take Wirral forward; diversify our communities and provide alternatives for living, whilst making better use of the abandoned and derelict places that scare the peninsula. The capacity of these places to manage growth has not yet been fully explored or sufficiently encouraged. It is far more sustainable to fix these places, that have abundant unused and previously developed land, with transport connections, than it is to build all over productive farmland. Save the Greenbelt. Repair the urban fabric.
DOR02873	I do not think any developments should be built on our Green Belt ,all developments should be built on Brown Field sites.
DOR02874	Please think again the Green Belt must be saved, villages need to be saved. Use Brown Field sites and make Peel play their part on the land at the Four Bridges.
DOR02875	A total waste of public tax payers money! How can a consultation take place based on the wrong ONS data and an out of date SHLAA. Totally bogus and biased process
DOR02876	I wish to present my strongest objection to any development of Greenbelt land for the following reasons:- 1) Wirral population growth is minimal if not static. 2) All "Brown" land sites should be fully developed before any erosion of Greenbelt occurs. 3) Greenbelt planning applications are likely to be for premium grade housing which does not address the shortage of affordable housing. 4) The only persons likely to benefit from release of Greenbelt land for development are the land owners and Developers. 5) Greenbelt land development is the easy option for developers as land remediation works are not necessary. "Brown " land sites are laying waste in the area because nobody will face up to the clean-up costs.
DOR02877	I feel as though this plan will start to turn the Wirral into more of a city than the paradise peninsular it currently is!
DOR02878	I am against the use of greenbelt land for new Buildings or Roads. Greenbelt land is ring fenced so greedy developers cannot get their hands on it.
DOR02879	Very much opposed to any building on local greenbelt land for many reasons: nature conservation, agricultural production, physical and mental health of present population, inadequate public transport (no railway connection), traffic levels already too high-air quality etc.. More housing not needed here on present statistics as presented.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02880	<p>I object in the strongest possible terms to the proposal to allocate multiple parcels of green belt land for housing on the Wirral as described in the consultation document. My grounds for objection are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Metropolitan Borough of Wirral is unique in being a metropolitan borough situated in a bounded peninsular. Further loss of greenbelt will significantly reduce access to unbuilt land in a way that is more pronounced than for towns and cities that are not closely bounded on three sides by coastline. This additional loss of facility has not been accounted for in the impact assessment. 2. The proposal as it stands does not explain and may therefore fail to achieve the required improvement in the social and economic fabric of Birkenhead. It is clearly imperative that high quality housing be built in Birkenhead and this should be a priority. This was indeed a previous proposal and the council should take steps to ensure that this happens. 3. In consulting and developing the plan the council should not give prominence to the views of the owner of the land in Birkenhead in question, since the development potential of this land is the key to the successful availability of housing that avoids the need to consume the green belt. The council should develop a plan first, and deal with the consequences second, not prejudice the plan by assuming that it cannot implement a suitable plan. 4. There is ample opportunity to meet the required target in and around Birkenhead, as pointed out in the letter to householders from Council Leader dated August 2015. The land in question may be held privately but that is beside the point since all most or all of the green belt land is also held privately. The council has powers of compulsory purchase in pursuit of an agreed local plan where the alternatives are not suitable. 5. The council has not explained in its consultation the options it has to compulsorily purchase the land in question in Birkenhead. Given the fact that there were proposals for 13,000 dwellings on that land and the pivotal importance of that supply to the Local Plan then these options should be developed and explained as part of the consultation, or else the consultation is on a flawed bases. 6. It is a flawed process to plan for 15 years of use of Green Belt land given the availability of other unused brownfield sites that exist on the Wirral and have existed for many years. The consultation about the Local Plan should include plans for these sites first. Green Belt land is so designated for good reasons and a plan that allocates wholesale change of multiple greenbelt sites for 15 years ahead is clearly not respecting the purpose or intent of the existence of greenbelt land. In summary I believe that the proposals will have a significant and irreversible detrimental effect on the Wirral, for the environment and economy of Birkenhead and for the remaining natural environment of the Wirral as a whole. I believe that if implemented the proposals as they stand will result in the significant degradation of the social and environmental fabric of the Wirral.
DOR02881	<p>I would oppose any development of Bromborough Civic centre and the adjacent car park. They provide a valuable resource to the community and are the base for many groups and activities. The loss to the community by future development would be keenly felt .</p>
DOR02882	<p>My belief is that it is not necessary for ANY of the green belt land to be recategorised. The Wirral is a unique environment and as residents we have an obligation to preserve these green spaces for future generations. Once given over to housing development it can never be reversed. The WBC should seek inventive ways of utilising existing land for new houses.</p>
DOR02883	<p>I am writing to object to the proposed use of green belt land for housing development. It has been proved, particularly as revised housing forecast figures have been released that there is no requirement for the use of green belt land. We have recently moved to Wirral and it is clear that there is a very slow demand for new build houses and other houses/flats are on the market for many months before selling. In this respect I believe the Council needs to seriously reconsider the areas of land in the proposals and work with realistic expectations and requirements.</p>
DOR02884	<p>I located to Wirral 25 years ago, I have started businesses and raised a family here – the greenbelt was THE major factor in my decision to move here. Destruction of the greenbelt will, I feel, make Wirral a much less attractive location option for future generations. I attended one of the consultation meetings recently and was disappointed in the lack of imagination shown by the council planners. Obviously building on greenbelt site is the easiest and cheapest (and most lucrative) option for the council, but it displays a disregard for the borough and contempt for its population. The presentation seemed to ignore sensible solutions such as the Wirral Waters development and redeveloping empty properties, and push its own agenda of destroying greenbelt to build, in many cases, executive homes to financially benefit the landowners (and councillors?). Firstly, the figure of 12000 new homes to be built in an area of declining population needs to be comprehensively challenged and clarified. Where is the independent analysis of this figure? New developments that are required can easily be absorbed by redeveloping brownfield sites: 4-6000 empty properties – why not redevelop them, penalise landlords who keep the properties empty or adopt a £1 ownership scheme - similar to Liverpool's - to create new communities and affordable housing? Redevelop the rows of derelict shops and businesses across Wirral. Clearly the high street has changed and there will be fewer shops in the future so why not redefine the use of these properties to become homes? Many large homes are often occupied by single elderly people. The council could encourage elderly people to share their property with a younger person who would provide company and act as a helper/carer - and benefit from discounted rent (they do this in Germany). Alternatively, if the council built small premises designed specifically for elderly people's needs in pleasant communities and encouraged people to move to them it could free up thousands of family homes.</p>
DOR02885	<p>We need to protect the Green Belt as much as we can. We need use more power of Compulsory Purchase to force the sale and obtain empty and derelict buildings to be converted for housing. We need to build more multiple occupancy homes i.e. flats and apartments rather than houses with front and back gardens and driveways. We need to house people above shops and offices where feasible. We need to build homes that are truly affordable both to buy and to rent and this should be calculated using local pay averages.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02886	<p>1 – The process. The presenter (Pensby High School 12/09/18) said “wherever possible brown field sites are utilised. Greenbelt land will only ever be used when there is no other option”. A fire station is currently being built on greenbelt land in Saughall Massie. Not only is this a totally inappropriate site due to road safety considerations but there were two viable brown field sites identified; one in Greasby village and the other the current Upton fire station. Public consultation resulted in over 90% objection to the Saughall Massie scheme. How can one have faith in the process when it has been blatantly ignored in this instance? One can only presume there are other forces at work here; perhaps the commercial or personal interests of the parties concerned in the decision making. Certainly the logistical arguments did not hold water!</p> <p>2 – ‘The Plan’ – What data is the requirement based on. Does Wirral need this kind of development in the period of the plan? There is little point in building or even planning houses if there is no one to sell them to. Much has been made of the planning permission already granted to Peel Holdings for 13000+ dwellings on the Wirral Waters site but it would appear they are introducing numerous excuses and caveats to delay execution. Are they just land banking and would the release of greenbelt land just lead to further land banking thus blighting existing greenbelt with no benefit. Will the council, by petitioning government if necessary, be prepared bring pressure to bear on Peel to execute these plans and if not to bring the land into public ownership via CP? I also believe it is possible for the council to create wholly owned development companies to facilitate the building of properties on such sites.</p> <p>3 – The Moreton West / Saughall Massie plans in general. Parcel refs SP00- 1, 2A, 2B, 2C, 3, 4A, 4B & 5A in worst case scenario would completely obliterate town / village boundaries between Saughall Massie, Upton and Greasby and to some degree Meols. It would remove all illusion of its semirural setting and destroy the conservation area that is Saughall Massie village. 3 Parcels SP00- 2A,B & C, 3 and 5A – all these parcels are adjacent with Garden Hey Road. This is little more than a country lane and already struggles with traffic volume. It is a pedestrian route without footpaths at the southern end and is poorly maintained. Further residential development here would be nonsensical.</p> <p>4 – Parcel SP001 – The two main roads bordering this parcel, Saughall Massie Road and Pump Lane, are already very busy / unsuitable and it would be inadvisable to introduce extra traffic on these roads especially with the potential delays that could be caused to vehicles exiting the (controversial) new Fire Station at Saughall Massie. It would also remove a valuable countryside aesthetic.</p> <p>5 – Parcel SP004A&B – I believe this could stand very limited, separated developments on the land facing Saughall Road and Acton Lane but the land currently with public access should remain untouched</p>
DOR02887	<p>I am writing on behalf of myself and my wife to register our heartfelt objection to the release of greenbelt land. As such we stand to be greatly affected by any development proposals. However I write first and foremost as a lifelong Wirral resident. I was born and brought up on the Wirral and I have always been proud to be referred to as a Wirralian. I believe that peninsula is a beautiful and unique place. To release the greenbelt as proposed is will our view do untold damage to the heart of the Wirral. In general terms I would challenge why it is necessary to release any greenbelt at all. I am aware of the requirement to produce the local plan. However I am also aware that under the National Planning Policy Framework (Paragraph 83) “Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances” Whilst I am no planning expert I do find it difficult to identify exceptional circumstances in this case given the following</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are no unusual pressures on housing on the Wirral. That appears to be accepted by all concerned including central government. 2. There is the question of Wirral Waters. This appears to have become a political issue which it should not be. Peel Holdings have recently restated that they are committed to the scheme. Indeed their web site (as confirmed by a recent press release) indicates that they are targeting 2,900 to 6,450 houses within the 15 years of the local plan. My reading of the plan is that it only allows for 1,100 houses built on Wirral Waters in that period. The plan (if its projections are correct) also sets a requirement of 4,794 houses from greenbelt. Accordingly if Peel commit 5,894 houses in the 15 year period then the need to build on greenbelt is removed completely. Surely the way forward is to negotiate with Peel to seek that commitment. 3. The local plan does include large areas of brownfield land which are designated for commercial or employment use. The amount of this land contained in the proposed local plan appears to be more than is reasonably required to satisfy commercial requirements. Wirral has a wealth of commercial land along the A41. There appears to be a number of sites (in Birkenhead in particular) which could be re-assigned for residential use. This land can then further reduce the need for building on greenbelt. <p>STORETON AREA It appears from the local plan that Storeton and its surrounding area is being hit particularly hard by the plan. This has to be considered by reference to paragraph 80 of the NPPF which states “ Green Belt serves five purposes:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas 2. to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another 3. to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment 4. to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns 5. to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land”. <p>In my view Storeton Village continues to tick all those boxes. So far as a) and b) are concerned Storeton is an entirely separate village surrounded by agricultural land. The proposals would remove not just some but all of that land from greenbelt. By doing so Storeton would be merged to the North and East into the Birkenhead conurbation thereby assisting urban sprawl and causing Storeton to merge into the residential areas of Prenton and Higher Bebington. The individual nature of the village would be lost. So far as c) is concerned this is obvious. The loss of greenbelt would mean the loss of large areas of Wirral countryside.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>And very beautiful countryside at that. Without embarking on a history lesson in relation to d) there is no doubt about Storeton's rich history. It has a strong Viking connection and was mentioned in the Domesday book of 1085. Storeton Hall dates back to the 14th Century. Much of the village's character remains preserved to this day. To infill and surround the village with modern residential housing would ruin its character. At this point can I also bring into play the unique nature of Lever Causeway itself. Its history can of course be traced back to the first Lord Leverhulme. Visitors to the Wirral never cease to be impressed by its tree lined setting. The present proposals would mean the loss of greenbelt on both sides of the Causeway. Residential housing on either side would again ruin its character. Wirral BC has only recently spent good money on building the new track to the North side of the Causeway. As my house is opposite to the South end of the track I am well placed to confirm how well used it is by walkers, joggers, cyclists and horse riders. It is a popular local resource. I have no doubt that it would not be so popular if it ran through a housing estate ! There is also and importantly the ongoing investigation as to whether the fields around Storeton were the site of the Battle of Brunanburh. There are others who can give much more detail about this but if this were confirmed then this is of the utmost historic significance. If there is any possibility that this is the site then it would be foolish in the extreme to build on it. Returning to NPPF e) is linked back to my comments under Wirral Greenbelt generally. We have brownfield options which must be encouraged. So all boxes in paragraph 80 are ticked. And that is without touching on the lack of infrastructure. Storeton has no rail link and a very sparse bus service. There are no schools in the immediate vicinity and the nearest doctor's surgery is in Higher Bebington. All matters to be taken into account in my view. FINALLY When it is gone, it is gone. If we get this wrong now generations to come will quite fairly blame those who are making these decisions.</p>
DOR02888	<p>14 years too late the incompetence and or corruption of council officers and councillors has put under threat our greenbelt. The Council leader has lied and continues to do so. The "cabinet" governance system has been shown to undermine basic democratic principles. WBC has shown itself systematically incapable of conducting this plan openly and with the genuine interest in Wirral, its residents, its history or its environment. There is no justification for any greenbelt to be freed for development. The latest ONS figures have, under the terms of the law, to be used. There is no justification for not doing so and no dispute to be resolved with the Secretary of State. The ONS figures are still too high based as they are on the utterly spurious economic forecasts of this Council. We have had a falling population since the 1970's the council has and continues to demolish huge tracts of housing none of which has been replaced by genuinely affordable housing and none at appropriate housing density. The Council has spent money on a series of grandiose plans for Birkenhead none of which have happened and none of which address the waste of the Woodside area nor the replacement of housing in central Birkenhead by retail areas that are largely empty. We need housing in our urban centres of Birkenhead and Wallasey not on our greenbelt. The consultation exercise was a sham Officers refused to answer questions and no councillors were present to answer. The new ONS figures demand a new consultation period, not to do so is a clear example of this Council's scorn for the democratic process.</p>
DOR02889	<p>I oppose the development on protected greenfield sites whilst less valuable land is still available. This plan seems to have been driven by questionable statistics which have since been revised downwards. The plan should respond to real demand on the Wirral, not arbitrary imposed demands. With particular regard to the plan to develop new housing between Irby and Thurstaston I strongly oppose this project. Telegraph Road is already highly congested through Heswall from both north and south, tailbacks frequently stretching through the town centre and from Tesco out towards West Kirby. The alternative route via the Arrowe Park cross roads is also heavily congested. Thurstaston has no infra-structure or amenities. Irby is already saturated as far as vehicle parking is concerned. Does the Irby sewage system have the capacity to deal with the projected new housing ? There is no main sewer in Thurstaston as far as I or United Utilities are aware.</p>
DOR02890	<p>I am having to use this method of responding to your document Wirral Local Plan, Have Your Say, as there is no online version of the document to fill in.</p> <p>Q1 -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Build homes in the right place 2. Build the right kind of homes 3. Provide local jobs; 4. Protect the Green Belt; 5. Protect our areas of natural beauty; 6. Get transport, school, other infrastructure; <p>Q2 - Q3 Add more homes in existing;</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Agree built up areas Expand existing villages; 2. Disagree into Green Belt Expand existing towns; 3. Strongly into Green Belt Disagree Create new Garden Villages 4. Strongly in Green Belt Disagree <p>Q4 - Protect the Green Belt Disagree</p> <p>Q5 - Infrastructure Better public transport</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. New or improved roads and junctions 2. More car parking 3. New or improved cycling and walking 4. Extra primary and secondary schools

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>5. New parks, allotments, playing fields</p> <p>6. New GP and other healthcare facilities</p> <p>7. New neighbourhood centres etc</p> <p>8. I consider that the draft Local Plan has serious data deficiencies, as identified by [another respondent] and others, and needs to be revised in the light of such expert analysis. Only after such analysis and revision should the Council begin to identify potential Green Belt areas for development, rather than the approach it has adopted up to now of identifying possible areas in great detail. It will be critical for any Green Belt development to be linked to definite new employment opportunities, rather than wishful suggestions, which appear to have been the case with the Wirral Waters/Peel project, which has run into such difficulties.</p>
DOR02891	<p>Do you have more detail about the proposed development for SP060? It's a big area. Also, I can't find what SP060A looks like on the website? I went to Irby Library and they said they wouldn't have any information till the end of this week. My concerns are about access to the new development, overloading the already stretched road infrastructure.</p>
DOR02892	<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. 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.</p> <p>I would like written assurances that development will not be permitted in a south-westerly direction beyond Dawlish Road 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. 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 who 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> <p>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</p> <p>b) Working at 30dph, the total number of dwellings that could be built on SP019B, SP059B, SP059C, SP059D, SP059E and SP060 is 1501.</p> <p>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.</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>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<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. 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.</p> <p>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. 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. 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>
DOR02893	As a resident of the Wirral I strongly oppose the plans to build on our green spaces, which would irredeemably change our community for the worse. Please reconsider the current proposals and fight to meet the targets for new homes by redeveloping unused industrial sites or underprivileged communities in the Wirral, many of which are in desperate need of urban renewal.
DOR02894	I feel that the green plan proposals are flawed and is based on out of date information, The population of the Wirral has been falling consistently for a number of years. I disagree wholeheartedly with any changes to the existing green belt regulations.
DOR02895	The consultation meetings were not consultation. It was a totally one-sided event with the council planning guy telling us what is going to happen. I do not understand why we are extending the green belt line when the Mersey side of Wirral has so many brown field sites. We have an entire docks area and the whole coast along the Mersey. The new green belt line appears to be based on the fact that the land is owned by few landlords who are keen for the money that will come their way if the land gets planning permission. It is currently prime farm land. The quality of life for those who live on the Mersey side of the Wirral will be spoilt as our green spaces are removed while the wealthiest areas of the Wirral will be untouched. Where do the senior members of the council live?
DOR02896	1. As presented in its Hard Copy at our local library it is a complete mess. So much paper, so little hard fact. To ask the general public to digest and form an intelligent opinion is a very hard ask. 2. It seems to me that there is no real need for extra housing in Wirral. A sensible plan as to how to use Brown Field sites and attract good quality housing to them would be much more sensible. The attack on our green belt is the fault of mismanagement for years by both Central and Local governments.
DOR02897	The loss of GREEN BELT LAND which is the consequence of these proposals being enacted would be never be forgiven by future generations of Wirral residents. The value of our GREEN BELT is so high (in many ways) that short term financial gain from building homes upon it is insignificant by comparison. Neglect of the value of BROWNFIELD land which could be used very efficiently for homes is there for all to see. Wirral has the chance to plan ahead in an imaginative and enlightened way. Creative use of the Wirral's resources is a responsible way forward.
DOR02898	Where to park if no car park in Bromborough. All along Allport Lane ? All roads leading into Bromborough? Matalan car park ? Car parks at the Bromborough & Royal Oak public houses ? Have you consulted them regarding the issues they will have to face because of your short sightedness. Please look before you leap.
DOR02899	Since Peel Holdings have been sitting on a large plot of land, with the value of it going up each year and every few years issuing statements like the Chinese are going to build, or we will build thousands and thousands of new houses here, thus interfering with local government plans. Has the council considered all options, including compulsory purchase order against Peel Holdings.
DOR02900	I think that it is criminal to consider building on green belt land. The Wirral is a fantastic place to live. It has enough urban areas but the jewel in its crown is the beautiful green belt areas. Once these are built on they are lost for the future generations. We have responsibility to retain these areas for future generations. I cannot believe that the demand for housing in this area is anything like that predicted. And there are enough brownfield sites that can be developed.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02901	This is disastrous action to take .No thought that it will open flood gates if approved which I am sure it already has been . No thought for the beauty of the Wirral and no thought for wildlife
DOR02902	Any brownfield sites should be de-contaminated and developed sympathetically as an absolute priority over any green belt land. Thereafter, any land other than green belt should be examined and considered, but only if existing housing in such areas has access to open space for recreation. Finally green belt land which is absolutely necessary should be used sparingly and not developed in great blocks creating 'urban sprawl', thereby retaining some obvious delineation between different villages/areas. I appreciate that new housing is necessary but it must be provided with common sense and not to the detriment of people's quality of life. Human beings need fresh air and recreation space in close proximity to their homes.
DOR02903	<p>SP019B Limbo Lane Plantation has not been referred to as the best most versatile agricultural land in the documents made available for the consultation. Natural England have confirmed that pre 1988 this was classed as 3C agricultural land and in the last 12 years since I have lived in Parkway I have viewed varied crops such as rapeseed, wheat, barley, and beans growing here. Please provide the current Agricultural land classification that you have made your decision on to include this in the consultation and provide the evidence to support your classification. I would like to express utter distress regarding the announcement of the plan to hold a consultation on the release of the green belt farmland to the rear of my property. I haven't slept since reading about this in my local paper, I have lived here for 11 years , we bought the house solely for the stunning views of the farmers' fields and the woods. I ride my horse and walk my dog across this land on the bridle ways and footpaths, as do many many others, , we have pheasants, foxes, woodpeckers, nuthatches hedgehogs and ducks visiting the garden. We have newts in our pond, there are families of herons that live on the ponds in these fields. The only thing that blocks our view occasionally is the sight of the tractor or the combine harvester a couple of times a year as it passes our fence. If this release goes ahead we will lose tens of thousands of pounds off the value of our home, our outlook will be destroyed, the whole feel of our very small housing estate in Parkway will be destroyed. We have only ever been concerned about travellers invading this area, I never thought I would have to fight the local council. Both myself and my husband have worked our backsides off for over 30 years to be able to afford our home, Please please do not let this release go ahead you will destroy the home we love and cherish, the garden that we spend most of our time in will be destroyed by the noise and disturbance of builders creating affordable homes for people that can quite frankly have homes built elsewhere. Let them live in a less desirable area until they have worked for 30 years and can afford to move to a lovely area with green belt and stunning views. Nobody handed us anything on a plate. This is to be our home for life, if this plan goes ahead you will drive us away along with many other residents. You will destroy the natural beauty of the area, the local bridleways will no longer be used by riders as the horses will be scared by the building work, the wildlife will be driven away, DO NOT LET THIS GO AHEAD!!! I know both myself and all residents of Parkway will strongly object to this plan . The infrastructure cannot support a large scale development of over 500 houses in this area. The roads are congested as it is , you struggle to get a doctor's appointment and the schools are full. You may also note that there is a national shortage of hay, Wirral has the highest population of horses per head in the UK. If you release these fields where does the farmer grow his hay? How will all the horse owners afford more expensive hay from outside the area? You will drive people away from Irby, business from the stables, there will be nowhere left to ride our horses. All the employment associated with equestrian establishments will be lost. The whole ethos of Irby village life will be destroyed if you build hundreds of houses that are not wanted by locals, crime will no doubt increase, the infrastructure of shops. And restaurants, Dr's and dentists will be unable to cope as will the roads (there are tailbacks at peak times). Environmentally the open fields are of great relevance and importance to lots of species and they also contribute to the good quality of air in the neighbourhood. The land has also been subjected to a High voltage electricity western link cable and we were told by the company involved that nobody would ever build houses there because of the cable. Please, please do all you can to fight this terrible idea and ask someone to write to me at my home address to update me regarding this matter. The Wirral is famously known as the leisure Peninsular. Don't turn it into a concrete jungle.</p>
DOR02904	<p>I have read most of the literature produced by the Council and planning departments over the last few months, together with literature from several concerned parties throughout Wirral. May I respectfully remind you there are to my knowledge, at least 15 Organisations that are appalled at your apparent lack of forward planning and thought for all the residents of Wirral? I appreciate you must know of and have been furnished with, a list of these extremely responsible and discerning Organisations. I attended the consultation meeting at Pensby School and viewed the planning maps you had on display and appreciated the opportunity to speak to the council staff. However, the presentation by a senior technical member of the planning department was sadly an insult to the intelligence of the people present. I do not know of his professional qualifications and how long he has been involved with planning for Wirral, but it seems he had a very difficult task to explain the ridiculous state the Wirral Council find themselves in at this present time. I do not intend to, nor do I find it possible to spell out all the incompetent facts relating to the current Local Plan. I can only reiterate much of which has been said by the above mentioned organisations and in particular from ITPAS with whom I am a member. As a local taxpayer for the last 65 years I expect far more reliability, competence and honesty from my local council and more professionalism from the planning department. What I fail to understand is why the local housing and development planning, has not been seriously undertaken since the last Councils Unitary Development plan. I have a folder containing literature and three maps of the Councils Unitary Development Plan, adopted in February 2000, to which you refer to in your 'Frequently Asked Questions' document dated 7th September 2018. This ongoing development is, as you point out, a Government requirement. Based on the facts that I have been presented with over the last few weeks, there seems to have been a complete lack of competence by our local authority. I am well aware town and country planning is a complex exercise and allowances for the changing criteria and the on-going development and availability of suitable land has to be considered. It is also obvious that to make provision for the most suitable and affordable housing within the restrictions of the relevant local and government regulations/requirements for the needs of all the local population of Wirral is not an easy task. May I refer to a letter we received from the Council Leader, dated August 2018 which I'm sorry to say, I find quite sad. He is in fact admitting the council were completely unprepared for the Governments requirement for a Local Plan. He points out that, and I quote, 'A local plan should be based on local knowledge. It should be underpinned by and entirely based on the needs and aspirations of local people. A genuine Local plan cannot be designed by a civil servant in Whitehall sitting at their laptop without ever having even visited Wirral'. So why hasn't he done it? What has the council been doing since 2000?</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	Needless to say I oppose your current plan and look forward to a revised plan, hopefully based on all the apparently more correct and logical information being presented to you by the Wirral's ratepayers.
DOR02905	I object strongly to Wirral being forced to building 12,000 houses when ONS says the realistic figure is half this. The unrealistic figure quoted would seriously affect our precious Green Belt that has been protected during my lifetime
DOR02906	<p>This is a late in the day rushed local plan with the primary focus on release of green belt to meet dubious housing target figures. It seems that little effort has been made in fully exploring alternatives because release of green belt is the easiest way to show deliverable housing numbers to a government planning officer due to the attractiveness of these sites to developers. There is the presentation of a great deal of spurious research to arrive at this desired conclusion which will be beneficial for council tax revenues. The time of highly paid council officials would have been better spent on formulating a plan that could be supported by the population of the Wirral.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The plan is simplistic. It is obvious that developers want to build on green belt land. The implied inevitable release does not encourage developers to look to alternatives. • The type of housing built on this land is likely to be of a kind that will encourage the development of commuter settlements rather than that needed by the resident population. • The housing requirement in the plan is based on poor data from the ONS. Even the subsequent revised household projection data does not reflect the lower housing requirement growth the Wirral is experiencing when contrasted with the UK as a whole. • The council is clearly focused on maximising council tax revenue regardless of detriment to the environment. A proper local plan should be concentrated on regenerating and delivering good quality homes in a pleasant, quality environment with supporting infrastructure at a level affordable to people on typical local incomes. This however requires will and effort on the part of the council and council officials whereas building on green belt does not. This plan will just create gentrified commuter enclaves, taking away the few parcels of decent green belt environment left and also leading to further decline of the rest of the Wirral. • The government's response to the new ONS figures will not be made until December yet the deadline for comments on this consultation is 26 October. Should not matters be deferred until we have these figures rather than signalling to developers a desire to release a vast area of green belt land that they can cherry pick and landbank? • I also note a reply given by the Assistant Director, at the Wirral West Constituency Committee meeting on 4th October 2018. He stated that despite the revised and reduced household projection figures from the ONS he felt the government would seek to increase the housing requirement based on these new figures and that this still meant green belt was required to meet housing targets. This resignation to, and even invitation for, increased housing numbers again evidences the council's desire for an easy solution that maximises revenue.
DOR02907	I strongly object to the conversion of green belt as outlined in the proposals SP033, SP036, SP037, SP038, SP039, SP043. In particular SP033 and SP036, which include woodland which is intensely used by locals for recreational walks, SP038 SP039 which are current golf courses and important green spaces for recreation of Bebington and Spital population. The plan for SP043 is appalling, as this is the Dibbinsdale nature reservoir, one of the view remaining places for wildlife - it beggars belief that this has been proposed in the first place.
DOR02908	I am concerned at the loss of green spaces, both on the Green Belt, and also in towns. However, there is a shortage of housing, especially affordable housing. I dislike NIMBY's. I live extremely close to SHLAA 2042 & 2043 (Ashton Court, Banks Rd, West Kirby) - derelict buildings - and I can't believe the efforts taken (principally by one man - "would you like to sign a petition") to stop it's redevelopment. Sorry I didn't start a counter petition, but I have a life. Please get on with redeveloping that site. I think SHLAA 0716 & 0718 (the fields on Grange Road into West Kirby) give it a lot of character. They make it feel like you're somewhere rural, even though we're here. Please try to avoid developing those. Fields are also important because they soak up rain. You are planning for building to happen on SHLAA 0916 & 3009 also, and I am concerned that it would increase the amount of run off from Grange Hill. WRT the Green Belt - I don't understand what is proposed on site SP016 (West of Meols Drive, Hoylake.) You say, "Protect Royal Liverpool Golf Course and coastal nature reserve" but what else is there? Also don't forget please that there is a right of way across the Golf Course. SP013 - bats live there. I've seen them flying across the fields. Perhaps they reside in Stapeldon Wood, but would they be affected by construction in this area? If the Green Belt is built on, and I think this seems unavoidable, you MUST build AFFORDABLE homes. I have been very fortunate and am on the "property ladder" but many young people who rent & work in West Kirby cannot afford to do so. I don't want future generations to lose this land forever so a handful of £450k+ homes can be built. (That's one of my big reservations about the Hoylake Golf Resort) Lastly, where you do permit big housing developments, please ensure that they are designed around people, not cars, like Poundbury in Dorset. Living as I do in the centre of West Kirby, I have really appreciated being able to get around on foot. And parking these days is harder, so there is a need for good footpaths and cycle ways to connect these new developments to their surroundings. Thank you for taking the time to consult.
DOR02909	I do not believe that we need, as a borough, to commit to so many new houses - we don't have that projected population growth and a large number of empty properties. I am totally opposed to assigning any greenbelt for development - it must be protected for future generations. I am especially worried about plans for Irby - there is simply not the infrastructure to support the number of proposed houses and it will destroy the nature of a very close knit village.
DOR02910	Regarding SHLAA 2024, SHLAA 2025 As a local business owner who customers are not only local but also regional we feel it would be devastating to build on these two sites not only for our business but for the other small & national companies in our village. Bromborough is one of few successful villages because of what we all do and the demographics. The village holds its own despite being so close to the Croft retail park, this proposal will kill the whole area.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02911	I have been looking at the plans for Anselmians rugby club and the surrounding land that includes the nature reserve. I can't see any mention of the section 106 agreement between both parties. What has been agreed?
DOR02912	I believe any proposals for Bromborough village re the car park or civic centre area for mixed usage would be highly detrimental to village life and generally to the commercial premises - that area is needed to keep the hub of the community and commercial Area alive - the civic centre is much needed as we need community space for our children and all our events as a community. I live close to the village so need the car park personally but I know many people who visit the area and use it all The time. If people can't park they will go elsewhere and the commercial revenue will fall including business rates. New businesses to this village don't want these threats - they are investing and we are making progress e.g. revamp of muffs / new barbers/ restaurant etc - why threaten that ?
DOR02913	Bromborough village is a thriving community and high street for the council to propose using the car park, library and civic centre for building of any description is criminal. We are told to support our local high street and what you are proposing will kill it. I have lived here for 30+years and now can't walk to the village I rely on being able to use my car and park near the local shops. Please reconsider this ludicrous proposal
DOR02914	This is atrocious to earmark the precious green belt land that makes Wirral a great place to live and visit. Why is the Council not proposing Brown belt? This is about our children and grandchildren's futures PLEASE PLEASE DON'T DO THIS !!
DOR02915	<p>A) GREEN BELT I strongly believe that we should not build on any of Wirral's Green Belt because:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Studies have shown that Green Spaces benefit the health and wellbeing of people. 2. Wild life habitats need to be protected. 3. Climate Change is a huge problem. We need to preserve as many green spaces as possible to try to help to counter act the damage that has been done to the environment. <p>B) ONS HOUSE NUMBERS</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I think that the figure of 500 homes per year to be built should be challenged. It is still a lot more than the number calculated by [another respondent]. 2. There seems to be a lot of house building in Wirral at the moment, I hope that some of these houses will count towards the ONS target. <p>C) BROWN FIELD LAND Every effort should be made to make this land suitable for house building. That may be using compulsory purchase orders or using money/grants to clean contaminated land.</p> <p>D) GOLF COURSE A while ago I read somewhere that chemicals used on the lawns at golf courses are bad for the environment and wild life. So I do not think that any golf courses should be built on GREEN BELT land.</p> <p>E) NEW HOMES Should be as environmentally friendly as possible.</p>
DOR02916	Wirral needs its green belt land protected! With regard to the plan to build on Bromborough car park this is a ridiculous idea. The car park is full practically every day of the week! Does the council have any idea on the impact their plans have??? I think not! Wirral must not become a concrete jungle!!
DOR02917	<p>I wish to express my fierce opposition to the proposals put forward to release huge swathes of precious Green Belt land on the Wirral for housing development. The Green Belt is a vital space for the wellbeing of every citizen on the Wirral that should be cherished and protected for future generations. We live in an increasingly stressful world – only last week it was reported that Wirral NHS has one of the largest waiting lists for access to mental health treatment in the UK (https://www.bbc.co.uk/news/health-45895541). There is significant and growing evidence on the mental health benefits of green spaces and yet Wirral Council is proposing that we build on yet more of our precious Green Belt space. What madness is this?</p> <p>(https://assets.publishing.service.gov.uk/government/uploads/system/uploads/attachment_data/file/357411/Review8_Green_spaces_health_inequalities.pdf) Wirral Council has a duty to all its citizens to protect and maintain our local green spaces. I cannot understand or accept why they are proposing to build on the Green Belt when there continues to be sufficient Brownfield site building opportunities elsewhere within the peninsula. Moreover, it is disgraceful that Wirral Council, its employees and elected representatives have taken so long to produce a new Local Plan, which appears to be based on questionable figures to satisfy unrealistic and overinflated targets. I chose to live on the Wirral and raise a young family here because of the beautiful green spaces that surround us. It makes me sad to know that this is now under threat and I am frustrated that the pleas of local residents to stop a new Local Plan being steam-rolled through seem to be being ignored by the Council. I implore that the substantial opposition of local residents is listened to and heard and that the current Local Plan process is altered to take into consideration the views of the people, in order to ensure that the Wirral Green Belt is retained for the continued benefit of residents and visitors, and more importantly for future generations to enjoy. It may be stating the obvious, but once the Green Belt has been built on, we can never get it back.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02918	<p>1. Wirral is a peninsula and so cannot expand outwards. You should ask for the area to be treated like an island so that development is restricted</p> <p>2. The housing forecast should be reviewed in the light of historic population growth, which is I believe very low, and predicted economic growth. Over-optimistic forecasts have led to this demand for extra housing by the government</p> <p>3. The plan to build on greenbelt land will merge existing settlements and so lead to increasing urbanisation. This is supposed to be prevented by the regulations for green belt land. In particular, the plans for the area 'West of Column Road, West Kirby' merge the housing between West Kirby and the houses along the road by Caldby Rugby club and Thurstaston Hill</p> <p>4. More effort should be made to provide brownfield sites. What about town centres where shops are closing? Why not reduce the size of the available shopping area and build housing there? This would also have the advantage of bringing more people close to the shops and increase footfall and business for them.</p> <p>5. You will destroy the special character of the Wirral. People want to live here and visitors come because of this special character. They do not want to visit or live in an urban landscape.</p> <p>6. You will destroy valuable farmland, wildlife sites, leisure amenities in terms of footpaths and fields used by many people, acres of countryside</p> <p>7. Where will this end when the next planning review comes into force? Logically if we follow this path, there will eventually be no green space left in the Wirral. Surely that is the whole point of having designated green belt land</p> <p>8. PLEASE reconsider and PLEASE fight against the government requirements by revisiting your forecasts, asking for special consideration as a peninsula and not just putting forward to the public proposals with no apparent alternative.</p>
DOR02919	<p>I object to use of green belt land for the creation of new housing. I would like the Council to ensure all brown belt land is completely used up before even considering the use of green belt. As Peel Holdings have already submitted significant plans which address the suggested housing shortages, I feel the Council should completely withdraw from proposals to use of green belt.</p>
DOR02920	<p>I fully disagree with the plans to build on our precious green belt. If it is built on there is no getting it back. It is an integral part of maintaining people's health and wellbeing by providing opportunities for people to upkeep good physical and mental standards. There are plenty of empty wasted patches of land which could be used to build on without destroying the green belt, an important factor which makes Wirral such a beautiful and sought after place to live and bring up children.</p>
DOR02921	<p>I am extremely against building on greenbelt land for environmental reasons. The land helps to reduce flooding in our area by soaking up the rainfall. Some of this land is quite boggy anyway and therefore building on it will inevitably result in more flooding of housing. As a planet we need to reduce the warming of the earth. We have been advised to plant more trees in our gardens to help reduce global warming so why would you build on so much greenbelt land which would be hazardous to our planet. The road network in our area is already overloaded. Travelling through Heswall is gridlocked and cars now backup along other roads such as Whitfield Lane and Downham Road North to avoid the queues. These roads are getting very busy and are not made for commuter traffic. Our good friends have recently moved from there as they have seen traffic increase in recent years. It will get much worse with more houses and cars. Commuting to work is already very congested. Travelling towards Chester, Liverpool, M53 or Levers Causeway are the only way out of West Wirral and could not cope with more traffic. We are not connected on the rail network here which increases road use. With Avon bus company going into liquidation the number 88 bus no longer runs. This was the only bus connecting Heswall to Greasby and West Kirby. The only way is via car now which again increases congestion and damages the environment. Our doctors, dentists, schools and hospitals are already overstretched. We could not cope with increased demand. Using the Greenbelt will reduce the health of residents. Less fresh air for those with lung conditions will suffer. Our beautiful countryside cannot be replaced once it has been destroyed. Future generations will suffer as result of your poor judgement. It has now been revealed that we do not even need these extra houses on Wirral. There is sufficient brownfield sites to build on in our area. The population in Wirral is more elderly, childbearing aged women are a small percentage so we are not going to have a population explosion in our area. These houses are clearly unnecessary. Wirral should be looked at in its own merits not have a blanket government approach to calculating population figures.</p>
DOR02922	<p>I believe the local plan to be ill thought out with little to no regard for public opinion, concern or need. Green belt land is critical to the wellbeing of wildlife populations and by proxy the wellbeing of society. Councils do not own land, rather they are stewards of the land representing the will of the people. The green belt development plan set forth by Wirral borough council is not representative of the will of the people, on the contrary it is aligned only to moneyed hegemony. The people of Wirral will stand to prosecute Wirral Borough Council and the central government for failing to protect the citizenry from polluting air and restricting access to green space.</p>
DOR02923	<p>The Wirral Peninsula has beautiful green land which should not be built on. There is more than enough brownbelt land to build on. 15,000 homes is a huge amount and I feel it is too many for such a small area, this potentially amounts to 60,000 - 90,000 people, it's just too many and I strongly object.</p>
DOR02924	<p>Ridiculous proposal had a with flawed data. No consideration of the people environment and wildlife of the Wirral. Simply use brown sites in areas crying out for investment and development. Green belt development would be criminal and unjustified. I object wholeheartedly to these preposterous plans</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02925	This is the most ridiculous plan. Used flawed incorrect data to support the supposed housing demands. The consultations have been farcical with no minutes being taken and officers unable to answer questions raised. There is no need to release this green belt. The Wirral has sufficient brown sites desperate for regeneration. These plans are immoral...why would we ruin our beautiful peninsula to satisfy greedy developers. I the environmental impact will be catastrophic...wildlife killed off and for what a few more faceless homes. Utilise the already empty homes and derelict sights...you should question and fight back against the government's figured which you are entitled to do and as a council tax paying resident I demand you do so... There has been no fight back or logical thought process in this exercise and I'm also disgusted that the notices were sent out in unmarked enveloped and delivered with just junk mail...easily lost. Wirral borough council. Listen to the people who live work and pay taxes to live here. Keep our greenbelt. I wholly object to your plans 100%
DOR02926	I strongly object to the Green Belt being used for development. Wirral has an older population than the rest of England and schools have been closing in recent years. Is there really a need for more housing? More houses would bring more cars onto our already congested roads. Liverpool has been able to regenerate the waterfront and run down urban areas. We should be able to do the same.
DOR02927	As a resident of Saughall Massie I am extremely concerned about the Local plan to build on Green Belt land and wish to strongly OBJECT to these outrageous plans. Why build houses on protected green belt fields when 'Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified' ?? There are plenty of brown field sites crying out for proper redevelopment and would support the need for housing in the UK. Intensive housing development around Saughall Massie would create even more traffic and associated hazards. The area has already seen devastating traffic collisions in the past few years with catastrophic impacts on local families including the death of a child, known personally to myself. Do we really want to increase traffic further and the likelihood of this happening again?? I for one do not and object wholeheartedly. Removing the green belt protection from our village would immediately cause huge encroachment into the countryside (one of the five purposes of having the green belt is to PREVENT this from happening.) Air pollution would also be increased and as a society committed to protecting our planet for the wellbeing and health of our future children, I believe this is something you have not considered, another reason I strongly object to your plans. Saughall Massie is a beautiful residential area with an agricultural character and landscape. My house backs onto the farm and looks at the beautiful fields and cows and to take this away from myself and other residents is an outrage! We have already lost part of our protected countryside to the new Fire Station being built - tell me why we should lose even MORE protected land when Wirral does not currently have a housing need that justifies releasing more green fields. Taking away our fields and closing down the family farm who have been here for years is unjustifiable. Your plans to build completely ignore ALL of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and I cannot believe that is acceptable or justifiable to go ahead with your plans. Please accept this letter as my strong objection to your plans and take this opportunity to save the protected fields of Saughall Massie, it's unique agricultural character and heritage.
DOR02928	I am totally opposed to this. Who in the government has decided the need for this housing? Where are the jobs coming from to employ these people locally? Who is going to pay for the schools and hospitals that will be required? Where is the evidence that this amount of housing will be required. This is all too soon before Brexit and we don't know how this will affect things, don't we need this farm land to be more self-sufficient? What about the sites like Vauxhalls which may close and leave a significant site for development? Has anybody looked at the wildlife that will be affected, are there any protected species? The land at Barnston fields is needed, otherwise it will merge the villages of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston, is this not a fundamental need for greenbelt? It is a disgrace that the consultation limited the number of questions. Who sold the land to Peel? Why wasn't there a performance clause? The amount of land potentially affected will significantly change the Wirral as a whole. We are just increasing our presence for tourism, in fact we were named as one of the most underrated holiday destinations by the Telegraph. The government should be challenged on these figures at the highest level. Instead of putting these areas up for development why not get them designated as areas of outstanding beauty? It is also a disgrace that the people standing to make money on this were consulted first, the landowners and builders who stand to make a significant profit. Use the brownbelt, upgrade empty housing, and just stop this criminal destruction of The Wirral. Affordable housing? I bet the builders are rubbing their hands thinking about how much money that can make and just pay off the affordable housing aspect to the government.
DOR02929	It would be a great shame to build on this site. The rural area is much needed.
DOR02930	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR02931	No consideration has been made into the impact the proposed developments would have on the infrastructure, the current residents or the environmental aspects along with many other factors.
DOR02932	I am definitely AGAINST building on ANY greenfield sites. These should be protected for ever. There are plenty of other sites to build new houses in the Wirral and areas where housing can be brought back into serviceable use. I do not understand how Peel Holdings can be allowed to reduce the number of houses they originally promised and still be allowed to develop the Wirral Waters site. If they were forced to keep the original agreement, the council would meet its targets and stop threatening our green spaces. The Wirral is one of the few areas blessed with space, natural beauty and agricultural areas. These are precious natural and historic areas that also play a vital role in the Wirral's economy. We need to keep it that way for the benefit of wildlife, the environment, and our health and mental well-being.
DOR02933	Please do not take our green belt sites away from us. The whole reason the Wirral is a lovely place to live is the fact it still has beautiful Green open areas to enjoy. There are plenty of area and derelicts buildings that could be used for housing etc. Use the space better that is already built on rather than just taking more space. PLEASE DO NOT TAKE THE GREEN BELT AREAS

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02934	<p>The revised estimate of 400 houses per year should make meeting housing need in Wirral much more manageable, without resorting to using the greenbelt. The new Local Plan should make it easier to change use, thereby allowing much more mixed use developments, especially in central Birkenhead where the town centre is dying and could do with more dwellings in amongst the shops to help their viability. This has worked wonders for Liverpool over the last 15-20 years, it could work in Wirral. This would also make much more sense from a congestion point of view as Birkenhead is really well served by many amenities, bus and rail, meaning people don't need their cars for every journey. Some of the areas for development proposed in this consultation have no amenities and are not on bus or train routes. This should rule them out straightaway in any sensible plan, because building there which would mean more pollution, congestion and poor health for residents. Once the greenbelt is gone, it's gone forever. I do not believe that all other avenues have been fully exploited yet in order to avoid that scenario. Wirral bills itself as the 'Leisure peninsula'. Concreting over our green spaces is at odds with marketing Wirral as a pleasant place to spend your leisure time. Who wants to visit a borough full of soulless housing estates?</p>
DOR02935	<p>I write to protest in the strongest possible terms about the Government target for Wirral Council to build 800 houses annually, totalling 12,000 by 2035. I also disagree with Wirral Council's interpretation of the Government paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need for 12,000 homes has been calculated from NATIONAL Statistics for population projection, rather than LOCAL statistics. However, using the 'Compendium of Statistics' from the Council's 'Wirral Population Projection' the increase in population from 2018 to 2038 is projected to be 5,500 people. 2. The Council has identified 2 major 'employment sites' on the Wirral. They have not indicated any immediate plans to increase this number, it follows therefore that there is unlikely to be any large demands for more housing to meet any additional future employment needs. 3. The local population saw a fall in numbers between 1996 (the earliest year quoted on the Council website); 2009 of 4.6%. However, since then the population numbers have risen to similar numbers to 1996 (322,700 in 1996 & 322, 800 in 2017). This increase cannot be guaranteed to continue as there is still a significant lack of employment opportunities for all age groups. 4. In 2010 Mersey Docks and Harbour Board sold a large area of land next to the West Float Dock in Birkenhead (now known as Wirral Waters) to Peel Holdings. This is a brown field site and outline planning permission was granted to build 13,000. To date no houses have been built. At a recent Open Public Meeting organized by the Council for local residents, we were told that discussions between the Council and Peel Holdings have indicated that only 2,600 houses will be built. If more are needed, I would suggest a Compulsory Purchase Order on some of the land allowing either the sale of the land to another builder, or the building of Council/Social housing funded by central government or the local Council. 5. Close to Wirral Waters are large areas of derelict land around the dock area. This provides an ideal opportunity for further development along the lines of Salford Quays and the London Docklands, so providing a much needed upgrade in the whole Birkenhead area. 6. There are also a number of derelict, run down, unused sites and buildings in central Birkenhead and again, re-development of these areas would provide significant improvement for everyone. 7. In the absence of any significant progress in the development of Wirral Waters, the Council has identified a large number of areas of local green belt as potential building sites, and they are justifying this by saying they must meet the Government target. 8. Of Wirral's 157 square kilometres, 46% is already covered in houses. Figures given at the Open Meeting show that 13,000 additional houses would raise this to 67% of our precious land. In contrast, Cheshire West has 10% of land built on and the UK as a whole 6% (Source: Alasdair Rae, University of Sheffield. A Land Cover Atlas of the UK). 9. The one area of opportunity of further development in Wirral is the tourist industry which is a major part of the local economy. We currently have a number of SSSI and SSI sites, a rich heritage and are blessed with beautiful scenery and stunning views around our coast. Turning the area into a huge urban sprawl would have major implications for visitor numbers and earnings. 10. The National Guidance on Green Belt NPPF2 states that "Once established Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans". The Council has not identified any 'exceptional circumstances', to justify use of our precious green belt. In short, we do not need 12,000 extra houses and even if future demand changes, we have enough brown field sites; the development of which would transform the area and benefit everyone.
DOR02936	<p>Green belt land should not be sacrificed when there are large areas of derelict land that have been left to waste throughout the Wirral, specifically in areas of Birkenhead, Tranmere, Liscard and Wallasey. Rather than losing Green belt land to housing, losing green spaces which improve the appearance and health of the people of Wirral, more focus should be on re-development of derelict land that has been left to overgrow, attracting litter, pests and fly tipping. If the focus was on putting pressure onto those landowners to either build on the land or sell to someone who will, especially where planning permission has already been granted, this would improve the appearance of more run down areas of the Wirral, allow for more affordable housing (rather than building in greenbelt areas with higher housing costs) and use the infrastructure that is already in place in these areas, which would prevent additional pressure on Council budgets for maintenance costs of this additional infrastructure. Where planning permission is already in place for housing, then the timescales are reduced, so building can start more quickly and any additional pressure from increased numbers of planning applications taken off council planning department. Empty properties should also become a higher priority with owners of empty properties being approached to bring these properties back into use (or possibly face fines!). Could the council also introduce an initiative similar to that used in Liverpool where properties that have been left and need renovation be sold at highly reduced costs on the premise that people who buy them must bring them back to a liveable standard and reside in them for 5 years before they can be sold? Allowing building on Greenbelt land is unacceptable while there are empty properties, massive areas of land in derelict sites and derelict houses that have been left to rot rather than developed or redeveloped.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02937	I am absolutely disgusted that The Council are planning to take away our green belt areas which are used regularly by members of public and are needed to escape everyday pressures of life. There are so many Brown Belt areas that are abandoned on the Wirral and can be built on why destroy the very little green areas we have left? I completely oppose these proposals and feel very sad that the Council and the Government feel they can destroy our Beautiful green areas take them away from people for revenue. I for one will not be voting Conservative or labour again if this is the way we are treated we need to protect our beautiful environment not destroy it even further.
DOR02938	There should be no building on green field sites. There is no need for it. The council should be preserving the countryside. That is what makes the Wirral a desirable place to live. Affordable housing should be built on already built areas. What about the town centre? Town planners have made a mess of that. Most of it could be knocked down and built on. Rather than build yet another supermarket build houses on brownfield sites or convert derelict buildings into flats. Also with addition of more homes what about the infrastructure and how is the council going to support that? I am totally against proposals to build on the green belt.
DOR02939	I totally disagree with the plans to take green belt for building work when there are empty buildings and ruined brown belt that can be built on. Green belt is only being target due to the fact it is cheaper, which is fundamentally wrong.
DOR02940	We need to make sure green belt areas are not used and older sites internal to Birkenhead and inner built up areas are used.
DOR02941	We are a young family with two children who attend the local school in Heswall. The school is exceptional and uses the outdoor space to ensure the children learn and appreciate nature. They teach the children about the local wildlife and about all the trees and plants and reflect it back to the curriculum. They are taught the importance of nature and wildlife and are encouraged to be as eco-friendly as possible. To see that the land around the school and surrounding areas is devastating. Not only is it going to affect the way the children are taught within the school. But it will also add to the crazy amount of traffic that is already a problem around this area. I would be inclined to suggest that whoever decided that building more houses around this area was a good idea, come down to the school and surrounding areas and see how dangerous and busy it is. Will it take a serious accident for you to realise that more houses means more traffic and less safety for our children. Not to mention the schools then being oversubscribed. We have lived on the Wirral all our lives and chose to love here when we started our family. We love the outdoor space and enjoy being outside as much as we can. Wirral is a beauty spot and is only a beauty spot because of all the green belt that makes it a special place to live, but is also enjoyed by many visitors who come to the area to enjoy the scenery and beautiful landscapes. This will be ruined by overbuilding and over population.
DOR02942	My children age 11 and 10 and I are against the destruction of our greenbelt on Wirral for housing. The council needs to primarily make use of their resources to find brownfield sites plus empty properties for housing options. Use of greenbelt sites are not justified. The greenbelt exists for local people to enjoy, for wildlife and it also helps to determine natural breaks between neighbourhoods. Green and open spaces are important to the health and wellbeing of the residents of Wirral. Wirral council needs to show responsibility in looking after its existing residents and our children's children. Wirral council also needs to protect its unique and precious natural beauty which will be irreplaceable if house building on greenbelt is allowed. The council have also not made enough considerations about the infrastructure (schools/GPs/hospitals) will cope with increased demand. IT is already VERY difficult to get an appointment at my local GP. I hope the council will reverse their plan so far and start to show a willingness to work with their residents.
DOR02943	-Disagree green belt land released for development -dispute the number of houses required - where are the additional resources (school places, doctors, dentists etc) for the additional population? -why does Wirral have an above average empty housing stock? What is the council's policy on returning this housing stock to be sold or rented - why are resources (time/money) not being invested into developing Brown field sites?
DOR02944	Green Belt should be preserved at all costs.
DOR02945	There is plenty of room for building on brownfield sites and derelict empty houses in Wirral. We do not need to do this and MUST protect our greenbelt, when it's gone it's gone. The whole world is trying to be more environmentally responsible and Wirral (recently voted the most desirable place to live in the U.K. due to its greenbelt amongst other things) is proposing to do the exact opposite. We already have a higher incidence of respiratory problems on the Wirral due to proximity of industry, don't let's make it worse. We have rare barn owls, bats and animals in our greenbelt, destroying their habitat is AGAINST THE LAW ! The following article is in today's Sky news: Conservationists have warned of an "ecological apocalypse" resulting in a dramatic decline in vast numbers of species across the UK. Launching a People's Manifesto for Wildlife, broadcaster Chris Packham said the UK is witnessing a "mass extinction in our own backyards" due to a lack of regard for the environment - such as building roads and houses through natural habitats and using pesticides in farming.
DOR02946	I am deeply concerned about the plans to knock down the civic centre and library in Bromborough and develop on the car park behind the shops. This is a very busy car park that serves the village shops which will be decimated should this car park go. I live off Spital road and at peak times it is hard to get in and out of my road on to the main road which is bumper to bumper with traffic heading to and from junction 4 of the M53. Plans to build on land in the vicinity of the roundabout will result in absolute chaos on the surrounding roads! The vast majority of development seems to be scattered around small pockets of land north of the motorway - Birkenhead side and yet the vast majority of spare land is clearly south of the motorway-Heswall side. Have all possible brownfield sites been utilised? I and others have paid premium prices for their houses and pay expensive rates to live in areas with green spaces and access to local shops. I hope that sensible reconsideration of the proposals will be given and Wirral residents views will be taken seriously and their concerns addressed and that this is not simple let a paper exercise.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02947	I feel that the construction of 12000 homes mostly on Green .Belt land will be detrimental to the local communities in Bebington and Storeton. The extra traffic lack of Schools and Health facilities. We barely cope with this now without the threat of a further 12000 homes. In all the meetings and information we get there is no mention of any form of infrastructure, and the most important thing of all the loss of Agricultural Land .
DOR02948	Please inform me about changes to the use of the car park in Bromborough
DOR02949	I wish to object to the proposed allocation of two areas in West Kirby as Housing development sites. the two areas are: North of 90 and 92 Grange Road and East of 92 Grange Road. As well as providing important areas for wildlife within the town, these areas give West Kirby a unique aesthetic 'feel' as you drive down column hill into the town, with grazing sheep and mature deciduous trees. There are evergreen oaks (Quercus ilex) not seen anywhere else in west Wirral and undisturbed open space for birds and other wildlife (unlike nearby Ashton Park which is public access 'disturbed' open space).
DOR02950	SP062. If 1,800houses are to be built it reasonable to assume there will be at least 1000 children living there of which maybe half will be under 11. All of the local primary schools are full if not oversubscribed . 500 children is 2 schools the size of Heswall Primary. Where will these be built? Where will the extra medical Centre go not to mention recreational facilities - no local swimming pool
DOR02951	I am totally against releasing green belt land for housing or other development. The rationale (as per the five tests: checking unrestricted sprawl, prevention of merging towns, safeguarding countryside, preserving historic setting and character of towns and encouraging recycling of derelict urban land) for land having been designated green belt land has not changed - there is no new reason why land should lose its green belt status. I have no faith in the central government calculation of the number of houses required to be built and, even if green belt land were released, it would certainly not be translated into social housing - more likely it would be executive housing that would be built - probably to be bought up by commuting Southerners taking advantage of shortened train journeys (another ridiculous plan) and cheaper Northern properties ... so much for easing the housing shortage for inhabitants of Wirral who currently cannot afford to get on the housing ladder! Our green belt land is the 'lungs' of the country - so, when government focus shifts attention (which it will eventually) to reducing carbon footprint and promoting eco-friendliness, we will deeply regret having allowed developers to get their hands on land which should be left to do its work of maintaining a healthy environment. This is our heritage and it is our duty to maintain it for our children and grandchildren. Specifically, I oppose four areas of proposed green belt land development: (1) Storeton Woods - this ancient woodland must not be encroached upon, both for historic and environmental reasons; (2) Bromborough Civic Centre / car park - the Centre provides valuable community engagement in many guises (for instance, it has one of the few ballroom dance floors in the area and I have attended the Wirral Dance Club (mainly catering for over 50's for over 11 years). Local businesses (including the Co-op) need the car park to remain in situ - to get rid of that parking will sound the death knell to Bromborough businesses and reduce employment in the area; (3) the recreation park between Brackenwood Golf Course and the residential area of Wirral Gardens (CH63) must not be poached for development. It belongs to the people and is well used by families, older people and dog walkers. It is essential for physical and mental health that this area remains as a place where people in the vicinity can readily connect with nature; and (4) the area around Claremont Farm should be protected. The family who farm the land have put in a lot of hard work and dedication to create an economically viable farm enterprise that strongly promotes the well-being of the family, connection with nature and an understanding of eco balance. I would strongly oppose any proposed residential development in that area that would be to the detriment to what they have thus far achieved.
DOR02952	SP060. This section of SP060 extends from the back of the houses on Thingwall Road down to a public pathway and either side are the gardens of Leafield Close, Daleside and Marlston Avenue with Harrock Wood making up the 4th side. I have been here 16 years and in that time planning applications have gone in by the landowner and each time have been rejected apparently due to the proximity of Harrock Wood. He was apparently told that he would never get planning permission because of Harrock Wood. I have been told that he now has sold out to 2 entrepreneurs apparently doing a deal with them that he will get a percentage of all the houses sold. So why when there are obviously people here just out for a fast buck in a huge money making venture running in on the back of green belt release should the planning permission be granted on this piece of green belt when it has previously been denied for the reason of the wood and its proximity when it will have such an impact on the ecology of the wood. Also for consideration in the proposal for so much housing in Irby is that we currently have to queue to get out of Irby when approaching the roundabout coming from Pensby and then again at the roundabout coming from Barnston. It can take up to 20 minutes to half an hour to get to the Arrowe Park pub set of lights. How much more delay will these hundreds of houses and all their cars cause! Not to mention the impact on the local GP centre when it is already difficult at times to get an appointment. Back to the wood: I have been in contact with NT who own Harrock Wood and they are just as angry and fearful of the affect this will have on such an ancient woodland. I was told that their North-West team were on the case so I'm sure that they have made contact and made their feelings known. This field is teeming with wildlife as there is a pond in the centre that doesn't appear to have your protection unlike others. The most outstanding visitor we have visit us regularly are a pair of buzzards that use the field as a hunting ground. What a shame that green belt like this should be given up forever. Quite frankly it's scandalous when there are many other options and particularly in the light of the revised figures for new homes on Wirral that have just been released. Please be sensible about the land that you give up and only if you have to. Someone I know who is not from the area but loves Wirral for its green spaces, recently made an observation that Birkenhead could be the next successful regeneration like the success that Salford has been, if the money available is used for that. Not only would the housing issue be solved without touching green belt but it would create much needed jobs, also making it an area that visitors would want to come to thereby increase revenue from the area. A long comment I know but thank you for reading as this means lot to so many people.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02953	There are many non-green belt areas on the Wirral that could be re-developed before taking up any green belt areas. There has been little thought put into where housing is actually required and the impact on those areas that will be subjected to additional houses/flats, the congestion this will bring, the negative impact on not being 'in keeping' with the area and the knock on financial impact re. house valuations when people have worked and saved hard to live in quiet areas
DOR02954	<p>GENERAL; We consider that there has been an over-estimation of the number of housing units required in the Wirral and that the increase in demand over time has been exaggerated. This needs to be examined more fully as there is no point planning for accommodation and use of Green Belt land if it is not needed. Full use needs to be made of Brownfield sites and available pockets of urban land - this needs to be utilised promptly. Empty properties need to be brought back into use and requests for planning permission speeded up to avoid unnecessary delays. An important priority should be to encourage Peel Group to develop the Wirral Waters as originally intended with as little delay as possible. Green Belt land should be used as a last resort - once it has been used for development, the loss to the Green Belt is forever. These green spaces are important for agricultural use, wildlife and biodiversity, recreation and as a 'carbon sink'. Green spaces are vital for a healthy environment and population. The Wirral SHMA and Housing needs Study (May 2016) states that there is sufficient supply of properties in West Wirral, but the cost of these properties was making them inaccessible to first time buyers and for the physically and mentally disabled. Therefore if selected areas of Green Belt land are developed for housing, the accommodation should be for these groups only and not for more expensive housing of which there is already adequate provision. It is important to build accommodation for housing need not for the aspirations of wealthy home buyers or developers/builders looking for lucrative deals. This means that the infrastructure in these areas will need to be improved - first time buyers, including those with young children, and those with disabilities need housing with easy access to affordable public transport, shops, amenities and support services all of which are currently mainly to be found in the eastern side of the borough. The sites in the Local Plan for employment development are mainly in the eastern side of the borough so accommodation needs to be built within easy travelling distance.</p> <p>BARNSTON VILLAGE AND WOODLANDS DRIVE We consider that Barnston is not a suitable area for housing development. It is a Conservation Area and any development would impact on the character of the village. It is also in close proximity to Barnston Dale, an important area for wildlife and bio-diversity. Animals such as foxes, badgers and birds of prey have a wide range in order to sustain their populations and any development would effect this and put their continued existence in this area at risk. Barnston Road in the dip area (by Fox and Hounds Pub) and the narrow part of Storeton Lane are not suitable for increased amounts of traffic. There are queues of traffic at the junction of these roads on a daily basis. The drainage infrastructure would need to be improved as there will be increased run-off of rainwater which the treatment works at Barnstondale would be unable to cope with - there are currently overflows into the stream in storm situations.</p>
DOR02955	<p>In considering the proposal to release large tracts of green belt land to the east of the motorway for housing development and the requirement for much of the housing to be affordable housing available to young families, I would ask the council to consider the following. Before any decisions are taken on the release of land for residential development Independent research needs to be carried out in those areas to assess the levels of air pollution. The prevailing wind on The Wirral blows West to East. Increasing the housing density in these areas will increase the traffic flow resulting in more hold up with traffic stationary or moving more slowly resulting in higher levels of pollution. Fears of the harmful effects of traffic emissions have been raised in a major study linking motorway pollution with permanent and life-limiting damage to children's lungs. People who live within 500 metres of a motorway grow up with significantly reduced lung capacity, and even children who have never experienced asthma are at risk, scientists warn. Previous research by the same scientists showed that children who grew up in areas of high pollution and car fumes were more likely to develop asthma. But the new study provides strong evidence that car emissions stunt crucial lung development in children between the ages of 10 and 18. The researchers suggest that traffic generated fumes are to blame. A Department of Health spokeswoman is quoted as saying "This evidence will be considered amongst other evidence of possible ill health from motorways or other vehicle emissions". Children who live near a major highway are not only more likely to develop asthma or other respiratory diseases, but their lung development may also be stunted. Children are especially vulnerable to auto-emission health impacts. Women who live near areas of high automobile traffic during pregnancy have a 20 – 30% higher chance of having children with lung impairment. (Morales, et al., 2014) Auto emission PM exposure from nearness to high traffic during the third trimester of pregnancy doubles the risk for autism. (Raz, et al., 2014). According to a study that appeared in the Feb. 17 issue of The Lancet and is now available online, researchers at the Keck School of Medicine of USC found that children who lived within 500 meters of a freeway, or approximately a third of a mile, since age 10 had substantial deficits in lung function by the age of 18 years, compared to children living at least 1,500 meters, or approximately one mile, away. "Someone suffering a pollution-related deficit in lung function as a child will probably have less than healthy lungs all of his or her life," said lead author W. James Gauderman, associate professor of preventive medicine at the Keck School of Medicine. "And poor lung function in later adult life is known to be a major risk factor for respiratory and cardiovascular diseases." The report draws upon data from the Children's Health Study, a longitudinal document of respiratory health among children in 12 Southern California communities. More than 3,600 children around the age of 10 were evaluated over a period of eight years, through high school graduation. Lung function tests were taken during annual school visits, and the study team determined how far each child lived from freeways and other major roads. "Otherwise-healthy children who were non-asthmatic and non-smokers also experienced a significant decrease in lung function from traffic pollution," Gauderman said.</p> <p>"This suggests that all children, not just susceptible subgroups, are potentially affected by traffic exposure." Lung function was assessed by measuring how much air a person can exhale after taking a deep breath and how quickly that air can be exhaled. Children's lung function develops rapidly during adolescence until they reach their late teens or early 20s. A deficit in lung development during childhood is likely to translate into reduced function for the remainder of life. "This study shows there are health effects from childhood exposure to traffic exhaust that can last a lifetime," said David A. Schwartz, director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. "The [institute] is committed to supporting research to understand the relationship between environmental exposures and diseases, and to identify ways to reduce harmful exposures to all populations, especially children so they can realize their full potential for healthy and productive lives." Previous studies have demonstrated links between lung function growth and regional air quality. The findings in this study add to that result, demonstrating that both regional air pollution</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>and local exposure to traffic pollution affect lung development. People living “downwind” of highways with 4 or more lanes (2 lanes in each direction) are exposed to higher levels of fine particulate matter. (Brugge, et al. 2007) However, this circumstance does not exempt one side of a highway from PM dangers. In many regions, wind direction changes not only depending on weather conditions, but also between day and night. In addition it must be considered that the resulting urban sprawl will change the nature and character of the environment on the Wirral and cannot be justified in terms of population growth and employment prospects in the area. The need to use green belt lands for housing is purely driven by outside agencies who want to exploit the area to make vast profits by building high cost properties in large quantities. There are many brown field sites which can be built on removing some of the deprivation which already exists on the Wirral. The current proposals will turn further large areas of existing housing on the Wirral into run-down deprived area. The redevelopment along Church road Tranmere is what we should be aiming for as an excellent example of how to reach targets while improving the environment. Natural habitat for animals and SSSI sites are prevalent in many of the packages of land that you wish to release from greenbelt land. The fields on Claremont Farm are worked and planted with crops routinely and provide work for their employees, produce for their shop, animal feed to Leahurst Veterinary College. The wildlife in these fields are too many to list but include buzzards, sparrowhawks, woodpeckers, various tits, tree creepers, owls, bats and foxes. The fields are also regularly visited by large flocks of geese during migration season. The land drainage in this area is into numerous ponds on the land and enters the River Dibbin and even the M53 drains into culverts under the motorway, and runs off onto local fields so any future developments would need sufficient drainage for the heavy flooding, that is regularly seen on the M53 after heavy downpours. Please consider my points before any decision is made over the change of use from greenbelt, and if that is successful prior to any individual planning applications,</p>
DOR02956	<p>I wish to object to the proposed reclassification of green belt land in the Irby area, in particular the areas designated as “South of Thingwall Road” (SP060) and “West of Glenwood Drive” (SP019B) These are areas of rare natural beauty. They provide pathways, views and peaceful walking space for the local community. They accommodate the habitats of countless local wildlife species. They are good for Irby’s lungs, legs and minds. Any attempt to develop this area for housing would be misguided. SP060 sits on a flood zone. I remain sceptical of assurances that developers would channel the water away successfully particularly during flood periods, given that the top of nearby Cornelius Drive was constructed in the same area and my mother’s gardens still flood annually. I do not believe that the Wirral’s stock of brownfield sites has been assessed competently. I do understand that the preparation of brownfield sites provides lower profit margins for property developers, which explains their appetite for greenfield sites. I doubt that the properties planned for areas such as Irby would be affordable to the intended beneficiaries of the government housing programme, i.e. first-time buyers, and would more likely be aimed at wealthier buy-to-let consumers. I believe the scale of housing demanded by the review has been overstated. On the 23rd March 2018 the Secretary of State for the ministry of housing, communities and local government admitted that the Wirral is not an area of high housing pressure. Indeed ten times the area of green belt has been singled out compared with other English local authorities. Destroying this environment would be a rash and short-sighted act of vandalism. I strongly urge you to reconsider any plans you have to reclassify these regions, such that building would be permitted there.</p>
DOR02957	<p>Use of Green Belt land for new builds should not happen. The number of new houses needed is in dispute with council own figures showing a decrease in population in coming years. Please stop this disgraceful opportunism to line developers pockets. Make use of brown field sites and refurbish the existing housing stock to meet demand. This needs proper debate rather than being shut down by councillors in meetings using procedures to prevent public opinion being heard and valid questions must be answered properly rather than being ignored. This is meant to be a democracy.</p>
DOR02958	<p>Yes great, but let's make it all social housing hey. ?? Instead of some housing developers fat pocket.. you've gotta love Wirral council..NOT.</p>
DOR02959	<p>Whilst it is recognised that some greenbelt land would be required to meet the housing target, the focus should stay with trying to use brownfield and regenerate areas like Birkenhead which are in need of root and branch development. The Wirral waters plans are a perfect example of this and will undoubtedly improve the area as has happened on Tyneside, in Leith and Liverpool docks. I am also concerned that any new development on greenbelt will have no provision for schools and shops or surgeries etc, thus adding to already congested roads which the new residents will have to use in order to perform the most basic errands. Pollution and attempting to reduce car usage will be impacted negatively. English council planning over the years has been appalling in this respect and it is well recognised as a major social issue affecting quality of life. In a similar vein employment prospects in west Wirral are nowhere near what is required to meet the local plan, again meaning more cars/traffic loading. The cost of any new homes in these areas will only be affordable to the medium and high earning public who are prepared to make long commutes. In West Kirby estate agents now insist that rental per month x36 should be a person's minimum wage to show they can afford the rent, and this will be replicated across west Wirral again limiting access/opportunity to the few and not solving housing needs or generating local community based employment. I am sure most of the above is well known but the Wirral is a delicately balanced area which for the last 40yrs has struggled with attracting big company investment. The likes of Vauxhall and Cammell Launds have kept going but they are the few. Therefore much of the revenue collected is tourism based i.e. greenbelt and coastal. That is why these areas should be developed on a wholesale scale only as a last resort recognising that other revenue streams will be impacted, and quality of life reduced, making the area less attractive to visitors and potential new residents</p>
DOR02960	<p>I object strongly to the extensive loss of green belt land throughout the Wirral. Separation of settlements with their own identity will be lost, e.g. Saughall Massie merged with Greasby and Moreton. Many areas have poor public transport provision and are not close to employment facilities so car use will be increased adding to pollution and congestion. Population forecasts for the Wirral don’t appear to justify widespread house building and the bulk of smaller household provision should be on the east Wirral areas earmarked for regeneration and close to employment and transport. Farmland and grazing land will be lost. The unique green space and amenity views on the Wirral will be severely damaged.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02961	As a resident of Rigby Drive, Greasby I am completely opposed to the current development plans. I feel that the proposed action to build on our 'protected' green sites is unnecessary and detrimental to our environment and community. In particular I am concerned about the pollution, and irreversible damage this would cause to our wildlife. My road is the main route to three local schools, already at capacity with traffic at peak times. A development in the area would only increase this problem, and would have a negative impact on the safety of children making their way to school.
DOR02962	I am completely against the proposed development plan for housing and industrial development in and around Eastham Village area and this includes the playing fields in particular. Eastham and Bromborough villages do not require any further enlargement, we supposed to be trying to improve the environment not destroy it with more traffic and pollution. I do not normally comment but find this so important I have to say Don't do it.
DOR02963	Green belt land needs to be preserved at all costs. The image & beauty of the Wirral is through that green belt land & without it you'd be destroying the essence of the Wirral.
DOR02964	[SAME AS DOR02094]
DOR02965	Myself and my husband are very concerned about Wirral Borough Council's proposals to release Greenfield sites on the Wirral as part of the Local Plan. In 2016 we took the decision to relocate here from North Wales, with our two young children, so that we could be closer to where we both work in Liverpool City Centre. One of the key reasons we chose to buy a house and settle on the Wirral rather than other locations near to Liverpool was the beautiful, scenic countryside on the peninsula and the opportunities for walks and outdoor recreational activities. We were also attracted to the area by its distinctive village and rural communities. In summary, like many other residents, we chose to live on the peninsula and raise our family here because of its open spaces. We are opposed to the Council's proposals to build on the Greenbelt. The people of Wirral have been told that the Council need to build 12000 new homes based on Government projections for housing needs on the Wirral. It concerns us greatly that the Council's own population projections (in a report produced by WBC entitled 'Wirral Compendium of Statistics 2017) predict a falling population on the Wirral over the next 15 years – this contradicts the Government projections that the Council are using as a basis to justify the release of precious greenfield sites. The Council should be challenging the Government's targets, particularly since The Office for National Statistics have reviewed their original figures for Wirral, and now recommend that only 5923 houses are needed as opposed to 12000 as currently accepted by the Council. The Council should also consider the analysis of population trends and the recommended housing targets provided by other independent professionals (such as [another respondent]), who have demonstrated that there is no need to release any Green Belt land in order to provide even the original, inflated 'Housing Need', let alone the much lower requirement reflected in the latest ONS growth forecasts. If the ONS figures are to be used as a basis for determining future housing needs, then Wirral Council should prioritise the development of brownfields sites in the area, on which there is sufficient space for new houses if these are needed in future. It is also our understanding that Wirral Waters has planning permission for 13000 new houses and that 6450 of these could be built during the 15 year local plan period. This more than covers the number of houses required according to the latest ONS growth forecasts. We simply cannot understand why Wirral Council are considering releasing Green Belt in that case. As residents we are very concerned about the environmental impacts of such developments. Our green belt helps to mitigate climate change, and the loss of these sites would increase the amount of traffic (which is already heavy) and therefore pollution. We are also concerned about the pressure and impact that an increased population would have on Schools in the area (which are already oversubscribed in the Irby, Greasby and Thurstaston) and local health services (when I needed a blood test at my GP surgery recently, I was told they didn't have any appointments until the end of November). We strongly feel that the Council's proposal to destroy precious greenbelt is unnecessary and that it should be protected for the continued delight of Residents and Visitors alike, and more importantly for future generations to enjoy. Please take our concerns and views into consideration as part of your consultation and do not release our greenbelt to developers.
DOR02966	I support the release of Green Belt land for housing. There is so much deprivation and poor housing in Wirral, particularly around Birkenhead. All additional housing will overall, bring down the price of housing on Wirral and make better quality housing and affordable housing accessible to the less well off. Simple market forces. Wirral needs a step-change in attitudes to help the deprived.
DOR02967	As the recent paper produced by ITPAS demonstrates, the council not for the first time is presenting a very opaque case for amongst other issues, population growth and the 'necessity' to utilise green belt land for additional homes development. Using your arguments and conclusions appears to be based on inaccurate and sloppy research which should it go ahead would inevitably lead to a poor outcome for the infrastructure and social and lifestyle benefits derived from living on the Wirral. As a family who moved to the Wirral by choice we object strongly to the councils apparent gung ho approach to these developments and demand that this current consultation should be stopped forthwith and readdressed using unbiased and reliable information.
DOR02968	Not thought through properly and rushed when you had ample time to get this sorted. There are ample brown field site to fulfil the governments requirements. The population of the Wirral is reducing not increasing as stated.
DOR02969	In common with many people I am concerned that the apparent future requirements have been exaggerated and overstated. Whilst I appreciate that there is a great deal of 'NIMBY' nevertheless the impact on Wirral's very special Green Belt area would be catastrophic and unacceptable. I hope that the huge sensitivity that has been shown by the general public will be taken on board
DOR02970	My personal area of interest is around Storeton and Barnston village. I find it unthinkable that the council would consider building in this green belt area. The infrastructure is already inadequate for the amount of traffic that has to pass through this region. As a resident of Barnston I tend to travel out of the area using one of three routes. Storeton lane to the junction with Barnston road. Station road onto Red Hill Rd or Rest Hill Road leading in to Mount Road. These routes are already struggling with the volume of traffic as they are country lanes. To introduce several hundred homes in this area would cause traffic chaos, particularly at peak periods.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	This area indeed much of Wirral is popular with its residents and visitors who enjoy the green open spaces. None of us wish to see this blighted by housing estates. There are many brown belt sites that already have better infrastructure for extra houses. Shops , schools parks, social activities etc. The region I live in barely serves the community now. This can be said if many of the sites which have been identified by developers. It has been suggested that many of the green belt sites would see executive housing built. I don't see how that helps the housing crisis and the inaccurate figures that have been put forward by the council. First time buyers and people looking for affordable housing will not be attracted to executive estates in the country. Young families want to be near schools and shops and amenities for social activities. Why would they be interested in housing in the country. I see pound signs as the motivation for taking more green belt land for construction. Peel holdings have promised to build houses in the dock land region and many brown sites lay derelict and unsightly. I totally object to green belt land being used for development.
DOR02971	Have a good look at what your proposing. There goes all are green belt no more countryside. All of you just have a look, Wirral isn't going to look as lovely after all the work you have planned. What about using all the houses that aren't getting used or where there has been a building but no longer. Do you realise we live on an island it is all good and proper saying we need more houses but we need to make a compromise and this isn't it. It will get to a point where there will be nowhere to go or walk what happens when all the green has gone where will we build then and are future for are kids to play and have fun. Thanks for listening.
DOR02972	We are writing to object to any incursion into the Green Belt on Wirral because we do not believe the housing need exists for such a drastic step: • First, in the light of the latest (2016) ONS based projections just published and, using the Government Standard Method, the minimum number of dwellings should be recalculated required to the lower figure of 7320 over 15 years (488 per year).The Council's July Cabinet report estimates a supply of 8735 new dwellings (7635 new dwellings and a provision of 1100 for Wirral Waters) over the Plan period. Using the demand figure of 7320 from above, this would make a surplus of 1415. • Secondly, in our view the Council has not taken sufficient account of the potential from Wirral Waters. 1100 homes should be allocated to the first of the three Plan Periods (to 2025). The Council should make provision in the period between 2025 and 2035 for a further 5350 homes at Wirral Waters. This would significantly exceed the Council's July Cabinet shortfall of 4990 and contribute to a surplus when using the new ONS projections. • Thirdly, in its briefings the Council stated that it has added 20% of the 12,000 (i.e. 2400 dwellings) to meet a "National Planning Policy Framework" (NPPF2) requirement arising from previous under-delivery. We think that the Council has misinterpreted the NPPF2. This requires a buffer to be "moved forward from later in the Plan period". It does not increase the total number of dwellings to be provided, merely their timing. • Fourthly, the Council has provided for 60 windfall sites per year which are not foreseeable in advance but which arise as the years go on. Our understanding is that this is a low estimate. Furthermore the reuse of empty properties where active programmes are in place need to be better accounted for. We think that the Council should review both its historic achievements in bringing properties back into use, review windfall application rates and recalculate its previous housing delivery numbers. We are also very concerned that the Council has identified a number of locations (infill sites) between the Wirral Way and the Estuary where "potential infill opportunities currently appear to exist." We think that there is no justification for such infill (given our comments above about the lack of housing need). Further, the Wirral Way is an important recreational amenity for local people and visitors and is also of historic interest, being the first designated country park in England. It particularly serves the requirements in para 141 of NPPF2 that "Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance their beneficial use". Although there is development to the east of Davenport Road, the area between Davenport Road and the estuary is largely undeveloped and it remains a key part of the Wirral Way. The Local Plan should also take into account the proposed Birkenhead to Welsh Border section of the proposed English Coast Path. Development of parcels SP096 (part), SP100, SP101 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.
DOR02973	I wish to oppose development in Wirral Green Belt, generally. I fully support the detailed, comprehensive submissions made by The Heswall Society, Wirral Society and Wirral Wildlife Group of Cheshire Wildlife Trust and Cheshire WT. I am [a member] of Wirral Wildlife and a Trustee of The Heswall Society. It is said that WMBC seeks to build expensive houses in prime locations to boost Council Tax Receipts. We need starter homes and sheltered accommodation for the disadvantaged people of Wirral along the Mersey coast. All brown field land must be developed first. The Peel Holdings land must also be developed in North Birkenhead and Wallasey. The plans if implemented would ruin the unique environment of Wirral for ever. Urban sprawl would merge communities, major problems for provision of transport, NHS, Education would arise.
DOR02974	I wish to object to the building of housing on the Green Belt, around the Heswall area, especially in the area around Riverbank Rd/Sea bank Rd /Davenport Rd area. The area is of outstanding beauty and is not suitable for additional housing, for the following reasons. 1. The area is home to significant amounts of wildlife, Bats, Badgers, foxes and birds. 2. The area can only be accessed by 3 routes, Station Rd, Cottage lane and wittering lane, all of which are narrow and already struggle to cope with existing traffic. The roads feeding those 3 routes are also narrow and again cannot cope with increased traffic. 3. It is difficult already, to obtain a place in the 2 local primary schools, St Peter's and Gayton Primary. There will not be spaces available for additional children. 4. Lower Heswall is a conservation area, and is already a bottleneck for traffic, and is dangerous already for children, who attend St Peter's and Gayton primary schools, to cross. A pedestrian crossing would cause even more obstruction. Increased traffic from additional housing would make the lower village even more hazardous. 5. There are not enough jobs in the Wirral already, The housing in the Green Belt would be "executive" types, well over £500 000. This will mean that there will be more commuting, and increased traffic for those seeking higher paid jobs, in the city.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02975	Before even considering using any of the green belt for development all other avenues should be fully exhausted. Having lived on the Wirral for almost all of my 61 years I see a number of areas/streets/houses that have lay derelict for a considerable number of years yet they do not appear on any of your lists (unless I've missed them!) - One example being the old River Streets area in Beaufort Road. Also I noted you have plans to change existing car parks when there is presently little or no free parking around the local shops in a number of areas. Are you determined to force all of our local shops to close?
DOR02976	I wholly dispute the process of the Local Plan consultation. It is evident that inadequate / conflicting figures / justification have been presented at meetings to date surrounding this matter. At the outset It is clear the whole process is entirely questionable, deserving a full review of coherence and legality. The release of Green Belt land is a socially transformative 'wrong turn' which will irreversibly affect our landscape and is not a move that should be taken lightly without more robust figures and an informed view on housing typology, quality and density (rather than scattergun density calculations to the release of ad-hoc areas of land). Any further review should better define the protection of historic villages such as Storeton and treasured landscape features such as Storeton Woods, whilst also proving the adequate provision of infrastructural support, e.g. school places and GP services in the chosen locations. Our side of the M53 requires this pastoral amenity more than those of lower density to the West. Storeton in particular represents a green lung for people from the locality to enjoy such activities as walking, cycling and horse riding. Release of land for commercial house builder 'estates' should not be viewed as the only viable solution to the creation of new homes without a more thorough review of existing consents, brownfield sites and empty properties. With recent release of new figures, the whole process requires repeat and more professional analysis to prevent mistakes that will shape generations or indeed result in further public challenge.
DOR02977	I am utterly opposed to any development of the greenbelt and do not accept the premise there is insufficient brownfield land. I am a resident of Irby. The thing which gives it some character is the very fact it is NOT part of a continuous urban sprawl. The proposals to develop land East of Glenwood Drive and north of Thingwall Road will merge Thingwall, Irby and Pensby into a large urban mass with no divide.
DOR02978	Use the 16000 brownfield sites to build new homes and not on our greenbelt. Spend some of the money the council lends to other councils in GB to bring back the 6000 homes back in to use, and use some of Peel holdings lands they are sitting on. last but not least when the greenbelt gone ITS GONE FOR GOOD
DOR02979	My comments are specific to GB Parcel SP061: The highways are not capable of supporting increased volumes of traffic and have many severe bottle necks. There is no rail connections within reasonable distance of Thingwall, Pensby or Barnston. Plot SP061 sits outside of the areas categorised as easily accessible. There is a limited number of local amenities. Within SP061 there is a small pond supporting Great Crested Newts - A simple survey would prove this. Within the plot SP061 sits the local reservoir which supplies the entire Wirral with water. Building within the immediate vicinity poses a threat to the integrity of the supply. Although my comments are very basic, there is significant evidence within the review documents published which clearly shows that site SP061 is not a sustainable plot and has serious negative environmental, social and economic impact.
DOR02980	We have enjoyed the Green belt between Prenton, Landican, Barnston, and Storeton for many years now, and appreciate the improvements to access by the Council i.e. path/cycle track along Lever Causway, Landican lane and Roman road. We appreciate the need for more housing, even if it means encroaching on these areas, but feel it unreasonable to build here until all the brown field sites are used up to the full. We hope our children will still be able to enjoy the Wirral in twenty years' time!
DOR02981	On behalf of the trustees and members [of Wirral Barn Owl Trust], I write to object to the release of any Green Belt land on the Wirral for development. Wirral's Green Belt is important for biodiversity and, in particular, for protected species of birds and animals, such as a Barn Owls. We have worked hard for almost 20 years to restore a viable population of wild Barn Owls to the Wirral peninsula. This is now unnecessarily at risk, and we demand that the council give this particular aspect further consideration in line with your statutory responsibility. As a public authority in England you have a statutory duty to have regard, in exercising your functions (so far as is consistent with the exercise of your functions) to the purpose of conserving biodiversity (s40 Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006). 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 would like to be consulted about the Local Plan.
DOR02982	The Local Plan is flawed due to the fact that future housing requirements will actually be very much lower than your original stated needs. Green Belt land may well be prime sites for development and housing for the few who can afford it but these areas are needed by the many for leisure and relaxation. Even if the view is across a farmers field, it is a pleasant view. Animal and bird habitats are constantly under threat and Green belt land serves as breeding and resting grounds for many diverse species of life. There are many brownfield sites that could be developed for housing needs and these should be prioritised for any large scale housing development. Green Belt land should remain as such and we should be thinking about what legacy we are going to leave for future generations. Once green belt land is gone it is gone forever. There are also many empty properties on the Wirral and more people should be employed by the Council to help, and also to encourage owners to get these in a habitable state for tenants to live in them. We should not touch our green belt in the Wirral. Far too much is already being proposed to be built on and it all should be prevented and stopped including the Golf Resort in Hoylake. I object to any of our Green Belt being developed upon.
DOR02983	How is the 12, 000 new homes figure calculated and what criteria was used to come to that amount? It's my opinion that house building on that scale will simply destroy what makes the Wirral such a great place to live. The pockets of green space between existing towns and villages are essential for things like agriculture and leisure uses, without them we end up with non-descript urban sprawl. By all means develop brownfield sites but let's not ruin the Wirral by building onto greenfield areas. Can the Council not reject this Govt figure or contest it in some way, especially if the

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	consultation is overwhelmingly against the 12, 000 figure.
DOR02984	Levers causeway proposed building project would be disastrous for the committee. Do not build on any green belt land. Use the huge areas of brown belt land instead.
DOR02985	The Wirral is an enclosed piece of land surrounded on three sides by water, this means the population/built up areas cannot continue to grow to leave no greenfield sites. We have plenty of abandoned brown sites screaming to be reused. Don't abandon decrepit areas, revamp and enjoy. Do now concrete over yet more green fields where not necessary.
DOR02986	In response to the local plan, I have the following comments. I strongly feel that the true demand for housing has not been considered and market demand signals are not present to support the housing need estimate. Wirral population has been shown to be stagnating over the period of 2001 to 2018-a fact which must be placed at the heart of future building of houses on the Wirral. Even optimistic forecasts of population growth have been shown to be accommodated by the use of current brown field sites and therefore the whole green belt review process is flawed and unnecessary. I, like many others commute to and from the Wirral on a daily basis and unfortunately remain unconvinced of improving job prospects and economic growth in the Wirral. As a commuter, I am also very aware of the overloaded infrastructure, from a roads perspective there are very few major routes in and out of Wirral, the M53 is already at a standstill on a near daily basis and Wirral M53 junctions are increasingly dangerous with traffic queueing onto the main carriageway frequently. The roads in and around Heswall are also struggling, and should point out that as resident of Heswall/Barnston boundary area note that Barnston Road is increasingly polluted by heavy use and currently very poorly policed for speeding and illegal use of the road by articulated HGVs. The area is also served poorly by public transport, trains are unreliable and once per hour and commuters now park their cars in Heswall by day to take buses to Liverpool, as a consequence Telegraph Road is increasingly used as a parking lot. A peninsula which is only accessible by land on "one side" cannot be considered equivalent to land-locked areas which are accessible from many directions. The % of green belt cannot be considered as a justification for re-designation without tempering with other factors such as accessibility. The Heswall/Barnston boundary area stands out as one of the most valuable and attractive green belt areas, serving has high quality farmland and haven for wildlife. I have specific objections to re-designation of site SP062. Firstly the initial review appears to be inaccurate as SP062 serves all 5 stated purposes of green belt, much more so than sites that have been considered less preferred. A key point for the council to be clear on is what type of housing is needed to fulfil the unproven and questionable demand, it seems highly likely that most will need to be affordable and therefore SP062 will not satisfy the need for proximity to the need. There are long term flood risk concerns in this area coupled also to SP061, which will be exacerbated by loss of farm land replaced by hard surfaces and more demand on sewers, noting there are also serious and frequent sewer problems in Barnston dale already. The list of objections could go on, however the key point is that instead of approaching this review with unrealistic assumptions relating to demand, can the council not be led by a true demand for housing and a smart plan which allows for constant/regular review of housing uptake and the style needed rather than taking a blanket and mass release of green belt approach which is disrupting the entire Wirral unnecessarily. Local government and councillors have to live here too!
DOR02987	The Local Plan does not give enough protection our precious green spaces in the Wirral. I fear it will hasten the construction of ill-thought construction in the area which will diminish community spirit and have a negative impact on our natural environment.
DOR02988	Building houses on levers causeway would be an absolute disaster. For decades many people have been able to walk in the fresh country air with superb views of wales and Storeton woods. This is a site of outstanding natural beauty and you cannot even consider building on it. There are acres of unused brown field sites, and empty properties, that can be used.
DOR02989	Why are you considering building on green belt land when all others areas have not been exhausted i.e. empty housing approx. Three thousand six hundred empty properties and Brownfield sites SHOULD be used even if there are extra costs to builders? 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 THERE PLANNING CONSENT. Green belt should not be used until all other areas have been exhausted!!!!!!! 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. 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 may more which all live off this land. 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 are 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 to help clean the environment to help Carbon Emissions and they are intending to plant millions of trees across the country and Wirral council are going to allow all these mature trees to be felled it cannot be allowed to happen. 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. Also most of the land is arable so why is this been considered for building land.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR02990	12000 houses seem too high. This will increase population of Wirral by approximately 15%. By fixing one national housing problem you are creating many more. What impact assessment has been done to address highways, transport, schools, doctors and many more Local Authorities services which will require significant investment which clearly the council have failed to mention. The services are already at breaking point. The submission seems very rushed and not much thought applied. The green belt of the Wirral is its major attraction for people to stay here. If your urban development removes the green space then the Wirral will lose its appeal and existing residents will move away. To attract new people to live on the in your proposed 12000 homes what work will they do. As a short term fix You are already flipping employment land into housing. At which point will the council have to encourage new commercial investment to the Wirral to sustain the increase in population. I believe the Wirral is already a commuter residence yet the transport links are already at capacity. No national rail network. A two lane motorway connecting us the Wirral east plus toll roads to the North. It is evident the council have sat back and expected Peel holdings to solve their housing problems. Wirral Waters is just a small part of the Peel Land Bank and until the return of investment is attractive to Peel WBC have lost control.
DOR02991	I would like Wirral Council address and to witness Council actions mirroring its statements, including their being “defenders of Wirral’s Green Belt”, transparently applying an approach which is aimed at that very conclusion and one which adopts a ‘Brownfield First’ policy based on a rigorous exercise to maximise its Brownfield Site Register and its development potential, including through applying appropriately higher densities of modern development than previously assumed (needing lower land take) and to specifically answer the 10 points that concern the latter as identified and submitted to the Council by Irby, Thurstaston & Pensby Amenity Society.
DOR02992	When I went to one of the meetings, I couldn’t believe how all the proposed reclassification of green belt removal was concentrated on one side of the Wirral affecting Bebington Bromborough and Eastham mainly. We already have had mass development in the area over recent years with the establishment of the Croft industrial estate and the Wirral international business park plus planning for shops like b and m. Current planning for another 300 houses in Bromborough already given the go ahead, which will result in a huge increase in traffic, a need for schools. There are few areas remaining as green belt. at the meeting we were told that the council wouldn’t build on Eastham country park then why is it necessary to re classify it as non green belt. We and our future generations deserve to have areas to walk and enjoy locally without having to get into a car to go and seek them out on the “privileged side of the Wirral where there is little change to their current green belt . This isn’t fair. The north side of the Wirral is already over developed
DOR02993	Can the thousands of empty properties please be factored into the calculations Green spaces are essential to prevent urban sprawl Green spaces help to preserve the unique character of some of our towns and villages e.g. Eastham Have the council considered the impact of increased congestion, air pollution, pressure on services, particularly on the Mersey side of the Wirral Current green spaces provide protection from flooding and drought, mitigate urban heat island effects as well as enhancing recreation and wellbeing Once built on the green spaces are lost forever We need a long term strategic plan to ensure that Wirral is the best place to live for future generations Utilise brown as opposed to green field sites
DOR02994	Green Belt is precious. This plan is lazy and an easy option. Revise your figures as there is not the need on Wirral for the amount of houses that has been suggested. Use brown sites and existing empty houses. The Peel Waters scheme will cover lots of the required housing. Green belt should be left alone so we can enjoy the Wirral we know and love now.
DOR02995	In terms of the green belt the site at Caldý is totally inappropriate and is cherished green belt adjacent to a conservation area. The developer will build executive type housing and is just capitalising on the govt initiative. The Wirral needs affordable social housing and that needs to be near Services and public transport.
DOR02996	SP060. This green belt policy is so wrong. I live bordering onto the land at SP060. I was advised at the consultation that the land is no longer buffer zone as Irby, Thingwall and Pensby are now one settlement! Well who knew! That was a sneaky trick despite the 'full consultation' I was then told about. Looking at the 2012 Draft Settlement Area Policy which I presume spawned this change 'The strategy was to maintain the physical separation and local distinctiveness of Irby, Barnston, Thurstaston and Landican'. So it's tosh telling me that this land isn't a buffer zone because it is. Despite being surrounded by housing it maintains our separation. It is a green heart with ancient hedgerows, so many bats and owls, foxes and pheasants, frogs and newts and yet you are happy to destroy it when your own figures show that we have a falling population in this area and Wirral in general. Shame on you! Find another way to deal with this and leave our green and pleasant land alone.
DOR02997	Green belt should be very last resort to use for housing some of the proposed sites are highly unlikely to provide affordable housing, if houses are built have we the infrastructure to serve them schools roads transport etc
DOR02998	I am horrified & dismayed that despite Council Leader saying earlier in the year that you would not be building on The Greenbelt, that you are now considering just that. The Wirral is such a beautiful area to live in that if your ridiculous plans go ahead we are in great danger of losing our important green open spaces & more importantly farmland. Yes the borough needs affordable housing, although it now transpires that your figures are grossly inaccurate, but use the existing brownfield sites instead, use the empty council properties, use the houses Peel Holdings are to build but DO NOT touch The greenbelt. We need our open spaces, we need The greenbelt, we need our farms & farmers need their livelihoods. PLEASE DO NOT DESTROY OUR COUNTRYSIDE.
DOR02999	Green Belt should be preserved at all costs. Figures released by the Office Of National Statistics show that the current 15 year dwelling requirements can be downgraded and are consequently more easily reached without the need to consider green belt encroachment. More practical routes to satisfying the housing requirements should be found. Peel Holdings and other developers who are sitting on land, much of it with approved planning, should be coerced into making housing available in a more timely manner. Brown Field sites and empty housing are also areas which should be actively pursued. You cannot dismiss deforestation and wildlife displacement as negligible consequences of your cause. If the green belt is not preserved the Wirral will become the image of Ellesmere Port where you struggle to find an undeveloped parcel of land.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03000	Whilst being encouraged by Central Government to provide additional housing the general terms of the exclusion contained in the NPPF [P.145 (g)] is too generic, in that some sites last occupied by agricultural or forestry buildings would be improved by / lend themselves to development of residential housing. Both enhancing the environment and benefitting the community. Consideration should be given by the Council as to the visual amenity of converting a green belt-brownfield site before dismissing any such opportunity to create housing in the West Kirby area.
DOR03001	I wish to know why our green belt land is being chased for development by building companies who have no intention of building affordable housing on prime land And why we are told that Wirral Councillors all seem to be against the release of green belt and are blaming the government . The government are saying it's up to local councils . We need our green spaces saving not used to build homes that will be out the reach of people trying to get on the property ladder .
DOR03002	SHLAA 2024 , SHLAA 2025 and SHLAA 0683 i as a resident of Bromborough am outrage at the above proposed plans. I live on park view and to build houses on that strip of land will. Kill our neighbourhood cutting of access points increasing traffic and parking already is impossible for many of us that will make it implausible. As for the plans laid out for our village taking our civic centre and our very busy used car park will kill our wonderful village of no parking no resources equals no village. Please do not kill our wonderful village and beautiful area off with your hasty ill thought out plans.
DOR03003	<p>Having read much of the documentation concerning the proposed Local Plan and attended one of the consultation meeting, as well as a meeting addressed by local ward councillors, I wish to make the following points explaining my opposition to the Local Plan in its current form.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) Various claims have been made about who is responsible for the demand that Wirral build more than 12,000 new homes by 2035, but the latest ONS population projections suggest that by that time the population will have increased by a mere 11,000 approximately. This projection indicates that the figure of 12,000 new homes grossly exceeds all anticipated future demand. 2) The ONS figures further suggest that the most significant population increase, within the very modest overall growth, will be in the post-65 age group. This has a bearing on the type of accommodation that will be required, in that people in this group generally down-size from the larger family home to a bungalow, apartment or care home. This would release larger properties, which could potentially be re-developed. 3) It was stated at the local consultation meeting which we attended that the Local Plan was being developed without taking economic and employment factors into account. What is the point of building large numbers of new homes without clear evidence that there will be employment opportunities and adequate infrastructure for the residents? Some councillors and a large number of attendees at consultation meetings seem intent on criticising Peel Group, without recognising that, as a highly successful international company, they seize the opportunity to build new homes and business premises when they see viable economic opportunities. The fact that they have not already built the approximately 13,000 new homes at Wirral Waters, for which they were granted outline planning permission some years ago, suggests that they have yet to be convinced of the business case. 4) Without firm evidence of significantly greater economic development within the Borough than has occurred in the past thirty years, the only conclusion that can be drawn is that the majority of new homes will be occupied by people working outside Wirral. For various reasons, including consideration of the environment, transport, infrastructure, etc., it would make more sense for them to live where they work. 5) It was also stated at the consultation meeting that neighbouring authorities had refused Wirral's request to help meet the house-building quota. Why should Wirral become a sprawling urban "dormitory" borough for Liverpool, Manchester and parts of Cheshire? 6) Everyone recognises that it is easier and more lucrative for developers to build on large greenfield sites, so it is hardly surprising that some house-builders and landowners have already put forward expressions of interest. However, in a highly confined geographical area, which the Wirral peninsula patently is, there is an even stronger case than usual for ensuring that existing or previously developed sites are re-used. I cannot comment on claims that the Wirral BC Brownfield Register Consultation process was flawed, but it is obvious that there are many brownfield sites which could be redeveloped and go most, if not the whole, way to meeting the new homes target, especially if the Government revises that figure downwards. It must surely be a Council priority to work cooperatively with developers and the owners of these sites, possibly by helping to fund the environmental cleaning of the land, to ensure that they are re-developed, instead of being left as an eyesore? 7) In granting Peel Group outline planning permission to build approximately 13,000 homes at Wirral Waters, Wirral BC must have considered it to be a viable project. Why has it ignored Peel's latest commitment to build 6,450 homes, including instead a mere 1,100 in the Draft Local Plan for the full 15 year period and none at all in the first five years? Its argument that detailed Planning Consent is necessary has been shown to be flawed by the 2017 Appeal Court Ruling, which made it clear to councils, etc., that developments only need to be "reasonably possible" to be included in the Local Plan. 8) The Leader of the Council apparently told the Wirral Globe: "I'm not prepared to allow our greenbelt 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." On page 26 of the Background Report to the Initial Greenbelt Review for Wirral's Core Strategy Local Plan (September 2018) it states: "Appendix 3 shows that all the Green Belt Parcels identified, with the exception of some existing developed areas in the Green Belt, continue to meet one or a number of the Green Belt purposes set out in national policy. Development on any of these sites would therefore, by definition, continue to be harmful to the Green Belt." Nothing we have read in the Council's literature or heard at the various meetings has indicated that there are any "exceptional circumstances" justifying changes to Green Belt boundaries. 9) The investigation notes on the various identified parcels of greenbelt land prepared for the Council by its planning officers inevitably refer to a very limited set of criteria and exclude any consideration of important factors such as historical, archaeological and scientific features. 10) We have deliberately refrained from commenting on the parcels of land closest to our home,

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	because we are deeply concerned about the whole of the Wirral and the inevitable harm that release of any of the greenbelt would cause. Once this land is lost, it will be lost for ever, and the Wirral will become a less attractive place to residents and visitors alike.
DOR03004	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Figures for Wirral's housing needs should be recalculated as ONS have recently announced revised lower housing targets. 2. Because of the shape of the Wirral peninsula new builds should be restricted otherwise Wirral will become an urban sprawl. 3. Peel Holdings should be held to their promise to build homes. 4. Green belt area east of the M53 includes ancient woodland, wetlands and leisure areas. Also farmland -Claremont Farm which provides educational as well as leisure facilities for the community. These areas should not be developed as we do not have a high % of green belt land east of the motorway. These are my main concerns, there are others e.g. infrastructure, schools, hospitals etc.
DOR03005	Building new properties in Thornton Hough would have a detrimental effect on the character of the village. There is no shortage of land in The Wirral which is not green belt nor in a conservation area. Increasing the houses would harm the local environment and cause a dangerous increase in the traffic. Thornton Hough is a rural village surrounded by farmland giving it its character
DOR03006	SP025B Area west of Westbourne. Already had land sold off *10acres, near Manor Drive and built on. This has already caused increased congestion with traffic. The area does not support further development on the scale proposed. Furthermore there are areas such as the old Foxfield school site in Moreton which could be built on and is not green belt land.
DOR03007	You will turn Eastham into a town. The village is a beautiful medieval village and the green belt around it should be preserved. The facilities i.e. schools doctors are not enough to meet local current need and could not take on any further impact
DOR03008	I object to these plans
DOR03009	Don't build on any green belt land.
DOR03010	I strongly object to the proposed building on greenbelt area in and around Bebington. The alleged housing shortage of affordable housing would not be solved by building on an expensive area of the Wirral. The only people who will benefit from this proposal would be the developers and council. The local residents will suffer because local roads will not cope with the increase in an already extremely busy stretch linking Bromborough and the motorway. Local schools are already oversubscribed and an extra influx of children would have to travel out of zone to be school only adding to the traffic congestion. Local services would also not cope with the additional pressure. There are far more suitable areas of the Wirral which would be more suitable to provide affordable housing and not destroy precious Green Belt land. I sincerely hope these plans do not succeed for the sake of our children, residents and wildlife living in these areas.
DOR03011	Wirral need to look longer than 15 years for future needs of constituents. UK cannot possibly be sure what future priorities may be into the future. we have good agricultural land with excellent potential to grow much more of our own food. We need to be able to access land for crops, if plans to leave the EU make it necessary for us to be more self-sufficient. Wirral once had fantastic small nursery gardens along the coastal strip of North Wirral. These should not be developed into luxury housing which developers are sure to exploit. Our farmers have been struggling for years and could be our most valuable asset.
DOR03012	No more development of green belt land!
DOR03013	Green space should be protected. There are plenty of brown space sites that can be utilised.
DOR03014	Inappropriate use of green belt, potentially hazardous so close to residential homes. Clearly disastrous impact on local conservation village, country park and local residents. Further increased traffic on a narrow sometimes difficult to negotiate road is unacceptable.
DOR03015	I am somewhat concerned and dismayed at the amount of land in the village vicinity which is being considered for development. I have been a resident here for just over a year and had I been aware of this I would have reconsidered any move to this area.
DOR03016	As a pensioner who cannot get to Bromborough village without a car so NEED the car park when I go to the Bank and also use the library so any decision to use the car park and civic centre for building and to lose the parking facilities would have a big impact on my independence
DOR03017	I find it frustrating that we are subject to decisions made by central government when they are making their calculations about housing need using doubtful figures, and without detailed knowledge of Wirral geography. Bounded as we are by two rivers, and being in effect a narrow peninsula, it is difficult to see how we may prevent our distinct urban areas blending into one. Furthermore, because Wirral is an attractive place to live, it is likely that housing development will concentrate on executive property rather than affordable housing.
DOR03018	I am not convinced about the council's given information and oppose their ideas to use green belt land
DOR03019	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The Council should wait until the Government has finalised its new standard method for calculating housing need, expected in January 2019. This will be informed by revisions to the latest household projections by ONS in December 2018. 2. The Wirral Green Belt is particularly important within Merseyside, forming a relatively narrow swathe down the central and western side of the peninsula. Before any cuts to the Green Belt are considered there needs to be thorough consideration (under the duty to cooperate) of whether there are less harmful areas of the Liverpool City Region that could accommodate the growth. A strategic solution is needed including cross-boundary cooperation as with Oxford and Cambridge sub-regions.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>3. The results of the Part 1 Green Belt Review are broadly welcomed, its consideration of important strategic boundaries such as trunk roads and railways and the recognition that the land around Hoylake (and West Wirral generally) performs important Green Belt functions such as preventing coalescence of the patchwork of distinctive settlements here.</p> <p>4. SP016 - West of Meols Drive (Royal Liverpool Golf Course) is clearly an unsuitable site for development, being one of the country's leading golf courses which forms the main strategic separation between Hoylake and West Kirby. Urban Greenspace would not be a strong enough designation for this land and would not recognised and protect its function it maintaining the separation of towns. It is connected to the wider Green Belt and, in fact, is a crucial part of it. It is not a SHLAA site which suggests it is not available.</p>
DOR03020	It is unnecessary and I object most strongly to any infringement of areas set aside as 'Green Belt'
DOR03021	<p>*The council did not provide any figures for employment growth to sustain their growth figures for population.</p> <p>*I am not convinced, too, that the population growth numbers suggested by the Council are realistic or legitimate. This view is supported by the Council's subsequent reduction in population growth anticipated.</p> <p>*It was disingenuous/misleading/misrepresenting of the Council to include land within the areas proposed to be de-registered from the Green Belt which the Council knows can never be developed, such as: Eastham Country Park Royal Liverpool Golf Club National Trust land Only those areas which could reasonably be developed should be put forward for public consultation. Not to do so only serves to inflame public reaction.</p> <p>*The Council did not demonstrate in the public consultation the imperative to develop brownfield sites in preference to green belt. Green belt would appear to be considered a cheaper, soft touch; and brownfield sites, too expensive too expensive/too difficult. A point which was made at the public consultation meeting was 'once the green belt is gone, it can never be retrieved'.</p> <p>*The Council did not demonstrate in the public consultation the diversity of development required. i.e. the need for low cost starter housing or housing for the elderly. *There seemed to be a distinct East-West divide in the areas proposed for de-registration, with a focus on expansion of land development on the east side of Wirral. The argument that this is to retain district identities of Heswall, Irby, West Kirby etc., does not seem to figure when considering Bebington, New Ferry, Rock Ferry & Tranmere.</p>
DOR03022	I am very concerned that our Labour controlled council has seen fit to make a priority of building a golf resort in Hoylake in spite of the fact that most golf clubs are struggling for membership. This can only be viewed as an attempt to entice people with money to the Wirral, Why? You need to understand that this latest land grab of our green belt is going to put paid to any future Labour Councils on the Wirral. The green party will gain seats everywhere and the blatant corruption will not be forgotten. You have lost the trust of the Wirral population and your electorate both Conservative and Labour will take the middle ground. We already have over 50% development of the Wirral Peninsula why are you wanting to carpet it with concrete and very poorly built modern housing? How can a Labour controlled council which has shut down so many services for local people throw so much resource into something so obviously Capitalist? Are any of you socialists? Take a look at the roots of the Labour movement, I think you will find that you are supposed to put people before big business. Shame on you, I despair.
DOR03023	I think all brownfield sites should be redeveloped first before any green belt is considered. I moved to Wirral from a city because I loved it's access to the environment and many green fields. I totally get we need to think about where more people can move to, but we need to consider sites that don't ruin the many blessings we have.
DOR03024	<p>I am 100% against the plan to take vast amounts of what should be 'prized' land out of the Greenbelt for construction either in the short, medium and long term. These plans cannot be allowed to come to fruition as they are not in the best interest of the Peninsular or the residents, for whom the council should be working in the best interest of. There are a number of reasons for this:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We don't need to use any greenbelt land: I wholeheartedly disagree with the viability methodology the council have said to have used when looking as to what land needs to be used. There are plenty of brownbelt sites around the Wirral that will easily hold the housing numbers needed. Taking the greenbelt is the easy option and not in the best interest of the Wirral residents especially those on the east side of the M53. Peel holdings produced a letter commenting how they are willing to work with the council on the waterfront issue but the council are unwilling to work with them. Again not working with the best interest of the residents in mind. 2. The proposal is absolutely prejudice to those living on the East side of the M53: How can 90% of the proposal be on the already highly built up area on the East of the M53 be fair or justifiable?
	<p>3. The additional infrastructure will have a huge knock on effect: Extra schools, health centres, service roads, shops etc.....all of these are again likely to eat into the valuable green belt land that really makes the Wirral Peninsular special and should be protected at all cost!</p> <p>4. Why take sites out of the greenbelt that will never be built on: It appears to be underhanded and unclear as to why sites such as Storeton Woods are in the proposed building plans when we have been told they can't be built on? This seems like an attempt to keep land in the back pocket of the council for a later date.</p> <p>5. Why use the M53 as a natural boundary?: It appears to be an easy solution for the East/West divide to use the M53 as the boundary for the plans. However, the natural topography of the Wirral is the ridge line that runs along Mount Road leading to Prenton and Bidston. Again using the M53 does appear to be a convenient excuse to free up land in the greenbelt. I urge the council to NOW act in the best interest of the Wirral, its present residents and its future residents to NOT go ahead with the proposed plans and to completely rethink the process to not use our precious land which lies within the Greenbelt.</p>
DOR03025	I strongly object to the proposal to build houses in Caldys Woods which is behind Boundary Road in West Kirby. This beautiful area of woodland houses so much wildlife that it would be absolutely criminal to take away their natural habitat, not to mention the removal of so many trees which are crucial to generating oxygen and provide sustenance to the said wildlife. There are many Brown field sites available in the Wirral which would not have the same dire natural environmental consequences if they were used to meet the housing plan.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03026	Green Belt land is essential to the ambience of living in Wirral and gives separation to the existing communities. Every effort must be made to fully utilise brown field sites before any consideration is given to release of green belt for development. These efforts should include innovative ways of increasing the density of housing provision on these site.
DOR03027	<p>I object to the local plan on the following grounds</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There is sufficient land in urban areas to build on - the council needs to prioritise working with Peel Holdings to ensure that they build the developments that they had undertaken to do. This should be a council priority. 2. 12,000 homes are not needed - the population is in decline - the only increase is for suitable housing for older people who want to live in an area accessible to shops and utilities- not in semi-rural areas. 3. The sites either side of Lever Causeway are huge - this is a historic site of interest and makes a lovely walking / cycling route between East and West Wirral. Developing this area will cause unrestricted sprawl and merge the district areas of Higher Bebington, Prenton and Storeton. 4. The elevated position will destroy the views from the motorway which are currently green and pleasant. 5. The overall allocation of land to be developed is disproportionately biased in favour of West Wirral. 100% of the green belt land to the East of the motorway could be built upon. This does not support the delivery of the Wirral Plan which focuses on 'narrowing the gap'. How is this fair? People living in Rock Ferry or Birkenhead will have to travel a significant distance to see a green vista which is acknowledged to be good for mental health as well as providing free facilities for exercise.
DOR03028	<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. 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. 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). 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 wellbeing benefits. Please can we respectfully request that no greenbelt is released and instead further time, effort and finance is put into the development of brownfield sites and refurbish and utilise the vast numbers of existing and currently vacant and unoccupied properties throughout the Wirral.</p>
DOR03029	<p>We think it is disgusting that you are planning to take so much greenbelt land and turn our beautiful villages into a concrete urbanization!!!! we also know of one new housing site in Little Sutton that has stopped building because no one is buying! where are all the people for all these houses our roads are full our schools our full medical centres and dentists are full where are the jobs? Greenbelt should be protected so future generations can enjoy the beauty of open spaces, farmland should be that plant, work the land create jobs why destroy what this country has always had A green and pleasant land.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03030	<p>I write to protest in the strongest possible terms about the Government target for Wirral Council to build 800 houses annually, totalling 12,000 by 2035. I also disagree with Wirral Council's interpretation of the Government paper.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The need for 12,000 homes has been calculated from NATIONAL Statistics for population projection, rather than LOCAL statistics. However, using the 'Compendium of Statistics' from the Council's 'Wirral Population Projection' the increase in population from 2018 to 2038 is projected to be 5,500 people. 2. The Council has identified 2 major 'employment sites' on the Wirral. They have not indicated any immediate plans to increase this number, it follows therefore that there is unlikely to be any large demands for more housing to meet any additional future employment needs. 3. The local population saw a fall in numbers between 1996 (the earliest year quoted on the Council website); 2009 of 4.6%. However, since then the population numbers have risen to similar numbers to 1996 (322,700 in 1996 & 322, 800 in 2017). This increase cannot be guaranteed to continue as there is still a significant lack of employment opportunities for all age groups. 4. In 2010 Mersey Docks and Harbour Board sold a large area of land next to the West Float Dock in Birkenhead (now known as Wirral Waters) to Peel Holdings. This is a brown field site and outline planning permission was granted to build 13,000. To date no houses have been built. At a recent Open Public Meeting organized by the Council for local residents, we were told that discussions between the Council and Peel Holdings have indicated that only 2,600 houses will be built. If more are needed, I would suggest a Compulsory Purchase Order on some of the land allowing either the sale of the land to another builder, or the building of Council/Social housing funded by central government or the local Council. 5. Close to Wirral Waters are large areas of derelict land around the dock area. This provides an ideal opportunity for further development along the lines of Salford Quays and the London Docklands, so providing a much needed upgrade in the whole Birkenhead area. 6. There are also a number of derelict, run down, unused sites and buildings in central Birkenhead and again, re-development of these areas would provide significant improvement for everyone. 7. In the absence of any significant progress in the development of Wirral Waters, the Council has identified a large number of areas of local green belt as potential building sites, and they are justifying this by saying they must meet the Government target. 8. Of Wirral's 157 square kilometres, 46% is already covered in houses. Figures given at the Open Meeting show that 13,000 additional houses would raise this to 67% of our precious land. In contrast, Cheshire West has 10% of land built on and the UK as a whole 6% (Source: Alasdair Rae, University of Sheffield. A Land Cover Atlas of the UK). 9. The one area of opportunity of further development in Wirral is the tourist industry which is a major part of the local economy. We currently have a number of SSSI and SSI sites, a rich heritage and are blessed with beautiful scenery and stunning views around our coast. Turning the area into a huge urban sprawl would have major implications for visitor numbers and earnings. 10. The National Guidance on Green Belt NPPF2 states that "Once established Green Belt Boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans". The Council has not identified any 'exceptional circumstances', to justify use of our precious green belt. In short, we do not need 12,000 extra houses and even if future demand changes, we have enough brown field sites; the development of which would transform the area and benefit everyone.
DOR03031	<p>I think the local plan is a disaster. There are plenty of empty/derelict areas of the Wirral without using green belt. The houses being build will not be affordable as they are in areas that don't particularly lend themselves to being affordable. Can you not look further into Seacombe and Birkenhead North both of which are eye sores and could do with some regeneration this would be the perfect opportunity.</p>
DOR03032	<p>I wish to share my objections to the potential building on Lever Causeway Green Belt land for the following reasons.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1.) There is sufficient land in urban areas to build upon. 2.) The population projection does not warrant for 12,000 houses. 3.) It will spoil the character of the area. 4.) Lever Causeway and it's open spaces provide an area for relaxation and exercise for innumerable local residents as well as wildlife. 5.) Unrivalled views will be destroyed, irreparable damage to its setting. 6.) Increased traffic and major congestion in an already busy area. 7.) Acres of prime agricultural land will be lost which will be needed after Brexit. 8.) Damage to Mountwood Conservation area. 9.) The sites either side of Lever Causeway are huge. Once released from Green Belt, building could extend to Storeton, causing unrestricted sprawl, with historic Storeton and Bebington Merging. 10.) Use the Wirral's already empty 5,000 properties and the already existing space on brownfield sites for 18000 homes. 11.) There is no infrastructure for these buildings, schools, shops, buses. It will be another no man's land. Please protect the Wirral
DOR03033	<p>Green belt needs protection at all cost</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03034	<p>I strongly disagree with the use of greenbelt land for building, due to</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- the threat of flooding 2- loss of wildlife habitat 3 -radical change to the ambience of this beautiful area (it would no longer be the Leisure Peninsula) 4 - further air pollution 5 - the fact that this intensity of house building is simply not necessary due to falling population & lack of demand. 6 - Schools, medical services, social care services etc simply would not cope with a large influx of new residents. 7 - The use of farmland for building is insane, given the current uncertainty about tariffs on imported food & also in view of the desirability of reducing air miles for food. Consideration should be given to how we can make our green spaces work for us, in terms of encouraging wild life sanctuaries, food production & tourism instead of building on them. <p>There are other, more imaginative ways to cope with the current demands on the Local Authority-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1- strongly challenge the Government to demonstrate the evidence on which the house building figures are based, given the decreasing population. 2- Consider legal action against the Government to challenge the evidence on which the figures are based & also to challenge the imposition of a plan which would radically alter the local environment, expressly against the wishes of local residents. Where is local democracy? 3- Think more imaginatively about the type of housing needed, e.g. lots of low-rise apartments with lift, to encourage older people to downsize, releasing their properties for families. These apartments would need to include 2 bedroomed apartments or even 3 bedrooms, due to the recent trend towards adult children living with older parents. 4 -Wirral is surrounded by water & also has much inland water, so consider providing moorings & infrastructure for luxury house boats, as seen in Amsterdam. These would add to the environment rather than detract. 5 - Consider compulsory purchase of the land owned by Peel Holdings unless they speed up the delivery of new homes 6 - Use brown field sites for building new homes, using compulsory purchase orders if necessary. 7 - Do not allow anyone with any conflict of interest to take part in any decision making or lobbying on behalf of developers. Any conflict of interest should be made known publicly & dealt with immediately.
DOR03035	[SAME AS DOR02207]
DOR03036	<p>I can't believe you think it's acceptable in any way to even consider building on the car park and civic centre in Bromborough. You will ruin the livelihoods of all the businesses in the village. Bromborough village has a great sense of community. Where do u expect people to park. Have you looked at that car park. It's busy every day with people in and out the village. Take that away and you will kill that village. People will go to the retail park. The civic centre also has so many events on for older people and young people. Have you actually looked into what this does. If anything you should be providing funding to clean up the civic centre and the surroundings. If this goes ahead you will have a lot to answer for saying goodbye to the history of Bromborough. You have already got Acre lane. Surely you can find somewhere else. I understand you need to fulfil housing but at the expensive of others? No</p>
DOR03037	<p>Additional housing will lead to an Increased amount of traffic on roads leading to pollution and too much pressure on our already busy road system. Mental and physical health are improved by being outdoors using our parks and fields and footpaths. Schools are closing due to decreased pupil numbers so why do we need so much more housing? Wildlife will be greatly affected by destroying our beautiful green spaces.</p>
DOR03038	<p>I think you should use up all the brown field sites before destroying green field sites.</p>
DOR03039	<p>If the greenbelt goes we can't get it back. It's important for wildlife/ plants. It helps promote wellbeing by enabling people to connect more easily with nature. It prevents urban sprawl. There are plenty of brownfield sites (land that has previously been used for housing or commercial industries) that can be used instead. Don't go for the easy option of building on our beautiful green belt land!</p>
DOR03040	<p>I do not agree with building on green belt. There are plenty of disused buildings around which could be converted into suitable housing! I love living on the Wirral, mainly for the green spaces we have. Please do not destroy them!</p>
DOR03041	<p>I am totally opposed to the proposed local plan which puts at risk Wirral's valuable green belt. In particular I strongly object to the proposed development of farm land adjacent to Stapledon Wood. This land is next to the tranquil, scenic, well-loved beauty spot of Caldys Hill which is a favourite with locals and tourists. It also provides a wild life corridor across to Thurstaston Common, another site of special scientific interest. Development of this land would spoil and urbanise the unique nature of this special place. It would be to the long term detriment of the whole of Wirral.</p>
DOR03042	<p>I am concerned about the proposals to include extensive areas of green belt land in plans for future building when the options for use of brownfield sites and mixed-use land have not been fully explored. It seems entirely wrong that Peel Holdings are not being held to account for reneging on the agreement to build over 10000 homes, and thus putting pressure on green belt areas across the borough for building. I appreciate that there have to be new homes, but would suggest that the bigger need is for affordable housing and for provision for housing suitable for the ageing population (whether accessible private housing or supported housing options) rather than large numbers of executive homes.</p> <p>The housing needs to be in line with the projected demographics of the area.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03043	I don't want to see any of our greenbelt go, but can only comment on the nearest to me (Limbo lane Irby) and its effect. Irby village and surrounding roads is not built for the extra motors this build will bring. Most homes have at least 1 car. Irby is clay, how will the build effect drainage/future flood risk. Also by taking our fields, most of which produce hay for the large population of animals, particularly horses in the area, you will drive farmers out and the locals will have to source hay outside of Wirral, which will drive prices up. The knock on effect will be horses escaping onto roadways looking for grass or worse still being abandoned and left to starve. The local sanctuaries are already in crisis, with this year's hot weather effecting short supply of grass, and funding running out. I am happy to pay higher council tax to live in a green belt, but will this price drop when no longer GREEN??? Having lived in Irby 28 yrs I will defiantly move if this build goes ahead. Maybe the housing associations need to be looked at, I know of 2 flats that have been empty over a month. No workers are in them getting them ready for tenants, and there are dozens of houses every week on their lists. Good management could cut the waiting lists and there is plenty of brown areas that could be built on.
DOR03044	Grass is important, it make everyone healthier. A big reason my mum and dad moved here was because of it lucious countryside vibe and wanted me to grow up away from crappy towns and cities with no green areas to appreciate. Also by destroying our green belt you are contributing to mass reduction of biodiversity on our planet which will lead to species extinction and even contribute to global warming due to the lack of plants photosynthesis. Please don't build.
DOR03045	There is no need to build on any Green Belt land on Wirral. Further destruction of our Green Belt land is unjustified
DOR03046	The local plan does not solve the issue of affordable homes and much needed social housing. Also adding more traffic to an area containing schools and 20mph traffic zones where the speed limit is rarely observed.
DOR03047	Your plan to shut Bromborough car park is ill thought out there are a lot of aging people live in the area who use the shops and still drive the shops will close the banks will go too. Not everybody can bank on-line you flattened acre lane school over 12 months ago and not a brick has been laid . we know you need affordable housing but when the shops close this will be a commuter belt due to the good transport links and your affordable housing will end up full of upwardly mobiles or is that what you intend do you care about our side of the Wirral all labour i might add well here is one vote you will lose if this goes ahead and I'm not alone.
DOR03048	I object to proposals in the Pipers Lane area
DOR03049	Young people cannot get on the housing market not because there is a shortage of house but because the houses themselves are too expensive for them. What is the point of building more house if they are going to be at the same price and they will still not be able to afford them ?. Building more house will not sort out the housing problem - the problem is a financial one - house prices are too high throughout the country and need to fall drastically - I say this as a home owner myself - I am prepared to see the value of my house drop if it will sort the housing market out and give young people a chance.
DOR03050	Any erosion of Greenbelt Land on Wirral should be and can be avoided. It will be resisted at the Planning Stage and, please, do not hide behind the Government. We look to you, our elected leaders to defend the beauty of Wirral Council Officials seem to be in awe of Peel Holdings and not prepared to take them on. Wirral Waters has Planning Approval for 13,500 units - more than enough dwellings to satisfy need for the next 20 years. The difficulty and added costs of development are recognised but can be overcome. Neglected old dock land and industrial sites are a blot on the landscape that need to be cleaned up anyway. There are plenty of examples of success with such projects in other parts of the country e.g., Bristol and since we are looking at a 15 year timescale there is time to do it. The Wirral Waters site is big enough to support its own modest set of amenities. The proposed Dementia Village is to be welcomed. More focus on amenities for the elderly would make the area attractive for downsizers You should look at retirement developments in Florida and Australia. Public opinion will be on your side if you put pressure on Peel Holdings to come forward with an imaginative plan for say 6000 units
DOR03051	<p>The degradation of the Green Belt, once permitted, cannot be reversed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The number of new homes as calculated in the Local Plan does not seem to have been subject to any reality check. They are excessive by any measurement and amount to a 10% increase above the current level of housing stock. No evidence has been produced as to who will occupy these houses if built or where the demand for them is coming from. Presumably, these new residents would need jobs yet this would imply a huge increase in the number of employment opportunities in the area. This does not appear to have been addressed and it is certainly not obvious where these jobs would come from. 2. In any event, obtaining more jobs in Wirral, whilst an essential part of the local plan, will not necessarily lead to a greater demand for homes, as many people who already live in the peninsula, and whose travel costs and time would be reduced by working locally, would take these jobs 3. There is said to be some 6000 empty properties in Wirral. There are numerous houses in the Birkenhead and Wallasey areas which are in good condition and which can currently be bought for less than £100,000. At the time of this submission, "Rightmove" lists 148 homes in Wallasey and 130 in Birkenhead which are for sale at £100,000 or less. Indeed, it has been claimed that the price of homes in this price category has fallen as the majority of buyers can afford mortgages which enable them to buy more expensive properties. Stable and possibly falling prices at this end of the housing ladder plus a plentiful supply indicate that there is currently no shortage of "affordable" homes on Wirral. 4. There exists planning permission for all realistic demand for housing in the next 15 years within brownfield sites, in particular in Peel Holdings Wirral Waters planned redevelopment of Birkenhead Docks. This resource, along with other brownfield sites, should be fully developed before any release of Green Belt land is even considered. 5. Wirral is surrounded on three sides by water which makes it a special case when considering likely population growth. The necessity to travel substantial distances to reach work, which may be only a few miles away in a direct line, creates a substantial barrier to normal inward movement of population because of the cost of commuting.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>6. Wirral's substantial Green Belt is a major positive factor which helps to make it a desirable and very pleasant place to live. Its rights of way network and Open Spaces are of enormous benefit to the community and a reason why many people choose to continue to live in Wirral even if they work elsewhere. Reduction of the Green Belt will affect the quality of life on the Wirral and this, in turn, would lead to a reduction in future housing demand. We would suggest that Wirral BC carries out research into this significant issue to determine what the effect on demand would be.</p> <p>7. Furthermore, the Office for National Statistics is reported in the Times of 21st September, 2018 to have revised the forecast for the number of new households from the previous figure of 210,000 households per year nationally to 159,000. This knocks a 25% hole in the Government's figures. The ONS also says that a large proportion of the growth (88%) will come from people over 65, so Wirral's declining population definitely runs against this trend.</p> <p>8. In the light of the above the Society therefore calls on Wirral B C to review all projections of future housing demand and that a more realistic figure is determined.</p> <p>9. In addition Wirral BC should confirm that no release of Green Belt land will even be considered until all available brownfield sites have been developed.</p>
DOR03052	<p>I agree with the Council Leader. I believe we should use brown field sites where possible. Is it possible to compulsory purchase brown field sites held by peel holdings? It seems we are having to identify green field sites whilst brown field sites are being under developed. Will the houses be in keeping with the areas? In 20/30 years' time new builds will look run down and de value existing property on the Wirral. Green spaces are also proven to be necessary for good wellbeing and mental health. Furthermore I have been led to believe we have property on the Wirral that is being underutilised due to the 'bedroom tax' policy, would the govt consider revoking this law rather than building new houses when we have stock unable to be used due to this law? I agree we do not have the same pressures on housing either by affordability or availability as the south and shouldn't be subjected to the same blanket housing building policy/number requirements. Would the govt consider reviewing the housing policy. Is there anything that we can do as a local council to buy the Wirral more time, especially with new challenges on the horizon, i.e. Brexit.</p>
DOR03053	<p>I object to the developments near Spital especially at Claremont Farm and Vineyard Farm as it will encroach into the Greenbelt and open countryside for which no adequate 'very special circumstances' have been identified. Additionally there are not adequate transport and road links to all the areas identified for development and a severe lack of schools and shopping facilities</p>
DOR03054	<p>I am writing this with sheer horror at all the proposed developments which are supposed to happen in our district, in fact right at the bottom of our gardens!</p> <p>You must be aware of all the local impact that building would have to all concerned? The proposed plans would threaten the very eco structure and ecosystem in this historic township. Words cannot express how sad I am and my neighbours at the horrors of losing all the fields and wildlife. From buzzards to bats; from prehistory and as yet undug sites of significant historic interest, to rare insects, these fields and woodlands should and must remain as Greenbelt and as such, should be conserved and at the most, farmed and enjoyed for fishing and golf. I and my husband and son and two dogs put our names to any petitions against the building on this land. We live next to Site 1984 and have done since 1996 when we were told by our land registry when buying our house, that the land wouldn't be built on! At that time there was no question or hint of building proposals. It is a great shame to even consider building anything at all and if the government carry on like this soon there will only be the odd park left to walk our dogs in. I implore you to seriously listen to all the objections, and as a local historian with a B.A. Hons degree in Archaeology and a Masters degree in Local History (dissertation on 17th century Poulton Hall), I urge you to take into account what we stand to lose as local citizens and individuals as well as what the loss will be to the whole character of the countryside. I for one hope that the building does NOT go ahead. You have the power to make NOT happen.</p>
DOR03055	<p>I am writing to you to express my disagreement with the proposed plans to rezone green belt on the Wirral. I understand there is a need to allow for redevelopment of brown field sites; however, I disagree completely with the plans to allow our important green belt to be built on. It is imperative that these areas are protected for future generations. Whilst I am concerned about the plans as a whole, I read with particular interest the proposed changes around Higher Bebington including the land near Storeton woods, Brimstage and Peter Prices Lane. These provide valuable green space and are part of what makes the area a nice place to live. There is already quite dense housing and the transport infrastructure is not able to cope as it is: further housing development can be expected to exacerbate the problem further. Although there may be a government target to be achieved, I believe that Wirral residents would be opposed to plans to increase population density and especially to remove green belt particularly to the extent proposed. I am disappointed that I found out about the proposed plans by a flyer from other concerned Wirral residents; given the magnitude of the proposed changes, the council should have written to all residents with details of the plans to ensure people are informed and able to respond to a significant and material change in planning policy for the borough.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03056	<p>I am writing to express opposition to Wirral Council to development on any Green Belt land. I am aware the Council is under pressure from government. I am also aware that there will be powerful interest from Developers because it is easier and more profitable to develop as they provide less uncertainties than brown field sites. However, I am particularly interested in one 'plot' in Heswall, named SP07 1 on the Forward Planning proposals. This plot is alongside the Chester Road (A540). It would enable 200-300 plus homes. More specific grounds for objection in addition to the impact on the environment, including wild life:</p> <p>1) There is a danger that there will be a route to any development through the Barnston School residential area. One road (Suncroft Road) has a 'no through road which, if continued, would give access. Although there would almost certainly also be additional access onto the A540 this alternative 'rat route' would be dangerous. Existing roads on the Barnston development are VERY narrow. Currently there is large volume of cars accessing Barnston Primary School. Wirral Council would be culpable for any accidents and injuries (especially to children) were this road opened to further traffic.</p> <p>2) The main A540 road is an extremely busy road with considerable congestion. Gayton roundabout with multiple access is a dangerous junction. Access to both Boathouse Lane and the previously mentioned commercial area is also hazardous. To add more traffic onto that stretch of the highway would add to the problem. The council itself is aware of the dangers on the A540 It has already signs indicating 70 accidents on the road. Outline planning permission for 35 homes with access to the A540 has already been given (a different authority) just a few hundred yards further toward Chester compounding the problem.</p> <p>3) These homes are likely to provide a further demand on local services, especially the two closest Primary Schools (Barnston and Gayton). There are already issues with these schools in that external classrooms have been required to cater for increased numbers and further children means more cars on streets adjacent to these schools. Currently the traffic and parking provide a real problem, several pupils come to these schools from a wider area than anticipated for a Primary School. Members of the Council in Forward Planning should visit these schools at times when children start and finish school to see the hazards for themselves.</p>
DOR03057	<p>I am completely opposed to building on Green Belt land on the Wirral as there is already sufficient land on brownfield sites to accommodate the 12000 new homes required by Central Government. Peel Holdings have said on their website which was recently updated on in August, "Locally we recognise the role Wirral Waters can play in the delivery of any local housing strategy and the importance of brownfield developments in reducing the pressure to build new homes on Wirral's green spaces. We and our partners remain absolutely committed to house building on the Wirral Waters site." The Core Strategy Local Plan indicates that we are short of land to build 4700 houses, but with negotiations with Peel Holdings, Wirral Council should be able to come to some arrangement with them to build sufficient homes on these urban sites to avoid building on Green Belt. Driving around the Wirral there are also many urban sites that have not been included on the Local Plan and do not have planning permission, so a comprehensive survey of available brownfield sites has not been done. The council therefore falls foul of paragraph 119 of NPPF which says that the council should be proactive in identifying land that may be suitable for meeting development needs. Green Belt land is designated as such for 5 reasons. The first one is to check unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. I am particularly concerned about sites SP030, SP033 and SP035 in Bebington. If building takes place on this land, Bebington will just become one large housing estate and the quality of life & environment of this area would change for the worse forever. The second reason for Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. If these sites are built on, Bebington would merge into Storeton.</p>
DOR03057 cont'd	<p>This would also go against the fourth reason for Green Belt which is preserving the historic setting and special character of historic towns or areas. Storeton is a small village with its own identity. Lever Causeway also has historical significance as a route built by Lord Leverhulme from Thornton Manor towards his factory in Port Sunlight. Sites SP030, SP033 and SP035 are each side of this road. The third reason for Green Belt is to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. If all of the proposed sites are developed, the Bebington Ward area which presently has 50% of its land as Green Belt, will have no Green Belt whatsoever i.e. 100% reduction and Wirral South constituency would lose 33% of its Green Belt land. These are totally unacceptable figures. The fifth reason for Green Belt is to assist urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict urban land. Peel Holdings have outline planning permission to build 13521 homes on Wirral Waters. They have said that they are committed to building on this site. The Local Plan indicates that Green Belt needs to be built on because of a shortage of urban sites, but there is, in fact, plenty of land to build on this site alone. If you add to this the brownfield sites identified plus the sites that do exist but are not included on the Local Plan, there is absolutely no need to build on Green Belt land. If Wirral Council decide to adopt this Core Strategy Local Plan as it stands, they WILL find that they will be legally challenged.</p>
DOR03058	<p>It is totally unacceptable to even consider developing on the Wirral green belt sites knowing that enough housing can be found to meet the national government target through re-occupation of existing houses and regeneration of brownfield sites that have already been identified, offering a total well in excess of the 12,000 homes required by 2035. Wirral residents will not tolerate local government incompetence resulting in the loss of our precious green belt facilities within the Wirral peninsula. It is the duty of the local government to investigate and exhaust every possibility to reuse existing housing and assist in urban regeneration sites that have the local services already provisioned and will ensure we preserve our Wirral green belt for future generations. The proposed plans to build on our Wirral protected green belt will contravene the National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) and lead to unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas and merging of neighbouring towns. This will be detrimental to Wirral and our goal to preserve, maintain and protect places of interest and historic towns. It is paramount that we pay attention to the NPPF cautionary message in Paragraph 135 "Once Lost-Lost Forever".</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03059	<p>I would like to submit my objections to the use of the green belt land of Wirral for development . This will have a permanent negative effect on the unique nature of the Wirral Peninsula. I am specifically objecting to the proposal to develop the fields adjacent to Stapledon Woods. I can see no argument that can possibly support the destruction of this beautiful part of the Wirral. The woods cannot help but be adversely affected by this proposed development and we will lose this corner of the Wirral forever. Barn owls are frequently spotted hunting over these fields.</p>
DOR03060	<p>Riverside Park, Wirral International Business Park, ELPS049 –, representations to Local Plan preferred sites consultation, planning objection, vision statement, masterplan plan, highway feasibility report and letter of support received.</p> <p>Vision Statement - Demonstrated by the Masterplan that a suitable housing scheme can be achieved on this site. The plan shows the demolition of the existing buildings on site and a layout to show dwellings which could be achieved on the site, whilst presenting a suitable amount of open space. The site, should it be released for housing by the Council, will potentially be delivered by developers, who have a good track record for delivering housing in a quick and efficient manner and to a high standard, who have completed one of the most successful integrated mixed use schemes in the UK and have completed several retail, housing, and business developments across Europe. The proposals to bring this site forward for housing development will contribute towards the Council's shortfall in 5 year supply of housing, and will meet the requirements of Paragraph 73 of the NPPF (2018) whereby the site will be deliverable. The proposals also contribute towards development of Brownfield land, land of which Wirral currently have a shortfall of, hence the current Green Belt land review. Planning history, local and national policy and Wirral's housing requirements are cited. Lack of demand for employment use, despite initial successes, after several years the economic downturn and recession took a significant toll. Vacancy rates increased as businesses went into administration or down-sized, while demand for office floorspace markedly fell away. Despite extensive and wide-ranging marketing efforts, vacancy levels remain challenging. Only very modest interest emerged over this period. Outline planning permission for 75 apartments was refused at Appeal in 2015 for reasons such as the proposal would have a harmful effect on the level of risk to public health and safety, the proposal would fail to support strong, vibrant and healthy communities and would not perform well against the social role of sustainable development.</p> <p>The proposal would be significantly at odds with the Council's adopted policies for safeguarding employment land within defined areas and would seriously undermine its well established and on-going strategic and local approach to economic development and regeneration. Residential dwellings on this site and the former Epichem site, would lead to a removal of the HSE designation. Employment use is out-dated and should be reconsidered. Local policy is summarised. The sites allocated back dates the production of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (February 2000). The emerging Core Strategy has not taken into consideration, site specific market conditions. The site at Riverside Park has already been tested for B1 business use and there is an evident lack of demand. When judged against the sustainability criteria in the NPPF this assessment demonstrates that the proposed development will contribute to the social role of Bromborough. The proposed development site is demonstrably suitable and a good place to host new housing development that will deliver a range of benefits and value to Bromborough. Further development in Bromborough will ensure that the village continues to thrive and that services are maintained, whilst increasing the presence of new demographics who will further support and facilitate the village and surrounding area. The site as it currently stands has become unviable for employment use due to the ongoing lack of demand. The site has already been developed and therefore is not available for future development as it stands. The site is considered at present as white land, a general expression used to mean land (and buildings) without any specific proposal for allocation in a development plan, where it is intended that for the most part, existing uses shall remain undisturbed and unaltered.</p> <p>It is suggested that Riverside Park is incorporated into development of the site to the North at the former Epichem site, and the site to the West (map provided). This would be the most suitable way forward, and would provide a large amount of housing within a sustainable location. This would also lead to a reduction in the amount of Green Belt sites having to be released for housing. Brownfield sites should take priority over Green Belt sites, to accommodate housing need.</p> <p>In conclusion 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 its industrial allocation in the new Local Development Plan and allocated for housing.</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. 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.</p> <p>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</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>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.</p> <p>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 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. 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. 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. There are compelling reasons and some exceptional circumstances that would warrant Wirral opting for a higher housing need requirement.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>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> <p>Planning Objection - Site description, planning history and employment statistics are summarised.</p> <p>The Council have recommended: to allocate this site as an Employment Development Site as part of a wider Primarily Industrial Area. Given the context of the site and its adjoining uses it is considered that the site could best accommodate B1 and particularly B1a development. The reasons why the additional B1 uses have not been built at Riverside Park should be strongly considered by the Council. Evidence shows a lack of demand following the advertisement of the vacant high-quality office space at Riverside Park.</p> <p>Analysis of Wirral's Employment Land & Premises Study is provided.</p> <p>The assessment classed the land as Greenfield however the land would be more appropriate to be classed as white land as the site could accommodate a different range of uses. The existing hardstanding on site indicate that it would be suitable to be classed as previously developed land, certainly in part anyway.</p> <p>Agree that road access is good due to its proximity to the A41, local accessibility is very good, local road network is also suitable for adopting any additional vehicles. We deem the site to be more isolated from local employment areas. Proposals for large industrial and large distribution units would therefore not be in-keeping with the surrounding employment uses and new office development has been shown to be unviable on this site and the adjacent site. Owners have confirmed that they are soon to lose another 10,000 sq. ft. which would push the void rate to over 45%. This is not the mark of an area of employment land with good market attractiveness. It should be classed as being very poor. We don't believe that the viability rating of the site is good and should be poor or very poor.</p> <p>0 – 5 year time schedule has been provided for delivery. We would argue that due to the lack of market interest there is minimal chance that this site could be delivered on that timescale. There is no market interest for further office development within this location or adjacent site, the delivery timescale provided is highly unlikely therefore the site overall should be considered to be poor or very poor for further employment use.</p> <p>We do not feel that this area is appropriate for large industrial or large distribution units due to the surrounding land uses being offices or open land. There is no market interest for further office development, the delivery timescale provided is highly unlikely therefore the site overall should be considered to be poor or very poor for further employment use. The creation of jobs on this site is likely to be miniscule in the context of employment across the Wirral and the creation of jobs would likely be offset elsewhere in a more appropriate location. Development Plan and history of allocation is summarised.</p> <p>The sites allocated back dates the production of the Wirral Unitary Development Plan (February 2000). The emerging Core Strategy has not taken into consideration, site specific market conditions. The site at Riverside Park has already been tested for B1 business use and there is an evident lack of demand. Several marketing initiatives have taken place to market the existing building at Riverside Park for B1 office use (estate agents letters and marketing details enclosed).</p> <p>Since 2017 Riverside Park have had only 1 enquiry from a recruitment company for 4,000 sq. ft. of B1 office, however they decided to purchase an office in Woodside instead. In summary, from estate agents extensive dealings with Riverside Park they have concluded the opinion that there is no shortage of available land suitable for B2 or B8 uses within the Wirral area where enquiry levels remain extremely poor. This is clearly evidenced by the fact that there remains a large amount of vacant space within the buildings speculatively developed on the site. It is evident that the remaining phases of the development scheme should not be built as a result of the current market situation.</p> <p>Conclusion - The Council should reconsider this employment land allocation and remove it from future documentation. This site is considered unsuitable for future employment B1 uses, and the Council should consider alternative options.</p> <p>Highway Feasibility - Detailed report indicates that it is not considered that a residential development would necessarily have an adverse material impact on the surrounding highway network. Sites can be considered to be accessible by sustainable modes of travel. Off-site junction capacity does not present a material concern. Nothing to suggest an existing safety issue and the accident record is considered to be enviable. Potential residential development at the site is deliverable from a traffic and transportation perspective.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03061	<p>Land North of Irby Road, Irby, SPO60 – representations on local plan preferred sites consultation, vision statement, residential site plan, ecological assessment, landscape and visual site appraisal, flood risk & drainage scoping report and accessibility appraisal received.</p> <p>Vision Statement - Submitted masterplan shows a mixture of housing which could potentially be achieved on the site. The layout has taken account of the existing watercourse and has provided an 8-metre easement gap as advised by Flood Consultants. The layout shows 5 different house types including 3 detached bungalows, fronting on to Irby Road, and a mixture of 2 storey semi-detached dwellings. The layout results in 24.5 dwellings per hectare, which are more than sufficient plots in terms of density. Site is relatively well contained by surrounding residential development and the topography to the north and the south. The views are limited to nearby roads and public footpaths to the north. Should the Council seek to release parcel SP060, the site would be a valuable contribution to a wider masterplan. Some areas along the brook corridor are within Flood Zones 2 and 3, whilst this is a constraining factor it also offers the potential to create an attractive area of public open space with footpath links that could connect to the existing rights of way within the wider site. Local and national planning policy and housing requirements for Wirral are cited. The land is also unnecessary to keep permanently open as it has no public access and the permanence of the boundaries in all directions will ensure that no further encroachment of the Green Belt at the end of the plan period. The proposed site at Irby Road therefore displays the exceptional circumstances required for release from the Green Belt as Wirral needs to enhance their housing supply. The site would be classed as sustainable development as it is adjacent to a major settlement with good transport facilities, local services and amenities. The site would not lead to further encroachment in to the Green Belt due to the permanence of the site boundaries and finally the site doesn't accord with the five purposes of the Green Belt which are defined above.</p> <p>The site contains no policy constraints besides the Green Belt allocation preventing its future development. The site is fully enclosed and contained by the adopted road network which will help prevent encroachment in to the countryside whilst providing a clear physical feature which is likely to be 'permeant', (in line with para 85 of the NPPF). This is contained in all directions and therefore should be assessed as having a good defensible boundary. The site doesn't contribute significantly to any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF and Local Plan. Based upon the supporting information we believe that the proposed site at Irby Road does not significantly support the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and its release from the Green Belt would be considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF to bolster housing requirements across the Borough.</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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>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. 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. 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. 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.</p> <p>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>
DOR03062	<p>Aboricultural Report. - Trees on site collectively provide an excellent visual amenity for the surrounding area. Occasional specimens have a higher amenity value due to their age, size and visual prominence. Species surveyed include Common Ash, Common Beech, Birch, Oak, Elder and Sycamore. At present no trees are recommended for removal. No remedial works were deemed necessary. The site surveyed comprises an area of native woodland with mature and veteran trees present. These features not only have high amenity value and potentially a long lifespan, but collectively will provide a range of niche habitats providing opportunities for wildlife. Bat roosting potential could not be fully assessed due to limited access. There are a number of high amenity trees within this site. They will enhance any proposed development and care should be taken at the design stage to ensure that these trees are retained where possible. All trees on this site are afforded protection by Tree Preservation Order WR0145A00. The data gained during the survey provides an indication of the health of the trees. However, it does not enable a comprehensive assessment of their condition over time. Trees are living organisms which are affected by many factors including weather conditions, diseases/disorders, light levels and human activities. Because of this, this report is only valid for a period of 1 year from the date of issuing.</p> <p>Marketing - Letter from estate agent indicates instruction to market site in June 2016. Table provided show interest came from 5 applicants, comments indicate SAFC employees were looking for a new venture, another company decided to take a place at Champions Business Park and others indicated site was too big, too expensive. Agent indicated interest was limited and there is no current interest. Feedback indicates the laboratory/manufacturing space is not fit for modern purpose and that office accommodation is dated and would ideally need significant modernisation.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03063	I'm writing to express my concern over the government proposal to force WBC to build houses on Wirral's Green belt land. Wirral is a lovely place to live and this is partly due to the amount of green belt land that Wirral residents enjoy. Building on this land will be irreversible and generations to come will be deprived of what we as residents value now. I do not want all Wirral's town and villages to be closer together as a result of the green belt disappearing. Build houses on brownfield sites or rehouse in one of the 600 empty properties. I am strongly against building on green belt across Wirral. I urge you to do all you can to prevent the irreversible damage that will be done if Wirral's greenbelt is allowed to disappear forever.
DOR03064	I would like to register my objection to the proposed building of houses on Green Belt Land in Poulton Lancelyn. I have seen the impact of mass housing development in Ellesmere Port near my friends home. Traffic is now bottle necked down one small road trying to get to the M53. Terrible . Why must you destroy our green belt, build on brown sites. I know these projects involve a lot of money, but that does not mean the builders have the right to ride rough shod over our lives. Please fight this terrible idea.
DOR03065	While everyone realises the need for housing these days there is no need to eat up green belt land. There are many empty commercial areas where houses could be built and if you were to make Peel Holding come good on their proposed development it would go a long way to solving the problem. The proposed land at Spital would be a disaster the volume of traffic already in the area it would create it would be) accidents waiting to happen due to the Croft and Industrial estates Levers poor roads and lack of transport services shop and school which are already oversubscribed. All of these issues require very thorough investigation.
DOR03066	I strongly object to using Green Belt land for homes and leisure facilities. A much better idea would be that, brownfield and non-Green Belt land are used first, including above shop and town centre conversions. That the Council do not consider giving any Planning Permissions until all above sites have been built upon. Developers obviously want to build on Green Belt as the profit margin is higher due to more congenial surroundings. Inspirational and far sighted designs by architects need not mean the usual identikit boxes are built. The style of same multiple designs nationwide and on estates needs to be corrected and addressed with imagination. After Brexit more agricultural land will be needed to offset food costs, so again brownfield sites first .
DOR03067	I am emailing to support the opposition of plans to build houses on local green belt land. I support the need for housing however appropriate placement is essential.
DOR03068	Client's site, which forms part of Parcel SP071 is highly enclosed, being surrounded by existing built development. Council's view that only Green Purposes 1 and 2 appear to allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites. Sites that do not fulfil an important role in relation to the first two Green Belt purposes are therefore more likely to represent candidates for release than other sites which make a greater contribution to those purposes. Welcome the Council's acknowledgement of the need to undertake a review of the Green Belt and recognition that the preparation of the new Local Plan is the appropriate time to release land which is shown to not perform an important Green Belt role. Most of the existing Green Belt boundary was defined several decades ago (in 1983), with the various settlements having been gradually developed, leaving very little residual developable land within certain settlement boundaries. There is a compelling need to release Green Belt land for development, without which it will not be possible to meet the needs of the local population and the economy. Previous Comments Regarding the SHLAA Update 2014, whilst we considered that the proposed methodology was generally robust, we provided our view that there is a compelling and urgent need to undertake a review of the Green Belt in Wirral. Submitted evidence which demonstrated that a high-quality residential scheme can be accommodated at the Chester Road site in Heswall without offending the five purposes of the Green Belt set out in the NPPF, given the highly contained nature of the site and the strong physical features which define its boundaries.
DOR03068	The findings from a suite of preliminary technical assessments undertaken to test the feasibility of developing the Chester Road site, which demonstrated that whilst some important matters will need careful consideration during the design process, no technical constraints have been identified which would preclude the site coming forward for housing; and _ confirmation that client is committed to working collaboratively with the Council and other local stakeholders with a view to delivering a high-quality residential scheme. Site was included as part of the SHLAA Update 2016 and was identified as notionally being able to deliver approximately 250 residential units. However, the site did not form a component of the Council's assessment of future supply. We reiterated that identified needs can only be met in full through the careful release of some Green Belt land in sustainable locations. We welcomed the proposal in the SHLAA Methodology Update 2017 to assign undeveloped sites in the Green Belt a theoretical category rating (between Categories 1 and 4). In our submission to the Proposed Methodology for the Green Belt Review, we again explained why Green Belt land in sustainable locations will need to be released and highlighted some of the key economic challenges. Characteristics of the Site : Council's evidence documents confirms that Parcel SP017 benefits from a high level of containment, surrounded by existing residential uses on three sides (north, west and south) and other built development including a hotel and a public house/restaurant to the north west and a primary school to the north; will form a natural 'rounding off' of the south-eastern part of Heswall, one of Wirral's largest settlements with its own railway station and an array of community facilities; and is enclosed to the east by the 'Borderlands' railway line (Bidston to Wrexham) and to the south by Chester Road – both of which represent enduring boundaries which means there is no potential for further expansion of Heswall to the south or east and there is no possibility of Heswall and Park gate /Neston coalescing (maps enclosed). Parcel SP017 is controlled by a relatively small number of landowners. Site is very well-related to Heswall, wholly within Flood Zone 1 and surface water flooding can be engineered out. There are unlikely to be any ecological constraints, potential to secure net gains for biodiversity, possible to create two vehicular access points, additional pedestrian and cycle accesses can be provided. Noise and vibration sources have been identified - Chester Road, railway line, Darlington's Industrial Estate, hotel and restaurant, and Heswall

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Football Club. Acousticians have specified appropriate set-back distances, which have been incorporated into initial parameters plans. There are not anticipated to be any utilities related constraints. Development will involve the loss of 9.5 hectares of land within agricultural land sub-grade 3a, which Agricultural Consultants regards as not significant and a negligible loss of the agricultural resources available locally. to secure net gains for biodiversity, possible to create two vehicular access points, additional pedestrian and cycle accesses can be provided.</p> <p>Green Belt Review - Pleased to note that the Council's Green Belt Review has been undertaken in line with various recommendations that we made at the Proposed Methodology stage. We endorse the Council's view that only Green Purposes 1 and 2 appear to allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites. Sites/parcels have been assessed in relation to all five of the Green Belt purposes, which we agree is the correct approach.</p> <p>Pleased to note the confirmation in paragraphs 1.4 and 3.6 of the Green Belt Review Background Report that the assessment parcels have been defined using clear, strong boundaries. Our client's site at Chester Road is one of the best-performing candidate sites in terms of restricting urban sprawl. The Council's finding reflects the fact that Parcel SP071 is surrounded by built development on three sides and is bounded by Chester Road to the south as well as the Borderlands railway line to the east. Those physical features represent readily recognisable boundaries which, by their nature, are highly likely to be permanent. Our client's site is therefore one of the best-performing candidate sites in terms of preventing coalescence. Table 4 of the Background Report referred to 'Sites Recommended for Further Investigation'. Parcel SP071, which contains our client's site, is one of the candidate sites.</p> <p>Table 4 identifies a notional capacity of 187-281 dwellings for Parcel SP071, but the technical work undertaken recently by clients professional team suggests that Parcel SP071 can comfortably accommodate in the region of 390 homes, taking account of on-site constraints and desire to incorporate generous provision of publicly accessible, green open space (further details in Development Framework document forms part of submission). All of the Green Belt Parcels perform the same in relation to Purposes 4 and 5, and Purpose 3 (with a handful of exceptions). When assessed against the Green Belt purposes as defined by the NPPF, it is clear that Parcel SP071 is a very strong candidate for release. Development Framework, Landscape & Visual Assessment & Agricultural Quality</p> <p>Key findings from three other documents that form part of our submission demonstrate that there are no physical, environmental, ecological or other constraints that will prevent the site coming forward for housing. Benefits - Development will: make a meaningful contribution to the supply of market and affordable housing in one of Wirral's largest and most sustainable settlements – at a highly enclosed, natural rounding-off site, adjacent to existing residential uses, and one of the best-performing sites in the Council's Initial Green Belt Review provide high-quality family homes in a range of styles and sizes, including much needed affordable properties for local people, thereby helping to retain working families in the area as well as meeting identified housing needs; create new areas of publicly accessible open space, utilising and improving the strong network of ponds, trees, hedgerows and other natural assets at the site and supplementing them with the creation of new parkland areas; enhance biodiversity in the area; and enable Heswall Town Football Club to benefit from improved facilities. The land within the central part of the site is controlled by client, with a small number of adjacent land ownerships. Accordingly, the benefits outlined above can be delivered much more quickly and straightforwardly than at other sites which are controlled by a greater number of landowners. Development Options Review – Briefing Session (September 2018). Confirms neighbouring local authorities cannot meet Wirral's needs; there is a substantial shortfall in housing land supply; it is not possible to meet the Borough's needs without using land within the Green Belt; sites/parcels have been assessed against all five Green Belt purposes, but with a focus on urban enclosure and not reducing the separation between settlements; the Initial Green Belt Review has focused on the 'strongest' boundaries; and that Parcel SP071 is one of five 'highly enclosed parcels. The suite of documents which comprises our submission demonstrate that the site is sustainably located and free from physical, legal, environmental or ecological constraints that would prevent the site coming forward as a housing allocation in the short term.</p>
DOR03069	<p>The Green Belt provides the lungs of a conservation such as ours. We live on one of the 4 entrances to SP013 and witness around 1000 visitors/week passing our house - dog walkers, buses etc. Lots of spaces in Birkenhead dockland - need using first. As Green Belt 'countryside' is threatened with the destruction not just being 'spoilt'. Building on 013 would destroy the farmland, which is itself productive, but also educational to the walkers in the woods and preserve the view of Thurstaston Hotel. Use derelict dock land, lots of it. New infrastructure should not affect Green Belt. Justify the destruction. As suggested, the population needs the green Belt to breathe.</p>
DOR03070	<p>Have to be affordable homes. The 6,000 empty properties need to be occupied first then build on brownfields. Green Belt land is here to protect our countryside to keep Wirral beautiful not an urban sprawl. The Council needs to redevelop brownfields and water ways. If they build there, there would not be any need to destroy our Green Belt. Wirral Borough council has sold school sites already for many housing developments. Now you are saying we will need extra schools!</p>
DOR03071	<p>This number of homes exceeds what the Wirral population needs. Government doesn't take this into account with their "one-size fits all policy". Do what one of your Councillors has suggested - take the Government to court. (The three "4" boxes are intentional) 1950's to 1980's - there was a lot more green Belt then (was it even called that in the 50's?) Today, there is far less, so what remains is very important and necessary. This whole business makes me want to leave Wirral (having lived here all my life). When there is eventually no Green Belt left, where will houses be built? A return to high-rise accommodation with a clear view of all the concrete? New infrastructure will be needed if more homes are built - which is an excellent reason for leaving the Green Belt alone. Please don't ruin our (still lovely) Peninsula.</p>
DOR03072	<p>Build on brownfield sites first. Fill empty properties. Many shops have 2/3 BR flats above which have been unoccupied for over 10 years. Speculators holding empty properties as value rises. Force them to house those in need of housing. If in need of repair force them on pain of financial penalty to make buildings habitable on a time scale.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03073	This excludes golf course for rich visitors in Green Belt West Kirby area. Rebuild Council buildings which are neglected. Example 22 apartments on Ashton Road/Banks Road, West Kirby. Listen to your constituents, not rich businesses from elsewhere please!
DOR03074	Walking around, you see large companies with land held for years, for car parks, expansion. Example - Arrowe Park Hospital. They take a bit more of a beautiful open space, build another car park, which won't fill up and take more of the open space. We must protect Green Belt. We need plants and trees to provide a balanced natural areas, where animals and people live together. Birkenhead North/Bidston Rise, a whole street was removed. Again, we must provide a green and pleasant land. In some areas, kids don't know what a farm or open Green Land is. Hoylake is a balanced area: Good transport, good parks and open spaces, good shops, pubs and cafes, good school, good architecture and layout. Less garage conversion and bits added to existing houses. We need order building control.
DOR03075	New housing, if needed, needs to be built on suitable brown field sites not Green Belt. Wirral's natural beauty needs to be preserved for visitors and locals alike. Brown field, vacant land in existing residential/industrial areas should be used and decontaminated if necessary for parks and housing. Many areas in the plan are designated as contained industrial use when they are clearly just wasteland, with no industrial use planned or intended. This land needs to be re-zoned for housing or Green Belt or simply opened up as 'open' space. Whilst I think it is a good idea to have a review of all available land/facilities, I do not want this to be an exercise in picking off the best land for re-development, leaving the Council tax payer to look after the poorer quality land. It should be an opportunity to make the Wirral a better place to live for all. Better allocation of on-street parking; re-use of industrial land for parks; more Health Centres; more investment in cycle paths and walking paths.
DOR03076	leaflet tick box comments only
DOR03077	1. Our Green Belts and green spaces i.e. parks allotments and playing fields are essential for the physical and mental health and wellbeing of the population as well as for the natural world and its plants and creatures. They filter toxins from the likes of cars, motorbikes and bus exhausts. 2. To destroy the green belts and green spaces in anyway is criminal and counterproductive vandalism and extremely short sighted. 3. There are plenty of brown field sites, rows of rundown shops e.g. Borough road and unused office blocks to use into the first place for extra housing. 4. do not waste money on tarring up Grange Road and other shopping areas - people go elsewhere or shop-on-line. 5. you have closed schools, why build more? where will you get staff? 6. where are you going to get the GPs for the new medical centres? There leaving the profession in droves - like nurses and teachers. 7. Lower business rates. 8. Stop fleecing motorists by building car parks (or extending them) and charging eye watering fees to park. 9. Get realistic. Stop trying to open or better other towns/cities and waste money in showy projects created by bigheads with big ideas. The public do not want or need them and resent their tax being used for them. 10. First sort out, clean up the filthy pig sty that is all too obvious in various parts of the borough. It would be well worth it. The impression a visitor (or even resident) has of a rundown dirty, uncared for area lorded over by self-complacent overpaid, overweight bureaucrats on the gravy train. 11. People value good quality buildings. Something well-designed and built; not some Soviet-style council rubbish. 12. Don't waste money on "experts". There are plenty of qualified, capable people already here on the Wirral. 13. The Wirral Peninsula is a lovely place (in parts). Preserve it, don't just hack at it and ruin it further for future generations (it's changed in my lifetime and not for the better, unfortunately). 14. Otherwise, it will come back to haunt you in many ways, if that is the path you choose. 15. You don't win with nature. It has a way of getting its own back on man's misuse and lack of respect, selfishness and greed. 17. think very carefully indeed on these things and even more carefully before you submit your final plan to the "so-called independent" planning inspector, otherwise you will all feel very foolish indeed if it is trashed. 18. Be sensible and realistic in your ideas and how they can be delivered - no clever clogs destruction of the area.
DOR03078	We don't need the new large scale plan for the new golfing complex and I speak as a golfer. We have enough courses on the Wirral to more than satisfy current demand.
DOR03079	The right kind of homes should be built in the right place - i.e. brownfield land. Creating new garden villages is easily the worst option. They will require the building (or at least widening of even more roads to even reach them. Doubtless, infrastructure would trail well behind the building of houses. I don't feel we should build on Green Belt land at all. Much better public transport, especially since the demise of Avon buses. Why can't greater utilization be made of the railway by providing bus links from other centre of Heswall to Heswall Station. All the services that passed (use to pass) it are at completely the wrong time to link in with the train services. Do you really need more 5+ BR houses taking up large plots of land? Surely the houses to be built should be ones that are needed. Currently the wrong sort of houses are being built in the wrong places. No Green Belt land should be used to build on until all the brownfield sites have been used and then only if absolutely necessary. It seems that using green Belt is just an easy option but it is a disaster for the future of the environment.
DOR03080	In addition to the apartments to be built by Peel Holdings, more homes for single people or couples should be built throughout the Wirral, so single or old couples can move out. Under occupied family homes but stay local. More social housing is needed including by the Council and golf courses are suitable "targets" as they benefit few and are the least valuable green areas environmentally. More community facilities and more visibility; improved road junctions and pedestrian crossings and better enforcement of speed limits.
DOR03081	Build on the land where the council wants another golf course (17 in Wirral already) which the population is very much against. Who would it be for? The rich and famous. Not us, the general public. If you have to build on the Green Belt then make absolutely certain that only affordable/social housing is built.
DOR03082	Leaflet tick box comments only
DOR03083	Brown sites first.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03084	I was born in Birkenhead. To look at it now brings a pain in my heart. Start by sorting out the mess of Birkenhead with new homes for the people on lots of areas. That's a disaster. Stop the uncontrolled Council from doing to the rest of Wirral what it has done to Birkenhead. We need our community facilities protected from the Council. This plan is a money spinner for the Council and not for the people of Wirral.
DOR03085	What about the empty properties that seem to exist in fairly large numbers. How many are there? If the plan limited itself to brownfield development, how many houses could be built? The Green Belt should be protected at all costs. If this means less housing is developed then so be it. The map on page 15 shows how easy Wirral would develop into a densely populated area. The Green belt on Wirral is fragile and should be seen as an absolute necessity to modern living. What does the population trend indicate in regard to housing requirements. The whole thing looks like a political game. Whilst we continue to develop or spend on a golf resort in Hoylake, at the same time as shutting down special needs schools, the council has no credibility. We already have a golf course covered a whole area. If Peel holdings has an agreement in place with WBC to build a large number of houses on private land then that plan should be speeded up with incentives if necessary. When did the statue requiring a local plan come into effect? The housing minister, Environmental Minister etc. should be invited to see the Wirral first hand. What do our local MPs have to say? Particularly Wirral south and Wirral West? This plan is vandalism of the first order. WBC should be ashamed.
DOR03086	<p>As a pensioner I enjoy free local transport. The working population needs free transport at the busy times of the day. They have families to feed and mortgages etc. to find. Their need is absolutely more important. If they had access to a proper public transport system there will be fewer cars on the road at busy times and with their transport costs reduced they would generate a more productive economy and more jobs for others. Finance a proper public transport system; construct a few new road junctions (without traffic light); add a few more stations to the existing rail network and electrify the Bidston to Neston line - even consider reinstating the Neston to Hooton Railway (It's only a rarely used footpath these days). When the population can get anywhere in the Borough in less than 30 minutes they will find more job potential and then they will define where they want to live and where you will plan the houses. New Stations at :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Woodchurch Rd; 2. Between Moreton /Meols 3. between New Brighton/Wallasey Village; 4. extend West Kirby to Caldy. <p>Economics will determine what and where to build. As a branch of Government your duty is to provide the best chances of your residents being able to find work in your area. Frequent/free transport will do that. Fewer cars/more train passengers/more frequent buses/train and ferries will kick start economic activity (Liscard and Egremont Ferry to Liverpool?). Don't charge for parking/but limit parking duration so people can get to the shops and not find the town/village areas clogged with all day parking - parking charges kills retail. The people will create the jobs local government never will. Why does every cross river bus continue into Liverpool when many are half-way. They could be providing Cross Wirral transport. We don't all want to go to Liverpool. Some in West Kirby want to go to Eastham etc.</p> <p>The last strategic investment in Wirral was the M53 in the 70s. There was talk at the time that the J2 spur to Moreton was the first part of a roadway across the peninsula and then via a causeway over the Dee to Wales. This would have provided an opportunity for a freshwater lake for the Northwest with sailing and recreational opportunities with associated employment. Such a road would have given speedy access to N. Wales. But also access into Wirral/Merseyside from N. Wales and Ireland. We would be connected to the larger economy and not just stuck at the end of a road. Such a scheme might dislodge a few birds and gun fans from the marshes. But they didn't reside there 80 years ago. The Dee was a tidal estuary not a mud bath with plagues of flies as it currently presents itself. Why is there no bus service using the M53 as a speedy North-South link. By all means have a local plan. But don't try hard and impose your thoughts on a developing economy which will move much faster than any government when it comes to the detail. Create free/frequent/fast public transport. Unblock the road bottlenecks (Barnston, Village, Arrow park and many others). The 1st public consultation I visited was the bus placed at Arrowe Park Junction to discuss the plan. to remove the round-a-bout (pre 2006) whilst at the bus there where objections from Woodchurch residents that it would encourage the use of the estate as a rabbit run. there was no modification to the proposal on offer. Had the proposal to limit the junction to 3 exits and approaches, all left turning traffic could have flowed continuously and Woodchurch estate would not be the rabbit run it is today.</p>
DOR03087	Who needs these homes? It is the first time buyers, or those who cannot afford to buy. Builders want to make a profit, that only comes from the larger houses. we need our Green Belt for a good environment for physical and mental well-being. Green Belt land is needed of food production, cattle, cattle food, crops and horses. Green Belt is green belt for the 5 reasons listed. Any use of Green Belt will destroy the local environment. There is a problem getting the staff for the existing health care facilities. How do you cope with more? Schools - they have been closed down in recent years. Why. Car parking - better public transport is what is needed. Shops etc. - they are closing down because of superstores. Why build more when many are empty or charity shops. Community facilities - youth are all supposed to go to Birkenhead. vandalism/boredom further afield. Who are you building new housing for? Think before you grab green belt.
DOR03088	We would not need more homes if we reduced the numbers of immigrants. And why not build all these homes in the vast areas of derelict land in Eastern Wirral. you say "we need to build more homes? Why? You cannot continue to build in a limited area. And if you do, where do you grow food for that population. All politicians and civil servants involved in making these plans are not fit for purpose as the plans will upset every respondent of Wirral and cause huge outcry and deserved rebellion (except from the immigrants and builders and speculators who will all benefit). And this could lose Labour the next local elections. Be warned. No additional infrastructure would needed, if you did not build any more houses!
DOR03089	Leaflet tick box comments only

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03090	I think it is most important to protect Green Belt land where people can walk, play and destress. And any homes being built to be built on brown land first and affordable to all not to just a few. I think this Council is bias and will do what they like. The government does not want you to take Green land. They would prefer you to use brown sites. More GP surgeries and more schools. Stop closing them down and where you have use that land. To get rid of most of the green Land is most unwise and is not necessary.
DOR03091	Where possible houses should be built on brownfield sites or filling in areas where there are already houses. Empty houses should be used to house people without homes. We have a few green spaces. These should be preserved. We have enough brownfield sites and empty properties available. Business premises could also be converted for housing. We should not need to build on Green Belt land. It is detrimental to the flora and fauna for the area spoiling important habitat, causing pollution and unreasonable pressure on services. local shops within walking instance of houses, improved cycle lanes, better recycling, litter bins, well maintained parks and play areas, haven for wildlife, flood defences and green spaces in which to walk and play.
DOR03092	There are plenty of Brownfield sites to develop without touching the Greenbelt, including part of Birkenhead North where a lot of the houses are boarded up. Use Brownfield sites before touching Greenbelt. Use Brownfield sites first. Where is your review of these? There is a large area of Birkenhead & Wallasey Docklands held by Peel Holdings waiting for development. Revision of bus services, cycling facilities. You should have reviewed brownfield sites before considering Greenbelt. You haven't considered developers like Peel Holdings that hold considerable Brownfield sites. Why aren't you getting them to develop the areas. This must have been the plan when they bought the land cheaply.
DOR03093	<p>In considering the proposal to release large tracts of green belt land to the east of the motorway for housing development and the requirement for much of the housing to be affordable housing available to young families, I would ask the council to consider the following. Before any decisions are taken on the release of land for residential development Independent research needs to be carried out in those areas to assess the levels of air pollution The nearer the motorway the cheaper will be the housing and much of it will end up being occupied by families with young children. The prevailing wind on The Wirral blows West to East. Increasing the housing density in these areas will increase the traffic flow resulting in more hold up with traffic stationary or moving more slowly resulting in higher levels of pollution. Fears of the harmful effects of traffic emissions have been raised in a major study linking motorway pollution with permanent and life-limiting damage to children's lungs. People who live within 500 metres of a motorway grow up with significantly reduced lung capacity, and even children who have never experienced asthma are at risk, scientists warn. Studies link permanent lung damage, which can shorten life expectancy, to traffic pollution. Previous research by the same scientists showed that children who grew up in areas of high pollution and car fumes were more likely to develop asthma. But the new study provides strong evidence that car emissions stunt crucial lung development in children between the ages of 10 and 18. The researchers suggest that traffic generated fumes are to blame. A Department of Health spokeswoman is quoted as saying "This evidence will be considered amongst other evidence of possible ill health from motorways or other vehicle emissions". Children who live near a major highway are not only more likely to develop asthma or other respiratory diseases, but their lung development may also be stunted. Children are especially vulnerable to auto-emission health impacts because, among other reasons, they breathe more air relative to their body weight than adults, are more physically active, and spend more times outdoors during times when pollutant levels are at their highest. (Hulse, et al., 2004) Additionally, children have many more years ahead of them in which the cumulative damage caused by auto emissions can manifest itself in disease or disability.</p> <p>Women who live near areas of high automobile traffic during pregnancy have a 20 - 30% higher chance of having children with lung impairment. (Morales, et al., 2014) Auto emission PM exposure from nearness to high traffic during the third trimester of pregnancy doubles the risk for autism. (Raz, et al., 2014). According to a study that appeared in the Feb. 17 issue of The Lancet and is now available online, researchers at the Keck School of Medicine of USC found that children who lived within 500 meters of a freeway, or approximately a third of a mile, since age 10 had substantial deficits in lung function by the age of 18 years, compared to children living at least 1,500 meters, or approximately one mile, away. "Someone suffering a pollution-related deficit in lung function as a child will probably have less than healthy lungs all of his or her life," said lead author W. James Gauderman, associate professor of preventive medicine at the Keck School of Medicine. "And poor lung function in later adult life is known to be a major risk factor for respiratory and cardiovascular diseases." The report draws upon data from the Children's Health Study, a longitudinal document of respiratory health among children in 12 Southern California communities. More than 3,600 children around the age of 10 were evaluated over a period of eight years, through high school graduation. Lung function tests were taken during annual school visits, and the study team determined how far each child lived from freeways and other major roads. "Otherwise-healthy children who were non-asthmatic and non-smokers also experienced a significant decrease in lung function from traffic pollution," Gauderman said. "This suggests that all children, not just susceptible subgroups, are potentially affected by traffic exposure." Lung function was assessed by measuring how much air a person can exhale after taking a deep breath and how quickly that air can be exhaled. Children's lung function develops rapidly during adolescence until they reach their late teens or early 20s. A deficit in lung development during childhood is likely to translate into reduced function for the remainder of life.</p> <p>"This study shows there are health effects from childhood exposure to traffic exhaust that can last a lifetime," said David A. Schwartz, director of the National Institute of Environmental Health Sciences. "The [institute] is committed to supporting research to understand the relationship between environmental exposures and diseases, and to identify ways to reduce harmful exposures to all populations, especially children so they can realize their full potential for healthy and productive lives." Previous studies have demonstrated links between lung function growth and regional air quality. The findings in this study add to that result, demonstrating that both regional air pollution and local exposure to traffic pollution affect lung development. People living "downwind" of highways with 4 or more lanes (2 lanes in each direction) are exposed to higher levels of fine particulate matter. (Brugge, et al. 2007) However, this circumstance does not exempt one side of a highway from PM dangers. In many regions, wind direction changes not only depending on weather conditions, but also between day and night. In addition it must be considered that the resulting urban sprawl will change the nature and character of the environment on the Wirral and cannot be justified in terms of population growth and employment prospects in the area. The need to use green belt lands for housing is purely driven by outside agencies who want to exploit the area to make vast profits by building high cost properties in large quantities. There are many</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	brown field sites which can be built on removing some of the depravation which already exists on the Wirral. The current proposals will turn further large areas of existing housing on the Wirral into run-down deprived area. The redevelopment along Church road Tranmere is what we should be aiming for as an excellent example of how to reach targets while improving the environment.
DOR03094	I have lived in Eastham opposite the M53 looking onto the woods. To have nature opposite my house which might be destroyed to allow further housing is simply outrages. I am 100% for the site to stay in the green belt area. The fact that most of the Wirral might lose its green beauty is a very worrying matter.
DOR03095	Carlett Park Playing Field has provided important local amenity for residents and is in constant use on a daily basis for dog walking, exercise, children playing games and other community activities. On this basis I would like to register my objection to any proposal to change the status of this land which permits subsequent development of any kind.
DOR03096	I am writing to express my absolute disgust at the councils proposals to allow development on huge tracts of beautiful countryside and agricultural land. Much of this land defines the natural Wirral landscape. I appreciate the need for more affordable housing in the country, however this land will not accommodate affordable housing but instead will be developed for expensive 5 bedroom stock. There are huge tracts of brownfield land on the Wirral that could be released instead. The vast majority of the green belt land should have been iron clad protected within the local plan yet the local council have not put one in place. Why has this not happened! If you cannot protect our green belt land then the existing council is not fit for purpose and the Wirral constituents must vote someone in who will.
DOR03097	One of the reasons why we considered this house a home for our four children was that the property was not overlooked, was quiet and very private. Any future plans to build on the land at the back of our property will cause a considerable amount of noise and disturbance to our family and our elderly neighbours who reside in the avenue. The avenue is a lovely place to live and it would be detrimental to my family if changes were made to our surrounding area. We therefore hope that common sense prevails and we can continue to enjoy living in our lovely home.
DOR03098	I have seen new plans for this area that it is hope will be submitted for planning permission, as they are acceptable , mainly due to the homes they will provide. My main complaint is why is designated as Mixed Use, as this means the plan must incorporate shops. This makes a nonsense of the whole planning authority. As the main driving force these days is to increase homes not shops. Apart from the fact Wallasey Village already has at least seven empty shops in the area, why must we increase this by three making the empty shops 10, when complete homes is what is required. If you had looked in the history of Wallasey Village you will have learned that between Hardman Glazing and the Farmers Arms has always been residential, so building homes for people to live will just be restrung the status Quo. There are photographs in our history of this site having homes on this site with three floors, and probably basements as well. So why can't the area be restored to what is was, and remove the three new empty shops whilst carrying on to build homes , what the country and the area needs.
DOR03099	I have received a letter about your proposal to build on SP052 and I wanted to send you my comments to object to this as it's a conservation area . I bought my house as it is a quiet, historical cottage and the traffic outside my house is bad enough as it is and it will only be worse. I have looked at your other plans and there are better green belts to build housing on.
DOR03100	I strongly object to any building on green belt sites. There is no excuse for even considering building on these sites. Don't state it's the government forcing us to build 13000 houses. This council has had years to come up with plan. But Wirral is one of the few that have failed to do so. Looking at the population figures the population is decreasing making the figure of 13000 unrealistic. We must consider the number of brown field sights available. This is where affordable housing can be built. Looking at your list it is impossible to see how many house can be developed. You assess the number of houses for each site and then give a minimum number. This number is sometimes bewildering . Look at Bluewood Drive. Former properties 1 to 53 minimum number of houses 11. Former properties 2 to 104 minimum number of houses 13. It does not make sense to me that you plan states 24 affordable homes only can be built on a site which once contained over 70 large council houses. 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 their permanence. Once Green Belts have been defined, local planning authorities should plan positively to enhance the beneficial use of the Green Belt, such as looking for opportunities to provide access; to provide opportunities for outdoor sport and recreation; to retain and enhance landscapes, visual amenity and biodiversity; or to

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	improve damaged and derelict land. A local planning authority should regard the constructiOn of new buildings as inappropriate in Green Belt. Exceptions to this are:
DOR03101	We wish to object to the proposed green belt development especially SP042 and SP042A
DOR03102	Please note my objection to any development work under the site reference SP043. Being a local resident to the Clatterbridge ward and living adjacent to the Dibbinsdale and Brotherton Park area I feel it's vital to protect our local wildlife and green spaces and would object to any building/developments of any kind.
DOR03103	Wirral Councils proposal for the green belt land grab is an affront to the people of Bebington. The council plan to take a huge swathe of green belt that stretches from Storeton Village right through to Dibbinsdale - a distance of approximately four miles forming a strip along the M53 motorway, is a disgrace. A large section of this land is public amenity and once taken away can never be replaced. It includes half of a golf course, play areas and walking open spaces which are currently accessible to the public. It has been cleverly presented as individual parcels of land, but add them an up and it virtually takes away all of the Bebington green belt this side of the motorway. The council in the past have never given thought to local infrastructure and I would expect this land grab to be no exception. Schools, roads, health service amenities will all suffer. Local schools are already over-subscribed. waiting times at local surgeries are excessive. There is one direct route that this development would totally rely on for access across the Wirral - Brimstage Road - following development on any of these sites will turn it into a car park during the morning and evening. ONE ACCESS ROAD BETWEEN EAST AND WEST WIRRAL is already a major problem as there is no other suitable route to the Bromborough retail park, its industrial estates and the Unilever labs and factory not to mention schools and public amenities. The M53 slip roads already back up onto the motorway at rush hours and will be made substantially worse with these proposals Councillors are elected to represent the people - NOT THE INTERESTS OF LANDOWNERS, AND THE COUNCIL represented by the CHIEF EXECUTIVE. all of whom stand to make millions of pounds from the development of these sites. Surely this land grab suggests 'the tail is wagging the dog!!!
DOR03104	Whilst we understand that these proposals have come from central government and have to be carried out by Wirral council we oppose too much building on green belt land . The Wirral is one of the most populated counties for horses. Where are these horses supposed to graze and where is the hay coming from when a lot of this land is lost . How are the local hospitals going to cope when they can't cope now? Roads are so busy already and will get worse. We haven't got the infrastructure to cope with more building and a bigger population . There is hardly any industry to supply jobs for the bigger population. We are going to end up with a concrete jungle and possible flooding ... more concrete less trees . We are a peninsula surrounded by water so flooding would be a risk for the future . We live in a flood risk area and the rain fall last year was above average . This surely has to be taken into consideration by those sitting down in London giving out the orders . There are brown sites could provide affordable housing . How are the young generation going to buy houses when they are paying vast amounts in rent and can't save the deposits . Just who are these houses aimed at? Who's getting rich on the back of it and who benefits??
DOR03105	Any development on Green Belt land within Wirral would be regrettable. I 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 bye pass 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 'Fender 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. When first constructed the access shaft to the sewer at the Barnston Road end of the meadow in Barnston Dale SBI was well away from the stream edge, the stream has over time eroded the bank to such an extent that the shaft is now partially exposed within the stream bank. (see photograph A Taken 2013) A number of smaller pipes cross the stream to connect with the main sewer. Over the years there have been a number of leaks and even complete breakage of these cross pipes which I have reported to United Utilities. The sewer eventually enters a large treatment plant 'Barnston Storm Tanks' situated at the bottom of Private Drive, within Lower Heath Wood SBI, a storm water overflow leads from the treatment plant and feeds directly into the stream which is at that point bounded by both Lower Heath Wood SBI & Murrayfield SBI. This again is a matter for concern as the grating from the plant is often festooned with wipes and other extremely unsavoury looking material. (See photograph B taken 27/08/2018) I have personally reported this a number of times to United Utilities, who in fairness have acted. I can't imagine the material which passes from this discharge point will do anything to improve the stream or the environment in general. 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.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03106	This proposal will directly impact me now and when and if decide to sell my property I do strongly object to any building on this site. You have already over-ridden objections to the fire station being built on the site. The traffic on the by-pass is so bad in rush hour now that I cannot get out of Girtrell Road unless someone stops to let me out. I assume that the council will over-ride my objection however I will continue to object strongly to your plan.
DOR03107	I wish to oppose the proposed plans for the former Gladstone liberal club & warehouse on dial road. I purchased my house 7 years ago, and part of the appeal of the property was that it is not overlooked at the rear. Should the plans proceed this will no longer be the case and I am also concerned about my right to light. Furthermore there is already very little parking available for the existing houses on Greenway Road and therefore the residents are having to park in Dial Road and other local streets. The proposed development of 15 properties - 9 on the former liberal club site and 6 on the dial carpets site will only make the parking situation worse. Whilst the proposed properties may include driveways, I am guessing that this will allow parking for 1 vehicle - which given that most homes have multiple cars/drivers means that this is wholly inadequate.
DOR03108	I am responding to your invitation to comment on the Wirral Local Plan. I suggest that the Council might wish to consider establishing a "Principle of Preservation of Green Belt Land Between Nearby Areas of Outstanding Interest". An illustration of the application of this "principle" could be the valley which lies in the green belt area between the two National Trust properties, Caldly Hill (with Stapledon Woods) and Thurstaston Hill (with Royden Park). It is evident that the views from these two outstanding areas would be jeopardised by any further housing developments in the intervening green belt area, as well as compromising the associated biodiversity. This "principle" is a universal one in the sense that it could be used throughout the Wirral, and indeed throughout the country, for the preservation of existing green belt land which lies between any nearby areas of outstanding interest.
DOR03109	I completely disagree with your planned proposal to build on Greenbelt on the Wirral and feel very strongly that it will destroy all that makes Wirral into such a special place. For many years Birkenhead has been allowed to decay and as such it would be much better to fully regenerate much of the land surrounding Hamilton square as regrettably most of the industrial and office spaces in either empty or in such a state of disrepair. So much of this land in prime for Development and is ideal to build on as it is flat land ideal for alternative transportation such as trams and cycles along with its direct access to Liverpool. I believe that all such suitable developments could be funded by its own merits as house prices are now such that if a 5000 houses where build on the land it would generate such a volume of income that would enable the complete regeneration of Birkenhead which is so badly needed. Surely this would complement the Wirral waters project and build a new future for Wirral and our future generations. If you build on Greenbelt you will destroy Wirral and increase the traffic problems without solving the real issues
DOR03110	Please can we fight to save our beautiful green spaces on the Wirral. Allowing building to encroach on our beautiful countryside to ultimately merge the villages is a travesty for future generations. Once building has occurred, there is not going back. Cultivate the brown space – the cost may be more presently, but the long term cost is justified for the continued beauty and pride we residents hold for 'the paradise peninsula' There are so many reasons to uphold nature – psychologically, physically and environmentally.
DOR03111	<p>I am writing to yourself, to put on record and outline my strongest possible objections to the proposals of the Wirral Council to remove the protection status from the Wirral Green Belt with a view to allow development on this land. In particular the greenbelt land East of the M53 which, stretches half the length of the peninsula. The reasons for my objections, are as follows:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The removal of this protective status from this belt of land is contrary to the accepted principals of Town and Country Planning. Removal of this protection will irrevocably alter North Eastward Wirral's overall character by replacing what has been until now a number of long standing separate individual localities with a continuous urban sprawl concentrated along one side of this peninsula. 2. Some of the Green Field sites in this region hold important historical significance. For example the site Storeton Woods is the location of an ancient quarry dating back to Roman times. In addition the site of Brackenwood Golf Course has been proposed as the location for the Battle of Brunanburth which, is one of the most significant battles in the history of the British Isles. 3. The scale of the proposed urban development on the Green Belt will place strains on the urban infrastructure such as utilities, schools, roads, health centres, police etc 4. These green belt areas are home to precious wildlife such as Kestrels, Tawny Owls, foxes and badgers which, will no doubt be displaced should the proposed developments go ahead. 5. The Green Belt is not only enjoyed by Wirral residents but it also attracts visitors from further afield for recreational activities including golf, dog walking, rambling, bird watching etc. The council must be aware of this which is why it is considering proposals to build a hotel resort in Hoylake, which coincidentally, is also being considered to be built on Green Belt land which is a worrying trend especially after the council have advised that they will always develop Brown Field sites first. 6. With this in mind there are areas within the Wirral crying out for much needed redevelopment and investment such as Rock Ferry and New Ferry for example. Rather than identify Green Belt land to develop why isn't the council focusing on how best to redevelop these areas? By releasing Green Belt land developers would be more attracted and interested in building upon green spaces rather than current brownfield sites as it would cost them a lot less and they will maximise their profits. 7. If the Council is considering the development of the Green Belt land then will the council look to take action and revoke the planning permission granted to Peel Group for the redevelopment of Wirral Waters? I would imagine that a Brownfield area the size of Wirral Waters would be of considerable interest to other developers rather than Peel Group, and developers whom would agree to build the required homes within the required timeframe. 8. As a part of this exercise has Wirral Council been required to produce an Estate Terrier recording all of its existing assets, whether owned or leased, including land/site boundaries recorded at 1:1250 scale on OS maps, rights of access, easements, wayleaves, the utilisation, or underutilisation, of each of its building and the restrictions imposed on all buildings and land (Golf Courses, Park Land?) gifted to this council? This information is required if the Council is to prove that it is not holding any surplus, or under-utilised, land or buildings which could alternatively be utilised for residential development. The area East of the M53 is already the most developed and populated of the Wirral. It is of grave concern to myself and many other residents how, with such minimal

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	effort and consultation, the council can identify and propose these green belt areas for development and in doing so remove the green space and recreational areas from the very people who are most in need of them.
DOR03112	<p>I am writing to you to express my concern about Wirral Borough Council's plans to release large swathes of green belt land for housing development . As I am sure you are aware prevarication and incompetence on the part of the council to produce a Local Plan for housing since 2000 have resulted in Government telling them that if the y don't do it they will do it for them. Their knee jerk reaction has been to come up with a proposal to build on large areas of green belt land . This is irrational for a variety of reasons:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The council's population projections are of dubious merit and in all probability highly exaggerated. 2. If the idea is to build affordable housing then it's not going to be houses built on green belt land which is usually in more expensive areas .Housing built on green belt land is usually unaffordable to those most in need. Logically you would build affordable housing for first time buyers on brown field sites of which there are many on the Wirral. 3. There is space for 18000 houses on brown field sites on the Wirral which is more than enough to meet even the exaggerated target's. 4. Wirral Council seem more interested in pandering to developers needs then the needs of the people they represent . Peel Holdings are an obvious case in point as is Hoylake golf resort. 5. Green belt land should be protected because it helps to mitigate against climate change. It is important for recreational purposes at a time when we are increasingly encouraging people to get out and walk or cycle to improve health outcomes and reduce the future burden on the N.H.S. It is also important because this land is needed to grow crops so that food can be sourced locally instead of being transported hundreds or even thousands of miles. <p>Please help the many thousands of your constituents who may be affected by this issue to defend the open spaces, fields and farmlands of Wirral. Once they are gone they're gone and it will not be for any justifiable reason.</p>
DOR03113	<p>Here in the Spital/Poulton Lancelyn area there is a serious problem if extra is housing is built. I list some comments concerning the two references above plus some other thoughts.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The local school and doctors could not cope with the influx. 2. There is only really one main exit (Spital Crossroads) should there be "major incident on the present estate". I know that there is a route via Dibbinsdale but this is very narrow and steep and only two Saturdays back it was blocked owing to an accident. This left the single track, full of potholes road down to Raby Mere which again is not an emergency route. I had to take this road as my wife and I were responding to a person's health issue in Bromborough and could not afford the time to go all the way back to Spital Crossroads and down to Spital Dam to get to Bromborough. 3. There is a site in Wirral that has still not been built upon despite the previous building being demolished many years ago. The Dell Primary school, Rock Ferry. (School no longer required) There is also the site of the old Rock Ferry Grammar School still empty.. 4. When are the existing brown field sites going to be built upon. 5. We are told that schools were closed owing to a drop in population whereas comments are now coming through that the population is not, so why were schools closed? Someone needs to get the facts correct.
DOR03114	<p>I would like to express my concern regarding the restructuring proposals for the only car park in Bromborough. I have looked at the outline planning and feel that it will have a huge impact on trade in the village. Not discounting the residents that use the car park from No.7 The Rake. Why do we need more shops when there are shops empty on The Rake and have been for years. I think this will have a very negative impact on Bromborough as a whole.</p>
DOR03115	<p>I would like you to consider the following when you come to consider Site 1984 .</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The projection of population figures needs to be revised. The population of Wirral is falling, not rising, so brings into question the need for further building. 2 The roads generally are becoming more congested especially around Spital Cross Roads which already serves a large housing estate. Any further building would require more extensive road works with property close to Junction 4 of the motorway. Numerous studies have shown living within 500m of a motorway is detrimental to health. 3 The local primary schools are already oversubscribed, surgeries are extremely busy and the whole infrastructure would need to be reviewed. 4 Local fields are characterised as "high quality farm land" which should be protected not built upon and the site drains into the already protected Dibbinsdale SSSI. <p>I fail to see how any further building in this site is going to increase the quality of life or protect the environment which should be your first consideration.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03116	<p>Green Belt - Green Belt policy was introduced in 1955 primarily to stop urban sprawl. Sajid Javid, Secretary of State for Communities and Local Government, stated in Parliament, that Green Belt is "absolutely sacrosanct" {Hansard -18 July 2016). Green Belt has encouraged the redevelopment of "brownfield" land in urban areas. This is has been successful in London and Liverpool e.g. Baltic Triangle and city centre apartments. The Green Belt helps with the two major issues of today, mainly the increase in population and global warming. Much of the Green Belt is used for agricultural purposes, which is required to feed the increased population. The UK can't afford to be more reliant on other countries for food. There is the safeguard of supply and the environmental cost of importing the goods from overseas. The Green Belt provides a sanctuary for wildlife and assists in the absorption of CO2, a key element of global warming.</p> <p>East V West of M53 - The health and life expectancy of residents on the East of the M53 is remarkably inferior to the residents on the West of the M53. Life expectancy in the poorest areas on the East is 10 years lower than on the wealthier West. This has even been raised by Angela Eagle MP in Parliament last year.</p> <p>On the review of the Green Belt sites for possible re-classification for potential housing, it appears that the East of the M53 is again being targeted on the less affluent and less healthy. This would further increase the population density to the existing residents to the detriment of their well-being. The proposals would increase traffic and air pollution in an area that is already suffering in those areas.</p> <p>Air Pollution - Recent studies have shown that increased air pollution affects people's health. A recent study by Lund University in Sweden (June 2018) calculated that over 400,000 people in Europe die prematurely due to air pollution. As well as the increased mortality, the study found more people had health rated issues.</p> <p>The building of the additional homes without the lungs of the Green Belt to assist in the absorption of the pollution would damage the health of the Wirral residents.</p> <p>Peel Investments Holdings Limited Per the March 2017 financial statements, filed at Companies House, the group received planning permission for the Wirral Waters project in May 2012 . This is the largest planning permission in the UK by consented floor area . There is sufficient land available at this location to meet the housing needs required, instead of building on the limited Green Belt that exists on the Wirral. I will be following this issue very closely as I am completely opposed to the use of Green belt land in this instance, for the reasons stated above .</p>
DOR03117	<p>The land under site reference SHLAA 0500 for proposed housing allocation has two busy roads running one on either side of it. It also has several mature trees growing on it, which help with the pollution from the roads. So if these trees are removed to build houses we will be exposed to higher levels of pollution and toxins from the vehicles using the roads. I therefore strongly object to any building on this land.</p>
DOR03118	<p>I have seen the areas that have been identified for potential mixed use allocation (SHLAA 2024 & 2025) I fully appreciate the need for increased housing in Wirral but any future development in these 2 areas needs to include plans to increase car parking capacity for the shops in Bromborough village. It is already difficult to park a lot of the time. The development of the main car park by Sainsbury's in Neston some years ago managed to increase car parking capacity and provide additional housing.</p>
DOR03119	<p>I am writing regarding your plans to build on the ground next to the Tan Box in Bromborough I regularly use this car park as does my husband and it is nearly always full - this clearly shows an need for parking and that local businesses are being supported. Whilst we agree that housing is need surely there is other land that could be used e.g. the field opposite Please rethink these plan - you are paid by the public - listen to the public</p>
DOR03120	<p>It is an outrageous, high-handed imposition to lump Greasby, Pensby and Irby – three distinct communities – together as one 'settlement area' so that you can plan to infill areas between them, destroying Green Belt farmland, to meet unrealistically high and questionable housing targets. This is a cold-bloodedly cynical move and shows complete disregard for the feelings for the residents and the character of the communities in question.</p>
DOR03121	<p>I wish to register my objections at the way green belt land is being considered as part of the Local Plan submission in meeting the government's requirements for local land use. I would offer my objections as follows: With regard to the above, why has this only just surfaced when there has been a government requirement to put together a local plan for a number of years? Why also is green belt land being considered when there are many brownfield sites in the Borough lying desolate and in need of development? Peel holdings have identified many areas that would meet the government's formula for housing numbers calculation for Wirral and is within the timescales up to 2035. If new houses are to be built will they be the ones people can afford or are they ones that will give the Council greater revenue from rates. Also will they use the latest energy efficient materials and meet the local community's requirement in terms of services , integrating public transport, cycle-ways, walking routes and easy access to essential amenities. Surely smaller houses built on brownfield sites for first time buyers not large 4 or 5 bedroom houses would generate more rates due to the larger numbers. Exploring where these new houses should be built is very important, in existing areas; residents want to remain in the communities where they have put down roots with friends and family nearby. This means looking at brownfield sites local to them and building around our existing communities and landowners should be urged to get on with obtaining planning permission to build affordable housing on pieces land that they own.</p> <p>I understand that nearly 50% of the borough is Green Belt land and is owned by a small number of landowners. The largest brownfield site I would surmise is the Wirral Waters development this is owned by Peel Holdings, who by public statements, seem to want to invest their millions in building on their land, the majority of which is of brownfield status. The amount of housing they have promised would satisfy the housing requirements for the borough as a whole. The use of green belt land as part of Wirral's "Local Plan" submission to government is therefore not an issue, apart from maybe the council's perceived need to merge villages together and have no definable boundaries except for a sign at the side of the road. Surely preliminary "Environmental Impact Assessments" would play a part in the submission and also ascertain the impact of building in green belt areas, some of which are of special interest to locals. These areas house wildlife and are habitats for many different species of birds and animals. I would suggest that the council should look further into the efficient use of Wirral land not just see it as a way of generating money by</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	building houses that the majority of people cannot afford. Also government targets should be challenged as to current population trends and housing need.
DOR03122	Having been a resident in Eastham village ALL my life. I enjoy all the green areas around my village. It's a pleasure to walk down to Eastham woods and see all the green areas. I AM EXTREMELY OPPOSED TO ANY BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT AREAS IN AND AROUND EASTHAM VILLAGE.
DOR03123	<p>Please see below my concerns for local development and development on green belt, 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 this difficulties for future generation, 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.</p> <p>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. Since composing this response additional information has come to light which, allude to WBC knowingly doing nothing to address housing targets from 2016 (SHMA). and in fact sufficient brown field sites are available to achieve this targets and more (estimated 18000 units), WBC had also been accused of over inflating the actual requirement of houses on the Wirral, when population figures suggest a decrease in demand. WBC has been accused of wilfully neglecting of need of their constituents for the wants of developers. I ask that you do the right thing and put the needs of the many and not the few and protect our green belt not just for the local residence now but for generations to come, and make this council one we can be proud of.</p>
DOR03124	As Peel holdings have reneged on their promise Compulsory purchase Peel Holding's brown field land. This will produce many more houses of lesser cost to buyers than those that would be built on greenfield land in Heswall, Barnston or Gayton.
DOR03125	I wish to register my objection to developing the small car park next to Tan box in Bromborough. There is barely enough parking to support the high street as it is. It is amazing the high street still thrives despite the retail park so close, but by limiting parking you will damage the local independent businesses.
DOR03126	<p>Please let common sense prevail and eradicate the greed that is perceived to have encapsulated the decision makers in the council. Instead leave a legacy to be proud of.....we want to continue having good memories of the open spaces (some of which I still can't believe you actually charge for!) and not horrible memories of what will happen if the plans to build on all of the green belt land come to fruition. The farm I refer to has been there for over 50 years and having been passed down for generations. There is cattle and wildlife that live on this land, even bats in my garden which are protected species, as well as foxes, pheasants and birds. The farm also for instance supply milk around Wirral to shops, cafes, restaurants and sell to the general public. Please don't go ahead with the proposals as this will remove this farm, their livelihood, and local food sources, not to mention the wildlife and animals. I do not believe for one instant that there is no alternative. I will personally go round Wirral with a nominated person and note down all the open spaces/ plots of land that there are now. One piece of land that comes to mind is a vast area of land next to Birkenhead North Train Station. This was mooted for a new police headquarters until they could not afford it. Many many houses could be built there and it affords easy access to the train network... meaning hopefully more people would utilise the public transport system. This would also regenerate the area, as would building on plots of land that have been cleared of older dilapidated terraced houses for instance. Concentrate on those sites, there will be many in areas such as Birkenhead, Tranmere, Leasowe, Seacombe and Liscard. This is not to mention the many empty properties that are present on Wirral, estimated to be 3,000, that's THREE THOUSAND!!!! I'm no expert but I've read passages that Wirral does not require as much housing as you think it does and you can easily challenge the Government. Some areas are naturally sparsely populated, Wirral is one of them in parts. If these proposals go ahead I predict there will be a revolt. Please don't make Wirral a concrete jungle full of thousands of more cars clogging up the roads and country lanes and thousands of more people just in Greasby for instance. Use common sense, look around Greasby and the other areas such as Irby and Thingwall (not from Google Earth) at ground level and realise there are a limited number of schools and shops. Look at the traffic flow now in peak hours and visualise what would this be like if the proposals went ahead. The proposals will have a catastrophic effect on people's quality of life and health. Please don't</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	increase the pressure even more on our oversubscribed local schools, or the NHS, the ambulances serve whose vehicles were brought into service last century, or the police and fire service who have already shed staff and premises, whilst expecting people to pay (probably more) council tax. Don't put profit over health. You do not have the infrastructure to build 534 houses on Greasby copse. Overall it will be 2,000 houses from Rigby Drive Greasby up to Limbo Lane in Irby. Most houses have 3- 4 occupants, that's potentially 8,000 more residents. This is absolutely unworkable and clearly there is not an infrastructure in place. It matters not at the end of the day but where are all these people going to come from to reside in these houses? I see many homeless people in our national cities and unfortunately some in the likes of Birkenhead and Wallasey but not Greasby, Irby or Thingwall. Look at all the deprived areas Wirral has and concentrate on re generating them. Get money back into those economies; build/ renovate empty houses and shops to a standard where people feel proud to live, thereby reducing the propensity for crime or anti-social behaviour. Use common sense, listen to the residents, do the right thing. I sure I'm one of the majority that feels this way.
DOR03127	To even consider building on this space is preposterous! Bromborough village is one of few small shopping areas that remains within our borough that is well used by the local community, the car park is instrumental in the survival of our local businesses and essential facilities that surround it. I am highly aware that affordable accommodation is high on the councils list of priorities but this should not be to the detriment of our local economy. As a Disabled resident of Bromborough who regularly uses this car park I would like to strongly object to the proposal.
DOR03128	I have been informed of the possible plans for building on the land around Tan Box in Bromborough Village. If this goes ahead for housing development in the future it would reduce parking for us and all other businesses in the village. This would cause most businesses to close as there would be loss of customer parking forcing customers to go elsewhere. I hope you put this into consideration.
DOR03129	I fully understand the Authority having to generate a Local Plan for future development. I do however have to express my concerns over one of the listed areas being, The Rake, Bromborough, which is currently a local car park which supplies space for shoppers in Bromborough Village. The loss of this car park would be dire for local businesses if housing were to be built on this land. There would be no space for shoppers to park and the result would be closures of local shops. I also fully appreciate that housing generates more in the way of Council Tax for the local authority, but Bromborough needs to retain his shopping area, and with no car park the area will die.
DOR03130	We would like to express our concerns re the possible development in Irby. We live on Thingwall Road and have a lot of problems driving in and out of our property. The additional traffic would add to the issue. The road is not very wide and where it bends, it is dangerous - there have been a number of fatalities. The village car park is always full now so further traffic would add to the congestion. The infrastructure for such a large development is not in place in our Village. I'm concerned that we struggle to get appointments at the Warren's Surgery as it is. Also Irby Primary school is already oversubscribed. Parking outside the school is almost impossible. Where would all of the extra children go? Obviously it would be very sad for Wirral to lose its green spaces but there are other implications. We hope the council will consider all options before losing such a valuable asset as the green belt.
DOR03131	I am appalled this could even be considered and strongly object as does every small business, resident and the wider area do also. This is the only parking and this village is the heart of Bromborough. Born and bred. Why ruin a good strong community village that has been there forever and pray is for a long time to come. This will kill the village tally unnecessary with plans for acre lane also Mark rake which is bad enough THESE PLANS MUST NOT GO AHEAD
DOR03132	I have had a letter threw my door advising me of the plans to possibly build flat/shops on the car parking. If this was to go ahead would be disastrous to my very successful business of 10 years. My clients & staff depend on this parking. As it is the only parking in the area. The carpark is always full. If you are to go ahead with the plans there is a very high chance of my business failing and myself and 5 staff losing our only income & livelihood. Also think it will be very damaging to the rest of the village. This is a thriving little village. Please don't destroy it & make us another failing town similar to what you have done the Birkenhead and New Ferry.
DOR03133	We are contacting you to express our opposition to Greenbelt development around the area of Barnston & Heswall. There are still many undeveloped brownfield sites on Wirral that should be explored before considering any development on Greenbelt. Wirral residents greatly value the green spaces that are currently protected from further development, and it is alarming in the extreme to see the amount of land that is being put under consideration for development. If brownfield land is not being developed by landowners, then it should be compulsorily purchased by the council and used for this purpose. We understand that this is not as financially attractive, but it is the council's job to protect the area's greenbelt, even if this option costs more. There is a real threat of villages such as Heswall, Barnston, Thingwall & Pensby losing their identity and becoming one large urban sprawl. In addition, there is simply not the road capacity at the moment to support extra housing developments west of the M53. All the main arterial roads leading into west Wirral are heavily congested during the morning and afternoon rush hour, and sometimes at other times too. Extra housing without the infrastructure to support them will simply compound a problem that already exists. We believe a local housing plan should have been put forward by the council to the government every 5 years, and that the main reason the government is forcing the council's hand is the fact that no plan has been produced since 2000. It is simply wrong for the council to launch into a full scale assault on the area's greenbelt without pursuing all options for brownfield development.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03134	<p>I attended the consultation meeting at Hulme Hall, Port Sunlight this evening. It ended rather unsatisfactorily with many people still having unanswered questions and it not being very clear exactly what is being consulted on and what responses are required. It appears to me that the Council is really consulting on those sites deemed "for further investigation" rather than those where people have come forward to say that they would wish to develop their area of green belt. Things became confused because the presenter said that certain sites identified on that plan, e.g. Royal Liverpool Golf Course, Storeton Woods, Eastham Woods, were not suitable for development and would not be built on. Naturally the audience questioned that if that was the case why were they included on the further investigation map? The written document "Summary of Initial Assessment" is also confusing. Within one area it can vary from suggestion no development to hundreds of homes. I can understand that the methodology in that the Council has identified those areas of greenbelt that are "enclosed" and therefore potentially available for development. However, it seems a nonsense to include sites which the Council has decided should clearly not be included and are not actually for further investigation. The audience is left confused as to whether they should include submissions about those sites above or do not need to as they will not be built on. However, if no submissions are received is there a danger those sites could be included? The difficulty is that those sites would of course attract a lot of public attention and concern if there is a risk that they are included. This would be to the detriment of considering the other sites properly. It is also not clear why the exceptional circumstances are that require consideration of the green belt land. The fact that it may be a bit more expensive to build on industrial land due to contamination should not be an exceptional circumstance. It would be helpful to have some clear questions or guidance for those responding to the consultation.</p>
DOR03135	<p>I write with very grave concerns regarding the development and building on Wirral's greenbelt Land. The main purpose of the Greenbelt Policy is to protect designated land around large urban centres from urban sprawl as well maintaining the areas of forestry and agriculture, also providing a habitat for wildlife. It stops increased car use, also stops the neglect of brown land sights and dilapidated buildings. Greenbelt also includes significant local biodiversity - the variety of plants and animal life which is considered to be of great importance. It also protects heritage sites. Its trees, plants and open spaces soak up our carbon emissions as well as providing recreational space. Without greenbelt land our villages and towns would merge thus losing all identity. Two thirds of our greenbelt is agricultural land and is being depleted at an alarming rate. We are losing almost 7 dairy farms per week in England and Wales. This must stop. We only produce two thirds of our food in the UK and with leaving the EU we should be more efficient. Green House Farm a lot of loyal staff are employed on the farm with a wealth of experience. The wildlife on the farm is rich and varied. It has no voice but ours. There are Owls (Barn, little and Tawny). Common and Harvest Mice and Shrews. There is also an abundance of Sparrows, Robins, Wrens, Tits, great flocks of Starlings, Chaffinch, Greenfinch, Rooks, Crows, Magpies, Cuckoos, Pheasants, and Herons. Berwick's swans and little egret seem to use the land as a resting place. There are birds of prey including kestrels, Sparrow hawks. Swallows and House Martins come in their droves every spring from wintering in South Africa to their nests on the farm to breed and feed. Other wildlife present on the farm includes Frogs, Toads, Newts and Foxes. At dusk there is an abundance of Bats. The farm is a very necessary and respected part of our Greasby community all this will be flattened and built on. They deserve better. We cannot let this happen.</p> <p>We have heard enough statistics to know there is enough brown belt land and empty property to meet with the Government's requirement of houses to be built. I have been online under the Freedom of Information Act to find out about the Government asking the Leverhulme estates to release Green Belt Land. It Says 'Government Leverhulme Missing'. In the Greasby area alone, 534 new homes are proposed at Greasby Copse and a further 147 proposed between Mill Lane and Hillbark. A total of 681 houses are proposed. We do not have the infrastructure, schools or healthcare facilities to support this number of housing. What we have already is inadequate. Much has been made of the new Signs into Greasby "Gravesberie, Greasby One of the Earliest Settlements in Britain 8500BC" Rich in Heritage and Artefacts. One that is proposed to be built on, even ring fencing the Copse trees will do nothing to save this precious site. A person who spoke at the meeting at the Greasby Community Centre on 1st September works with people who are homeless and have poor housing in Birkenhead, they said the type of houses they are proposing to build on greenbelt will be far too expensive for the people who need them. The Council needs to build affordable homes in Birkenhead and improve the area and facilities. These will be executive homes on prime land, commanding a high price. Of course developers will be queuing up to get in on the act. At that meeting all 4 Political Parties, Labour Conservative, Liberal Democrats, and Green Party, were of one voice. Also everyone at the meeting on a show of hands said a resounding NO to any use of Green Belt Land on the Wirral. Please be a responsible Council and think again, you are elected servants of people who put their trust in you to do the right thing these are People's Lives you are dealing with you are causing a lot of misery and anxiety. What you are proposing will rip the heart out of the Wirral. It is very clearly driven by money.</p>
DOR03136	<p>I write with very grave concerns regarding the development and building on Wirral's greenbelt Land. The main purpose of the Greenbelt Policy is to protect designated land around large urban centres from urban sprawl as well maintaining the areas of forestry and agriculture, also providing a habitat for wildlife. It stops increased car use, also stops the neglect of brown land sights and dilapidated buildings. Greenbelt also includes significant local biodiversity- the variety of plants and animal life which is considered to be of great importance. It also protects heritage sites. Its trees, plants and open spaces soak up our carbon emissions as well as providing recreational space. Without greenbelt land our villages and towns would merge thus losing all identity. Two thirds of our greenbelt is agricultural land and is being depleted at an alarming rate. We are losing almost 7 dairy farms per week in England and Wales. This must stop. We only produce two thirds of our food in the UK and with leaving the EU we should be more efficient. I object strongly to the use of greenbelt for cheap development when there are brownfield options NOT being developed.</p>
DOR03137	<p>I am writing to express my concern over the proposed threat to Wirral's greenbelt particularly around Pipers Lane Heswall, already there is congestion around this area all the time as it is difficult to pass. The construction of further housing can only make this lane become more and more congested with no pavements on the lane pedestrians are at risk now from cars this could only increase. The area allows access to the countryside for so many people, if as a council you are encouraging the health and well-being of your residents then removing and reducing access to this amenity makes no sense. Finally, the Wirral is often voted as a fantastic place to live in national polls in part due to its green belt and access to open spaces, as a council you do yourselves no service and reduce the quality of life for residents by building on the very thing that makes the area attractive and brings in tourist revenue. Build on the derelict brownfield sites they bring in no revenue, no</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	tourism, no council tax and no beauty to the area.
DOR03138	<p>Further to the above plan, I wish to place on record my objection, specifically Proposed Green Belt Site - SP010A. The plan detail looks for the development of this area with an alleged 550 homes on what is currently green belt protected land and a site of local interest. The area identified is also within a conservation area for the Greasby Copse. The development outlined would simply clear the area of agricultural activity and protected land. The development also raises serious questions for the surrounding infrastructure to handle additional residences. Increase in transport, schools and environment elements. The existing infrastructure is insufficient to handle greater volumes with limited space for expansion. The proposed site was a contributory factor to the 2014 Moreton floods when a severe downpour caused excess water to enter the culvert and merge with Arrowe Brook. The development of current green belt land will increase the run-off of water and increase the potential of floods. In addition the run-off water will increase the risk of flooding to Arrowebrook Farm. The development will also considerably alter the appearance of our land. The introduction of fencing will see the removal of hedges and associated natural inhabitants. We have a wide range of animals from Foxes, Rabbits, Voles, Pheasants, Hawks, Owls and a variety of birds that use and rely on these environments. Finally, Green House Farm has been farming the proposed for a number of years offering a range of services to the local community. The proposed development will close this local and family business from the landscape along with the associated benefits.</p>
DOR03139	[SAME AS DOR03135]
DOR03140	<p>I'm writing to document my concern and advanced objection at the proposed development on site reference Spool, Appleby Farm in Greasby. To develop here would completely change the face of this village as we know it, a village that is the earliest dated settlement in Western Britain, one of the oldest in the whole of the country. Below is a number of my personal feelings and the impact development would have that I wish to highlight;</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • My 3 year old son loves nothing more than to watch the foxes play in and around their den in the field from his bedroom window- the first time he saw them he described them as 'brown cat dog things'. Now he has learnt all about them. These would be no more. • He also loves when the cows are in the field. When they visit, without fail he will race from the house to see them, and watch them for hours on end, learning and understanding. So much so, the farmer invited us in to visit the day the new calves were born in June. These calves were only minutes old - a truly magical experience for a 3 year old, one that he has not stop talking about, telling friends and family all about. These opportunities would be no more for my son and newly born daughter, no more for all other families too. • We also enjoy watching the birds in the fields and copse; Sparrow hawks, Buzzards, Kestrels, Geese, Jays to name a few recently watched. Although not frequently spotted, owls and woodpeckers can be heard from the Copse. All of this is fascinating to a 3 year old and greater education for him than any other. I'm sure that this is the same for many other families in the area. Although the Copse is proposed to be protected, these birds would definitely be no longer in the area. • Being a resident on Rigby drive, we are already plagued by the traffic caused by the Schools. There is already 4 schools within a few hundred meters of each other; Greasby Infants, Greasby Juniors, Our Lady of Pity and Brookdale Juniors. Adding more children and more traffic is bluntly dangerous. I'm sure you would agree if you visit Rigby Drive/Arrowe Road at school entrance and leaving times. <p>In addition to the above, the other wildlife that would be no more, many various birds, frogs, newts, toads; the already too busy doctors and dentist surgery's; the increased traffic to an already busy and congested area; the hard work of the farming family would be wasted - pride is taken in drinking the milk and eating eggs from the farm; the increased pollution of at least 500 cars to the area; to name a few. I'm sure you've been made aware of many others. I plead with you to hear my concerns and not to peruse development here.</p>
DOR03141	<p>Having considered the proposals for the above local plan, I wish to make my views known. According to the Council's own website the population of Wirral stands at 319,783.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Wirral has a relatively high older population. There is an expected 17.4% increase of over 65 year olds by 2021, and over 85 year olds are expected to increase by 29.9%. • The age demographic of 35-59 year olds (the working population) is expected to decrease over the same timescale. • Of 326 areas in the IMD 2010 document, Wirral is the 60th most deprived area. • Wirral is in the bottom 3% of 326 areas for employment. <p>With the above in mind and bearing in mind that the apparent "need" for 12,000 more houses has been identified at national not local level it seems to me that this figure must be challenged as being irrational for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The population is ageing rapidly. As people die, more houses currently occupied by older people will become vacant. 2. The Wirral working population is decreasing. Therefore the number of people willing and able to buy new houses (demand for them) is falling. 3. It is likely that the money would be better spent on providing facilities for the older population e.g. building nursing homes rather than houses. 4. 12,000 more houses means many more people on a peninsula that is surrounded on 3 sides by water. Wirral does not have the space or capacity to absorb this many extra houses. Space here is finite. Not so in areas such as London or the South East for example. 5. There has been a lack of investment in transport and infrastructure in Wirral. Commuter trains to Liverpool are already overcrowded, yet £millions are being spent on Crossrail in London. If 12,000 new houses are to be built, is the government prepared to fund the upgrade of the transport infrastructure and provide more jobs in Merseyside for those people taking on mortgages to buy these houses? I won't hold my breath. 6. The impact on local amenities has not been considered. For example, site 1984 will mean more pressure on GP waiting lists, dental surgeries, parks, sports centres etc. It will destroy high quality

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>farmland and make Wirral a poorer place to live. I choose to live in Wirral rather than a place like London with its overcrowding for a reason. 46% of Wirral is Greenbelt. 12,000 more homes requires more roads, more car parks, increased travelling times and more congestion.</p> <p>7. Greenbelt land is exactly that. It should not be built on to satisfy an arbitrary government housing figure decided on by a Whitehall civil servant who has no idea of the impact that such a proposal would have. For example, the Battle of Brunanburh was fought at Brornborough. Not heard of by many, it was as pivotal in shaping the structure of the country as Hasting, yet the government wants to destroy it by building houses on the site.</p> <p>8. I have no expertise on planning law, but if Peel Holdings who own large swathes of brownfield land have reneged on the promise to build 13,000 houses on that land and build 2,400 over the next 15 years instead, cannot pressure be brought to bear on them? A compulsory purchase order perhaps?</p>
DOR03142	<p>I attended the Local Plan event last night. As someone with some knowledge of planning matters I understood what was being said about Green Belt boundaries but felt that you would have avoided a lot of grief from the audience if the graphics had shown which areas would be protected as green space if green belt status was withdrawn.</p>
DOR03143	<p>Having attended both a consultation meeting today at Hulme Hall and observed the Wirral Council meeting this evening I feel I have no option but to write to express my extreme concern over this "plan" and the proposed violation of the Green Belt. The Green Belt is a vital resource, one that make Wirral special, it is imperative that we pass it on to future generations and is not something to be squandered. Whether you walk in Staunton Woods, cycle along the causeway, explore the footpaths and bridleways, picnic at Thurstaston or Eastham (I could go on forever) Wirral has so much to offer in terms of quality of life and I weep when I think that my children and future grandchildren may never experience this. As far as I can see the proposed development plan ignores, or at best pays lip service to, brownfield sites and concentrates on the Green Belt for building thousands of houses of questionable need. It strikes me that it is the work of weary, jobsworth, local government civil servants, showing absolutely no initiative or imagination but merely looking for the easiest option in order to tick the box. The Green Belt is one of the few things that makes Wirral special and surely the emphasis should be the preservation of this together with the regeneration of areas like central Birkenhead and the waterfront rather than the concreting fields and woods. Having listened to the arguments, I remain to be convinced that there is indeed a need for the 12000 homes quoted. I fail to see why any new homes can't be built on brown field sites and I really can't understand why the vital need to bring new life to our dying city centres isn't being addressed. Finally, with an ageing population surely some thought should be given to accommodation suitable for the elderly. Having spoken to many people locally I have yet to meet anyone, in favour of the desecration of our green belt.</p>
DOR03144	<p>As a Wirral resident I am shocked and appalled by plans to build on precious green belt land. I would like to voice my strong opposition to these plans. It is not acceptable to hide behind the wishes of central government. Whether this amount of housing is needed on the Wirral is highly questionable. If more housing is needed alternative solutions must be sought. The loss of green belt land has serious environmental implications and will impact greatly upon the health, wellbeing and quality of life of current Wirral residents.</p>
DOR03145	<p>I have strong reason to request that you review the need to take up Green Belt Land to meet Future Housing Need on Wirral in your Local Plan</p> <p>The current calculations of need should be reconsidered in the following areas:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Calculation of Buffer is overstated at 7390 dwellings. The number brought forward should be no more than 20% of the first 5years not 20% of the full 15 year requirement. the shortfall should remain nearer the unenhanced figure of 4990. 2. Assessment of Housing Provision in Wirral Waters - Your view is far too conservative and is not in line with Government requirements on assessment for the Local Plan. Peel Holdings has written various letters outlining its commitment to Wirral Waters, most recently to Margaret Greenwood MP. Where in March 2018, they announced three major housing projects that will bring over 1000 new homes to the area over the next three years and as many as 6450 to be delivered during the period to 2035. Currently there are three Planning Applications from Peel Holdings awaiting your review. 3. Housing Need and Windfall Sites - The Council should review both its historic achievements in bringing properties back into use, review windfall application rates and recalculate its previous housing delivery numbers so reducing the previously identified under delivery. It should also include more realistic numbers in its future projections. The council has calculated its 12000 housing need figure using a Government formula based on Office of National Statistics household projections for the period to 2035. Using the Government's standard method and a more up to date baseline than the Council's it is calculated that the base need is not 12000 but 11760 - a further reduction in the shortfall. It is reasonably apparent that a reconsideration based on the above would reduce the need to take up Green Belt Land for development and make better use of the vast amount of currently available Brownfield Land in the Wirral Area where existing infrastructure and provision of services makes the provision of Affordable Housing much more sensible

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03146	<p>I cannot believe I am having to write this letter in response to the "proposal" to change the use of the Bromborough Civic Centre, Library and Rake Car Park, it is truly a bizarre proposal. This land and these facilities are huge assets to the village in their current form and should be left as is. I therefore ask that you consider this a formal statement of disapproval to the proposed "change of use" and I would urge you in the strongest terms to REJECT the proposal to change the use of the land to "Mixed Use".</p> <p>My objections are based on the following :-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If it's not broke THEN DO NOT CHANGE IT - I could understand the proposals if the car park was unused, being misused or an eyesore but this is simply not the case! I can see the car park from both my living room and kitchen. I can therefore reliably inform you of how popular and busy the car park is. The Bromborough Car Park is a busy car park from around 8am to 7pm six days a week (Monday to Saturday). Between the hours of 11am and 2pm the car park is usually at capacity but as people are continually coming and going, visitors can usually find a place. The car park is also used on Sundays by church goers for services, weddings, christenings and in the week for funerals. In the evening the car park can also be busy with people for functions at the Bromborough Social Club, and Civic Centre. 2. The Car Park and Civic Centre are essential to the CURRENT life of the village As previously stated the Bromborough Car Park is extremely busy. The cars are continually coming and going. The visitors to the car park are making use of the shops and businesses in the village. It is these businesses and these people that are the lifeblood of the village and it is the Car Park, Civic Centre and Library that provide the essential conduit. Bromborough was granted a market in 1278 and has seen trading activity ever since. It is a fact of life now that people use vehicles to shop and go to the bank etc. If the village of Bromborough is to remain a village with any real form of commercial activity it needs to retain its Civic Centre and Car Park. - Fact - Nothing really to debate In the event of the car park land being used for anything other than a car park, I feel would spell the end of any real commercial activity in the village and the businesses it supports. People just will not come. Incidentally the Civic Centre and Library also heavily depend upon the Car Park for the participants and delegates of the various functions (including Charity Sales, Yoga, Community Meetings). It may be easy to see this land as an asset that does not generate income for the Council. This is very short sighted and simply not the case. This land secures the life of the village and the council tax paying businesses that provide facilities and employment opportunities to us all. The Council needs to see the bigger picture. The view should be to keep the use of the Car Park, Civic Centre and Library unchanged. 3. The Car Park and Civic Centre are essential to the FUTURE life of the village I think we all understand that facilities must keep pace with a changing world, but that is precisely what these areas of land are already doing. Villages are failing due to a lack of parking. Customers are going to free car parks on bland, soul less trading estates visiting multi-national corporates. We in Bromborough have a chance to have the best of both worlds, we have the "soul less" Croft estate and the opportunity to maintain a true future proofed village experience that includes shopping, eating, banking, hair dressing, visiting a solicitor, estate agent. All these being a mix of big companies and independent traders (the back bone of Britain and its Entrepreneurial Spirit). On this basis alone the use of the above land should not be changing. The future of the Village and the businesses including future businesses is truly in the Councils hands. On a final note I understand that the land that the Civic Centre, Library, and Car Park occupies, was bequeathed to the council for the "recreational use" of the residents of Bromborough. In its current form it is used by the residents and a change of use I feel would be not in-keeping with the spirit of that bequest. The Council should honour the spirit of bequests and not just use changing times as a justification for altering the wishes of our ancestors and kind benefactors. I re-iterate --- It really is madness. Please accept this letter as a formal objection to the proposed change of use of the Bromborough Civic Centre, Library and Car Park.
DOR03147	<p>As a resident of Bromborough, I am writing to you in relation to local plans SHLAA 2024 and 2025. Do I understand correctly that it is planned (a) to dispose of the car park and build residences on it and (b) to replace the library and the civic centre with facilities for other services? If there is a plan to dispose of the car park, I very strongly suggest that it will kill shopping and refreshment services. In short, it will kill the village. Throughout the hours of 9am to 5pm on weekdays the car park is regularly full and the aforementioned facilities are well served with customers. Apart from the car park, there is very limited parking space available in the village. Consequently, if the car park is disposed of, the persons who currently drive into the village will not be able to park their cars and will almost certainly transfer their allegiance to facilities on the Croft Retail Park. The inevitable closure of the current facilities would create unemployment and destroy the atmosphere of the village. Similarly, the civic centre is a well-used facility, providing a popular venue for a range of activities, including yoga sessions, singing groups and bring and buy sales. If the civic centre is removed, where would those activities go? I do not know of any similar facilities in the vicinity. The removal of that venue would add to the draining of potential and actual users of the shops and refreshment services, adding significantly to the demise of the village. In short, Bromborough village would be reduced to a ghost town.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03148	<p>Having attended one of the local 'consultation' meetings at Hulme Hall in Port Sunlight, and listened to a council representative give a long, rambling and somewhat convincing 'spiel' about our need to release greenbelt... only to have all his carefully 'put together' reasoning torn apart by educated and interested members of the audience, I am wholeheartedly convinced that the council are using the government's request that they finally submit a local plan (something that is long overdue) as an excuse to blame central government for their own ineptitude in not putting through a well-reasoned and researched proposal much earlier, and at the same time make themselves lots of money through greedy developers, which will in turn disguise the fact that Wirral council have significant financial worries... again due to their own ineptitude. At no time during the meeting, where this unbelievable number of upwards of 12000? houses that will supposedly be required by Wirral over 15 years, did the council mention how many schools.... doctors surgeries.... dentists.... local shops.....community areas.....play areas..... pubs... .. sports facilities... .employment opportunities ... etc etc will be included in the structure of Wirral to support an extra 48000 people who will surely end up living in these homes... as let's face it, families consist of more than one person! (I'd love to know where these extra people are coming from?) Allowing development to happen sporadically on this greenbelt land by individual wealthy landowners and developers will mean that large expensive executive homes will gradually be built in 'pockets', gaining their respective builders huge sums of money, including Wirral council who will benefit from increased council taxes from these expensive homes, (Not to mention the backhanders ... yes- I dare to say it! We are not stupid, and know full well how this corrupt world works). Yet, these homes will then put increased pressure on local communities, who already struggle to get a guaranteed school place for their child, who wait weeks for an appointment with their GP, who are lucky to find an NHS dentist willing to even add them to their list, let alone get an appointment, who travel miles to find sports facilities so their child can join a hockey team... that's if they can even get there due to the congestion on local roads...</p> <p>How many of these developers have included plans for a GP surgery, road infrastructure, or new school within their 'small' to 'medium' building project? Let me guess.... NONE? And because all these little pockets of land are being put forward by individual owners and house builders, none of them will be forced to include the community facilities (because, as we all know, community facilities don't make the big bucks) and when it's all added together 15 years down the line, Wirral will be gridlocked, no one will be able to get to work on time, get a doctors appointment or find a school for their child. House prices will devalue across the area, people will leave as Wirral will no longer be a desirable place to live, Wirral council will lose money as homes devalue, and will have plenty of empty properties to fulfil the fictitious housing requirements Wirral didn't need in the first place! This plan is a JOKE. It is not forward thinking to cover the needs of Wirral residents over the next 15 years and beyond. You don't even know what type of housing will be needed? Old people's homes and sheltered living in my opinion - And preferably affordable for the ageing people of Wirral - NOT that ridiculous retirement village proposed for Thornton Hough, that only the 'Cheshire Set' could afford. Nor do we need more expensive executive homes, that many families can't afford! This plan is short-term financial gain for Wirral borough council, and some wealthy local families, landowners and building companies, who will be the first to up and leave this area when it becomes a deprived urban sprawl, leaving the rest of us to pick up the pieces. Please remember, you, as councillors have been elected to represent the views of the people of Wirral, not line your own pockets and let the local building companies brown-nose their way to trashing our beautiful peninsula.</p>
DOR03149	<p>My wife and I wish to record our objections to the development of the above site and indeed to others effecting Green Belt. The five statutory tests in themselves should be sufficient to halt most of these developments. However recent planning decisions by this Labour administration have shown no regard for GB and certainly not delivered affordable homes. I watched the council meeting on this subject when Wirral Waters was discussed. I would suggest it is renamed Wirral Muddy Waters due to the many claims and counter claims. People locally and nationally vote on these issues emotionally not rationally. Political differences disappear. The failure to challenge the national targets is a political mistake. If you prevail, you have won many voters. If the government prevails, they get the blame for the results and you win voters. So I am going to appeal to your base instincts. Politicians and re-election. Forget any short term strategic party gains and face the reality that Labour will pay a heavy price in upcoming elections if it develops these GB sites. Believe me, no one is fooled by the rhetoric you are spreading on these issues.</p>
DOR03150	<p>We object to the Council's proposal to allow new housing development on the two GREENBELT fields on either side of The National Trust's Harrock Wood for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Insufficient infrastructure to support the influx of additional families - already overstretched primary schools and GP surgeries. • Insufficient suitable access and egress opportunities for the sites - Thingwall Road is a busy artery connecting Thingwall Corner with Thurstaston Road, already a through route for buses, school traffic and touring caravans heading for Thurstaston Caravan Park. Mayew Road is privately owned and as the owner of property with frontage on to this road, we would not agree to Mayew Road being used as an access point. • The fields provide important habitat for voles, field mice, herons, geese, ducks, pheasants and barn owls. The pond is just one of an ever decreasing water based habitats in Wirral and may well provide a habitat for Greater Crested Newt s. • There is frequent winter flooding on the land adjoining Elm Avenue, Mayew Road, Daleside Close, Leafield Close and Marlston Avenue. • The existing fields and surrounding trees/hedgerows provide important sources of CO2 emission removal from the atmosphere. • The present greenbelt status of the two fields in question currently provide a rural buffer clearly demarking the villages of Irby and Thingwall. • We strongly object to the proposal to declassify this area of green belt for housing.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03151	<p>I object to the proposals to release part of Wirral's Green Belt for the purposes of house building. Two points:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. "The government have told us that if we don't do it, then they will come in and do it for us." No - this is not correct. We live in a democracy: it is up to the residents of Wirral to decide what happens to our Green Belt. If our councillors do not carry out the wishes of their constituents, then those councillors will be removed. 2. Specifically in relation to the section of land between Banks Road and Broad Lane in Lower Heswall - this site was woodland not long ago, but the owners - a caravan company from Leeds who keep having planning applications rejected - keep digging it up in order to make it look less like attractive 'green' land. Please don't be fooled by this.
DOR03152	<p>I am writing to object most strongly against the plan to build on green belt land on the Wirral, or any greenfield sites. These open spaces play a crucial part in the general health of the population by providing places to walk, run and play. Golf courses, equestrian centres should be encouraged especially in the light of the levels of obesity in our country, rather than just another patch of land for developers. Taking away more and more open spaces, especially those that are easily accessible to where people live already, will have a negative impact on everyone. I am particularly shocked to see woodland areas, like Storeton Woods, also included in the plans for building on. Surely we know enough about climate change and the damage caused by traffic fumes to realise the importance of woodland in counterbalancing such impact on general health. There are several brownfield sites currently laying waste on the Wirral, such as along Dock Rd. Wallasey. This is an area crying out for regeneration like the recent renovation of the old dock warehouse. Look at Salford Quays, SE Liverpool and many other similar examples where dock areas have been transformed into attractive residential areas which would not only provided much needed housing but also gentrify an area in decline visually and structurally. Greenbelts should remain sacrosanct, especially here where open land is already limited. I therefore oppose the plans and would like to register my objection to the relevant people.</p>
DOR03153	<p>I am writing to voice my concern with regard to using green belt land in order to building houses. From what I can see the areas chosen are of vital importance to keeping Wirral green. I also feel that affordable housing would not be built in these areas, and would only serve to build the more expensive type of house. I also understand that there is plenty to brown field sites on which housing can be built, and I urge you to do this to keep Wirral greener the next generations, I am of an age when it will not affect me. So PLEASE do not building on the green belt</p>
DOR03154	<p>I strongly disagree with the future development on green belt Land on Wirral. Firstly peel Group have ownership of brown land which they have promised to develop in the past so many years, to build 13,000 houses on. This should be used first before building on any green belt. The area where we live has an abundance of wildlife such as Owls, woodpeckers, buzzards, foxes, rabbits, to name just a few which are co-existing with obviously an ideal ecological area. We class ourselves to be so lucky to live so close to these areas. we live on Bracken Lane in Higher Bebington and are surrounded by the green belt that is being put forward to the government, Brackenwood Park and golf course, Storeton village and surrounds and Bebington recreation it is scandalous that so much is being given up. We all need green areas for wellbeing and what with the concerns over diesel fumes to propose so many houses where the roads congestion now is barely manageable on Mount road is ludicrous. Just by building a drs practice at the end of Bracken lane has caused so much congestion and now the proposal of all the houses which on average people have 2 cars. How are our roads going to cope? They aren't now with all the potholes that the council can't keep up repairing due to the changes in weather, never mind schools and hospitals. We hope the government take notice of our concerns.</p>
DOR03155	<p>I wish to object to the proposed development at Claremont. To lose more of our Green belt land is bad for the community and the loss of the amenities Claremont Farm provides to all.</p>
DOR03156	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The proposed house building rate [800dpa] is neither supported by recent annual house building rates, nor, by the ONS projected population figures. 2. Notwithstanding this ,Wirral Waters can accommodate the plan's total projected housing need if the required investment is accelerated. This could well be a decision taken by a future government/council/investment group provided there was a sufficient demand for the release of housing land. Doubling the amount of available land by releasing land within the green belt would act against this most desirable development. A decision to take land away from the green belt would decimate the character of Wirral. It is also more than likely that the allocation of residential land within the green belt would generate an irresistible commercial pressure for its release despite the intention that the release of green belt land should be looked on as a last resort, or ,any provisions in the local plan to reflect this. 3. SHMA indicates that 60% of households cannot afford to rent housing in the borough,and,80% cannot afford to buy. It is difficult to see how taking the pressure off the development of sites[which require regeneration] within the urban fence by releasing green belt land can help these people. 4. I would suggest that the answer is not to release green belt land for housing but invest in and develop the land which is available within the urban fence to provide the housing that is needed in an urban environment that is worthy of the green space that surrounds it. Green belts were introduced into England in 1955 and have been consistently used and supported as a planning policy to prevent urban sprawl, to release land now would simply create a precedent to look on the green belt left as a land bank for the future.
DOR03157	<p>I am against any building on Claremont farm and our precious Wirral Green Belt. Developing on that part of the farm is integral to the business which attracts many visitors each year and taking it away brings the viability of the whole of Claremont under speculation.</p>
DOR03158	<p>I strongly object that there is insufficient parking for this project. I already cannot park outside my house in the evening. I also object that the loss of this green space would greatly affect the view of the grade 2 listed terrace houses. Also would restrict light to our properties. Also there is very little space for such a large development and would cause traffic congestion in both roads adjoining the site. The area has many early 19th century houses and a new development would not be keeping in character with the existing housing stock especially its loses neighbours.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03159	I am writing to express my support of the tenant farmers at Claremont Far m. That farm is incredibly important to the local area for environmental and social reasons. I am strongly against the idea of building homes on this green field site. The negative environmental impact of this will be huge both in terms of the loss of the large area of land and the trees and wildlife present on the land as well as the significantly increased pollution and traffic that more housing here would cause. I live in a built up area and think the long term impact of losing more green belt is detrimental to the health and wellbeing of people across Wirral. I urge you to reconsider this plan and to find brown field sites for housing instead of destroying green field sites.
DOR03160	[SAME AS DOR02884]
DOR03160	I live in the historic village of Irby. According to the Oxford dictionary the definition of a village is 'A self-contained district or community within a town or city, regarded as having features characteristic of village life.' Irby is currently distinct from the villages of Thingwall and Pensby. The decision to effectively merge Irby with Thingwall and Pensby seems to contradict both the definition of 'village' and the values of the green belt national policy. By the way, the definition of 'council' is 'a™ of people elected or chosen to make decisions - to represent a particular™ of people' - so, apart from greedy landowners and councillors, are these plans really representing the wishes of the people of Wirral?
DOR03161	Claremont has brought such joy to all the community please do not build on their farm! Claremont farm is integral to our Community and taking away part of their land brings the viability of the whole of Claremont under speculation. They rotate Home Grown Vegetables around this particular land as it's the closest land available to the shop, so we are not having to travel long distances every morning during harvest. It's also important that winter educational visits/welly walks can access these vegetables and enable the children to see these vegetables growing first hand. This part of the farm is also integral to our Higher Level Environmental Stewardship Scheme agreement, which works on a points basis, many of our points are gained in this area of land from infield trees & ponds, field corners, grass buffer strips, hedgerow management etc etc If we lose this land we will no longer have sufficient points to stay in the agreement and will also lose the right to offer 70 FREE school visits every year to the local school groups. There is a reason Bebington was voted the most desirable postcode in the UK to live and the Wirral is known for its green spaces, to take that away unnecessarily would be a travesty. Do we need to mention the obvious traffic issue and that it is already at capacity on Brimstage Road and the Clatterbridge roundabout.....and nothing is more frustrating than knowing that there are many more brown field and suitable areas where houses could be built but for political reasons, mismanagement and greed, these are not being utilised. We will back any campaign to save our green belt and to push the council to use the areas already marked for housing first and foremost. There are groups, such as the Claremont Defenders who we wish to distance ourselves from though and even though people may use our name they may not have our best interests at heart.
DOR03162	I am writing to express my concern on the proposal to build on Green belt land across the Wirral. Firstly Claremont Farm which has farmed on the land for 112 years! The tenants have a 100 year lease or 4 generations Agricultural Tenancy Agreement at Claremont Farm, the current tenants are the last generation to automatically receive the right to farm at there. After them, who knows what will happen. The land which is possibly going to be used for housing development is integral to the Farm and taking it away brings the viability of the whole of Claremont under speculation. They rotate Home Grown Vegetables around this particular land as it's the closest land available to the shop, so they are not having to travel long distances every morning during harvest. It's also important that winter educational visits/welly walks can access these vegetables and enable the children to see these vegetables growing first hand. This part of the farm is also integral to the Higher Level Environmental Stewardship Scheme agreement they undertake, which works on a points basis, many of their points are gained in this area of land from infield trees & ponds, field comers, grass buffer strips, hedgerow management etc etc. If they lose this land they will no longer have sufficient points to stay in the agreement and will also lose the right to offer 70 FREE school visits every year to the local school groups. There is a reason Bebington was voted the most desirable postcode in the UK to live and the Wirral is known for its green spaces, to take that away unnecessarily would be a travesty. Greenbelt was protected land for a reason. It is beautiful. It provides an abundance of wildlife to live and carry on the vital food chain. Taking it away will negatively impact on every person who resides on The Wirral. No beautiful land to look at or walk through. It is detrimental that this land is never used for housing development.
DOR03163	I wish to make my concerns and opposition known about the proposed housing developments on Greenbelt land across the Wirral. Especially that of Claremont Farm in Bebington. There is no evidence to support the loss of our Greenbelt land. If more houses are needed then out your efforts into seeking brownfield alternatives. Instead, neighbourhoods such as Birkenhead, Egremont and Seacombe, which are in desperate need of regeneration, would surely be a better choice. These areas where there are already well established transport links and schools etc. There are 6000 currently empty homes on the Wirral. Surely it's more economic to refurbish these homes instead of building more. By selling off our Greenbelt land you are ruining the history and beautiful landscape of Wirral which has made it such a tourist attraction and one of the most sought after place to live in the UK.
DOR03164	My disgust was absolute when I read that a local farm, one of the only places on the Wirral you can find fruit and veg not wrapped in excessive plastic, is under threat because of a ridiculous idea to build more unnecessary houses. So many places in the Wirral are allowed to go derelict and yet the councils plan is not to redevelop but to build new houses! This is simply redirecting the problem. We should be campaigning for local farm shops to remain open not threatening them! No one local wants to lose the farm and they certainly don't want a development going up in its place. For once, do the right thing. Save Claremont Farm!
DOR03165	Please do all you can to stop this destruction of our Green Belt land! As well as potentially destroying the land of a significant historical landmark and Roman farm, it will cause excessive pollution, grid lock, danger an higher risk of accidents, possible death! New services would be required, also shops, schools, surgeries and much more, and no room for them. A further strain on an already very busy and over stretched Hospital Trust will also not help.
DOR03166	I'm proud and lucky to have grown up on a lovely estate surrounded by farm land and fields....something which make the Wirral....the Wirral. I would like to express my wish to NOT build on the green land surrounding Claremont farm and keep our green land....green!

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03167	<p>I am writing in relation to the development of Greenland that has been proposed. Whilst I totally understand the need for more housing I, along with a lot of other people from the Wirral and beyond feel the same way. I think there are far better ways to go about this and find much better sites to build the houses on. Firstly why choose Claremont? Yes ok you will be bringing more customers to their shop but you're taking away the heritage you're taking away OUR land that, as a wirralian I love to see! This is one of things that makes the Wirral such a beautiful place to live. It brings people here from all over, so tourists spending money, to see the beautiful views and the countryside that we have. Secondly why are you proposing to build on a car park in Bromborough village. This is beyond ridiculous. So many people from the village and the rest of the Wirral travel to Bromborough to use the many different shops we have there. I shop there for cards, presents, co op supermarket for essentials, muffs for meat and Caroline and co for beauty not to mention the much needed pharmacy that has become a backbone of the community. You build on the car park and you kill off all these shops that bring the village together. Please I ask you as a kind hearted worried human being, please from the bottom of my heart think about reconsidering.</p>
DOR03168	<p>I write to share my shock and anger at the proposal to build on Claremont Farm. As a resident on the Poulton Royd estate I am deeply against this. This area is a fundamental part of the community, it brings people together and promotes the purchase and support of local produce. Many people benefit from and enjoy the facilities available at Claremont, adults, children & elderly alike. It promotes community spirit and integration and people come from all over the Wirral to participate in and enjoy the serenity of Claremont. I firmly believe the location and landscape of Claremont Farm adds to its draw. If the access to this area and view is impacted on by buildings then this will most definitely lose some of the magic this area offers. Local schools also benefit from this area, shoal trips, welly walks, Bushcraft camps etc the children learn about growing produce and enjoy these trips, this is integral to their development and appreciation of nature, simplicity and health. The ability to walk the fields with our children and teach them about nature, show them the animals and the view across to Wales was a big part of our reason for purchasing a house here, it provides a calmness and naturalness away from the hustle and bustle of modern day life, it helps us show our children the beauty of the area rather than man made greed, bricks & mortar spoiling such spaces. It is a beautiful green space and is integral to maintaining the natural beauty of the area. Bebington has been voted the best place to live for good reason, its open space, greenery, community spirit to name a few. People choose to live in Spital for its openness and scenery, there is no need to turn Spital into a mass of brick & mortar that will reduce the beauty of the area. Building houses here will significantly reduce the beautiful landscape and have a severe effect on traffic. There is limited access to the current estate and farm and there is frequently a back log of traffic on Brimstage Road leading to Clatterbridge roundabout. I am sure there are other options within the Wirral that would be more suitable for new builds, such as the green land near Dibbinsdale on the B1357 in Bromborough, the green land opposite the proposed site which is rarely used by the community and is a dead space The 'common' opposite Storeton Woods to name a few!!</p>
DOR03169	<p>Whilst the majority of Wirral residents appreciate new, affordable housing is needed, the key is 'affordable'. As a Bebington resident, it concerns me that if the land at Claremont Farm and Storeton is allowed to be built on, the land and subsequent housing would be within the catchment area of 2 local Grammar schools. Any houses built would not be 'affordable' to the people who need to get on the housing ladder. The developers would build 4 bedroom 'family' houses, with prices out of reach to the average family, to make as much money as possible. Additionally, the traffic along Brimstage Road towards Clatterbridge roundabout/M53 junction is already congesting the road. Both Brimstage Road and Mount Road are tail to tail each day, peak and non-peak times, and it could not cope with additional traffic new housing developments in the area would bring. Surely Wirral has enough Brown sites to build what is required by Government, that should be utilised first and foremost, I'm sure they have already been identified as possibilities. Please listen to the majority of Wirral residents who want to keep Wirral a nice, family friendly, green place to live. As I'm sure you know Bebington has been voted the best place to live in the country - it won't be top of the list again if the plans to eradicate Wirral as we know it go ahead. Our children and children's children deserve to grow up in a Wirral which has nature and fields around them, once they are built on they will be gone forever?</p>
DOR03170	<p>I'm totally against this plan for a number of reasons -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are plenty of other non-greenbelt sites across the Wirral that need development way way before green belt sites are even considered. i.e.....waste land, land near the docks. 2. This proposal will endanger and NOT Protect the local wildlife and greenery. 3. This proposed site will increase traffic volumes on Rigby drive and surrounding areas and the roads will not be able to cope and this will increase the risk to children who attend the local schools in the area which will not be able to cope with the extra pupils. 4. Support the local farmer by not building on the land and encourage organic natural farming. 5. The houses on backing onto the field of Rigby drive will be more at risk from flooding from the development onto their land as it's bad enough as it is now in the very wet autumn/winters we have. 6. This will have a negative effect on the housing values within the area of Rigby drive as Greasby will become saturated with characterless new build houses that are not in keeping with the local area. 7. The noise pollution levels will increase and disturb any local protected species of animals, birds, reptiles etc... 8. These proposed sites are purely for the greed of the council to make more money from the developers and the developers to line their pockets even more as the sites are prime locations for expensive housing developments which have nothing to do with the shortage of affordable housing as most residents will not be able to afford these new houses.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03171	I am just writing to express my views against development on green belt land in Wirral. I live in Spital and have seen talk on social media of plans to develop on land next to/ in Claremont farm and around Bebington. Personally I think this is a bad idea, Brimstage Road already gets very busy and lots of new houses around here will make this worse. Schools and doctors surgeries are already very busy never mind having to consider lots of new children and families moving into the new houses. Claremont farm is used by lots of local people who enjoy the fresh produce and in turn helps people by providing taxes. If land is taken away from Claremont farm the business may no longer be viable.
DOR03172	I am writing to you as a very concerned resident of Parkway in Irby. The news I'm getting regarding the possible of a huge housing development in this area would be devastating for the land concerned. This land (rated 3b) has been used for arable farming for many years, Adding much needed crops for the local area and further afield. Where will the crops be grown if we keep destroying this priceless land? The fields, and hedgerow, fields and ponds are home to many different animal species including birds of prey, bats, field mice, shrews and the ponds even have great crested newts, as confirmed by the Western link HV findings. Limbo lane is a very popular area for dog walkers and ramblers alike. Enjoying the green open spaces, fresh air and country smells. We can't keep taking these areas away. It is quite a landmark, with the great views from Thingwall road to the Dee estuary. I know that a large estate was planned there in the 1930s but a lot of other developments have appeared since then, filling the schools and making the through road very congested at peak times. I really don't know how the existing roads or schools could cope with a development of this size. I'm asking you and the other council leaders to think very hard about the detrimental effect that a housing estate would have on limbo lane. Once the green belt has gone, its gone forever.
DOR03173	I strongly oppose the Plan. I have attended a meeting to hear [a council officer's] presentation of an overview of the Local Authority Development Plan. It was too much to take in on the night even though I had viewed it online. However some of my questions were answered but my peace of mind was not. I listened to all the questions, replies (rather than answers) and comments from both those attending and also the council representatives. I looked at the plans for the proposed areas of Green Belt areas to be withdrawn from Green Belt Status. I know the MBW is one of three remaining councils still not to have complied with the Government request to submit the Local Plan. [A council officer] was unable to tell the meeting why this council had failed in its duty to do so. He did however deny that this public consultation was being rushed through. It was obvious that the audience did not agree with his comment. I understand that Peel Holdings have already offered to meet Government requirements for housing using Brownfield areas and the need to use Green Belt is not needed. I agree that the best people to decide where houses should be built are those who live here and know the Wirral and where people want to purchase affordable housing or to be able to buy in an area of their own choosing depending on their needs and income. To pay outside consultants is, in my opinion totally unnecessary and a waste of money. I feel that the whole process is seriously flawed and not fit to submit on our behalf as it stands. It certainly is not what I feel is a correct appraisal of the needs of the Wirral community as it is at present and as it is perceived to be five, ten, fifteen years hence and beyond. I know I am not alone in making this statement. We need to keep our Green Belt. I strongly oppose the Plan.
DOR03174	I wish to express and register my strong objections to the plans to build on green belt arable farm land at Claremont Farm. This is an appalling ill thought out idea that will not only destroy farmland, which produces food but damage the local environment. Spital is already struggling due to the large numbers of cars trying to get out of Poulton Road onto Brimstage, or Church Road and traffic regularly queues up to Clatterbridge roundabout. Wirral has plenty of available brownfill sites as well as large areas of derelict shops/ houses which could be turned into affordable housing. Greenbelt land is protected for a reason and this land in particular serves the peninsula by producing local produce and bringing in paying visitors so generating money and employment to Wirral. It would be criminal to grant planning permission to any area of greenbelt land on the Wirral and the council can quite easily reach the government target by using other available sites, not greenbelt areas. This would damage irrevocably Wirral and I trust the council will do what they are in position to do and act and listen to the wishes of the people of Wirral and firmly reject any plans that involve any greenbelt land.
DOR03175	I wish to object to building on the greenbelt because having been to several meetings it is clear that this is not necessary as there are plenty of brownfield sites and empty properties Had you have completed your local plan when asked and not been one of three who have not then we would have had plenty of time to discuss and consult this matter rather than the fiasco you have now created. Do not build on our precious greenbelt just because you are inefficient and too lazy to do the right thing and consider the need and wants of the Wirral residents, particularly as we have elections next year.
DOR03176	I recently attended one of the meetings in connection with the above and have also received the letter from your office about the subject. My home is Woodkind Hey, Spital. Which is situated very close to the site reference SP043. The green belt area at this site and also similar sites next to it are of great value in protecting the rural nature of the land between Bromborough and Bebington to prevent urban sprawl and ribbon development between these two developments. It is also prime farmland. We have lived at this address for the past 30 plus years and well remember the planning application in the 1980s I think it was, for the same site, which was rejected after a public enquiry. One very important reason for its rejection was the poor road access and damage it would cause to the environment of area like this. Also prominent was the effect on local services, such as schools, medical surgeries etc already at full capacity. Poulton Road has not changed since this original application and is still a country lane in appearance. The one thing that has changed is the huge increase in use of it by traffic using the road as a link between Bromborough and Bebington and places beyond such as the M53. If it was unsuitable then it is even more so now. Spital Road and Brimstage Road including the Church Road junction have a very high traffic flow now leading up to the M53 interchange at junction 4. Any more traffic from Poulton Road added to it would add to the trouble experienced now, particularly at peak times. We have seen the opening of the Croft Business Park make a substantial increase in traffic from other parts of Wirral both from the Motorway and Deeside who use Spital Road and Brimstage Road to gain access to it. My view is that any further development on these totally inadequate roads would be a disaster for this area. I understand that if the green belt at site SP043 was given up and the land developed, the number of potential housing would be in excess of 300. How could that number of people/cars be coped with?

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03177	<p>We write to vehemently oppose the proposed development of the Green Belt on the following grounds:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are Brown Belt sites readily available. 2. There are a huge number of existing vacant properties. 3. The population of Wirral is in decline and therefore the new builds are unwarranted and unnecessary. 4. Green spaces are vital for peoples wellbeing and once gone they are gone forever. 5. The Green Belt maintains boundaries between the numerous villages and prevents Wirral becoming one giant urban mass.
DOR03178	<p>I am not originally from Wirral but I settled and have lived on this beautiful peninsula in 1989 and made it my home. I love this place and the main reasons are the open spaces, the natural beauty and the feeling I'm on a little piece of heaven. Over the years I've seen traffic building up until every artery into/out of Wirral is at saturation point especially at rush hour. The reason people choose to live on Wirral is a feeling of open space and knowing you're only a few mins from sea or countryside which is unique and the best remedy for all modern ills - fresh air and exercise. The council are taxing the open spaces by applying parking charges just to go for a walk through the trees and now they want to sell off open green spaces between unique villages to create urban sprawls and evict tenant farmers to concrete over our biggest assets - farm land ! You aren't thinking of the future you aren't thinking of the people of Wirral - someone somewhere is pushing this through to feather their own nest and have become so greedy they aren't thinking further than their retirement pot. I am very concerned re these proposals and I shall be joining forces with all those who oppose this land rape.</p>
DOR03179	<p>I am contacting you in relation to the plans to develop on the green belt land around the Clarendon farm area. This would be a travesty for all who live and visit this area. Many of us have chosen Bebington as a place to live due to the surrounding rural areas and to escape the towns where many of us work. This farm provides educational visits for our school children and also food for residents of the Wirral. This beautiful area would be lost to our future generations and there must be many areas where houses can be built without ruining our green belt areas.</p>
DOR03180	<p>I am emailing to object to the proposal on local planning for use of the car park, library and civic centre to multipurpose. Bromborough high street is a thriving community and the library and civic centre and car park are well used, not only by Bromborough residents but also by the factories and warehousing in Bromborough who use the local shops and cafes at lunch times. Also it will deprive people in surrounding areas who will not be able to use the facilities in Bromborough through lack of parking. Please do not Kill our community.</p>
DOR03181	<p>I am an extremely concerned resident of Irby. I have lived here the majority of my life and the reason i have chosen to stay living here is how wonderful this area is and one of the main reasons for this is the beautiful green spaces we have available. I walk through some of these lovely spaces every day with my dogs and it would be incredibly sad to see these turned into yet another housing development. Irby is such an amazing place and it has such a lovely semi-rural feeling to it, this will undoubtedly be ruined if the proposed new build plans go ahead. The argument is simple - If greenbelt is released this should be equal across Wirral so as not to disadvantage a particular community. As it stands this would not be the case, as follows -</p> <p>Wirral population 321238</p> <p>Irby population 6110 (1.9% of Wirral population) Total green belt houses allegedly required 7390 Total Irby green belt houses proposed 1771</p> <p>So, if all Irby sites selected for building, we would shoulder the burden for 24% of green belt release, despite currently containing less than 2% of Wirral's population.</p> <p>The population of Irby (based on mean 2.3 people per household) would increase by 61% despite no increase in school places, health care provision and no facility to improve access to the M53</p> <p>I ask you to seriously reconsider the impact such large scale developments will have on such a wonderful area.</p>
DOR03182	<p>Building in Pipers Lane and surrounding fields, I am a 78 years old widow, my only means of transport is by car, in order to leave Lower Heswall I must use the following, Pipers Lane/Delavor Road/Dee View Road/Thurstaston Road/ Village Road, if the proposed building of houses takes place, these already very narrow crowded roads will be impossible to navigate safely, especially as there is St Peters School and Gayton Primary School in very close proximity .</p>
DOR03183	<p>My husband and I use the village two or three times a week, every time we go to the village we have problems parking, so to take away seems a very stupid idea, or is it the council's idea to see the demise of Bromborough Village.</p>
DOR03184	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. how was the 800 per year arrived at? Who was responsible for it, & on what basis was it arrived at? What demographic calculations were involved? 2. Was this decision put to the people of Wirral for their assent to this population growth & its effect on the character of Wirral? <p>If not why not? What suggestions have been put forward to ameliorate the effects of this population growth and assist its assimilation into the citizens of Wirral & preserve its character?</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3. In responding to this demand what proposals has the council's planners put forward for the necessary infrastructure for the increased population & the land use required: for roads, schools, surgeries, shops &c.? Has respect for the archaeological and historic landscape of any proposed developments been addressed? 4. Will all new housing be of a good design standard and built to Parker Morris standards? <p>I trust these queries will be considered at the planning consultations.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03185	<p>As a resident of Lower Heswall, I am concerned about the plans for more housing at the end of Pipers Lane. I feel that the infrastructure is already under strain, the traffic in Heswall is already extremely busy at times particularly around the primary schools and more cars will increase the chance of accidents. Within in recent years there has already been numerous sites developed and there are currently houses being built by both St Peters and Gayton schools. There are also a number of houses that have been converted into blocks of apartments, increasing the population density and traffic! Heswall is a small town which already struggles to cope with a very busy Tesco supermarket, Marks and Spencers food store and Aldi supermarket . I feel that any development in Pipers Lane and the Heswall area would be unsustainable, particular with services like the Police Station closing. Also the end of Pipers Lane is of considerable natural beauty and I am of the understanding Badgers live there.</p>
DOR03186	<p>I write to comment on the above proposals. Then Wirral Peninsular is characterised by a series of villages separated by beautiful countryside. These villages have evolved over time with a mixture of ages and styles of building and each has its own charm. It is up to us to protect and cherish this precious environment for future generations.</p> <p>I write to object to the above proposals because:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1 The two proposals, which are in fact one large expanse of land, are blatant infilling and will result in urban sprawl adversely affecting the communities in Pensby, Irby, Barnston and Heswall. 2 Barnston Road, which is one boundary of both proposals: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • already has signs indicating 128 accidents in three years. • is already a busy road on which it is difficult to turn right. • Has queues to turn into Storeton Lane due to single lane area • The road in Barnston Dale is narrow and acts as a bottle neck. • The turnout of Gills Lane is dangerous with poor visibility. <p>For these reasons, Barnston Road is unsuitable for the extra traffic which would result from this amount of extra houses.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 3 Parking in Heswall is already difficult at busy times and this number of additional houses would exacerbate this issue. 4 The field bounded by Barnston Road and Gills Lane is water logged for a large part of the winter making a small lake. Any houses in this area would have drainage problems.
DOR03187	<p>I am writing in to register my views on the local planning on green belt land under site reference SP061, north of Gills Lane, Pensby. I wish strongly to protest. When I originally bought this house It was purely for the fact that it was not overlooked at the back and that fields were what I looked out onto. I was under the impression that the land directly behind was a farmer's field and that the reservoir would be there for ever and could not be moved. The price of my house incorporated these factors. Now I found that all this may be used for building. This will greatly affect the price of my house and surely devalue it. Have you looked at this area which is highly populated with very little greenery, walks and parks? This area is kept clean and litter free. The reservoir company look after it well, cutting grass and trying to blend into the back ground. I understand that there is a housing shortage, but why do you keep having to build new ones when there are so many run down and empty ones that are not being used, surely it would be easier and cheaper to fix these. I feel very let down and disheartened as the main reason why I this property is now under threat and will harm me financially.</p>
DOR03188	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposed release of Green Belt land for development in the Poulton Lancelyn area. I stand in absolute opposition to the idea that this land should be released, given the range of Brown Belt options that exist on the Wirral. As well as the significant changes to the local environment, from the animals, plants and insects to the school children and residents, it is extremely disappointing that there seems no clear reason for the release of this land to be considered before the Brown Belt land has been used. I spent my childhood and teenage years living in the area and, having moved away, I still return to Dibbinsdale and the fields near Claremont Farm. The regular sounds of the woodpecker and the sightings on birds including Bullfinches, Lapwings, Wagtails, Kestrels and Kingfishers are both valuable for the quality of life of nearby residents and for the birds themselves; of this list, all are named on the RSPB conservation lists and depend on the woodland. There can be no doubt but that nearby building and significant changes to the local area would prove disruptive for this habitat and the animals and birds that live within it. My own memories of Poulton Lancelyn school trips to the fields is supported by the groups we still see in uniform visiting to learn about the environment and ecosystems. My elderly parents remain in the home in which I grew up and their social activity and physical exercise depend on their proximity to this accessible protected land. The enormous numbers of dog owners and walkers, families, couples and groups who walk into these fields every week proves the benefit of this land to the quality of life in the area. The recent listing of Bebington as a desirable place to live rests in no small part on the accessibility of this land. I am further concerned about the environmental impact of the increased traffic that would result from building in this area: not only is the route from the M53 to the Green Belt already frequently congested and a cite known as an accident black-spot, but the many primary and secondary schools nearby mean that these children would be placed in danger from both increased pollution and increased risk of traffic accidents.</p> <p>The building plans suggests that placement would create risk of sewage flooding for the lower areas of Dibbinsdale, significant risk to the areas of heritage that are contained within the fields (Brunanburh Battle and the suspected Roman Farm to name two) and increased demand on the already-oversubscribed primary schools in the area. I understand that, as well as local residents, the owners of Claremont Farm are opposed to the release of land.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03189	<p>We are writing to object to the proposed building on the green belt, currently being put forward by Wirral Council. Our objections are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. that the amount of homes proposed seems to be based on some very odd statistical formulae. We understand the population is decreasing so the demand for so many new homes seems unwarranted. 2. that the settlements agreed by the Council some years ago also seem based on spurious evidence. As residents of Irby for 40 years, under no circumstances do we feel affinity to Pensby or Thingwall as part of our so-called settlement. Buildings joining the three villages will totally destroy the character of each one. This also appears to be the case in other parts of Wirral such as Barnston, Storeton and Eastham. 3. that the fields around Irby are currently used for crops and for grazing cattle and horses. They are also used by many walkers in groups and individually on the footpaths that link around Harrock Wood to and from Irby village. These are a wonderful resource in which to exercise and to enjoy the fresh air which is beneficial for both mental and physical health.
DOR03190	If the new health centre is never going to be built, why don't they put it in the now redundant fire station?
DOR03191	I would like to formally object to the proposal to building on the car park in Bromborough village. This will have a devastating effect on the businesses throughout the village and will put tremendous pressure on schools, doctors, dentist in our area who are struggling to cope now.
DOR03192	<p>Please do not build on the Greenbelt use the brownfield sites first. The greenbelt should be protected at all costs or Wirral will become one large conurbation with no open spaces and green fields. We are lucky to live here as it is but building on the greenbelt will be to the detriment of the Wirral. We do not want to become one large City. Where is the infrastructure. We already have to wait for up to a month for a doctor's appointment, the schools will not cope and the traffic will be increased upon the roads especially Irby Road. If the brown field sites need cleaning up get the builders to do it they make enough money as it is from the sale of houses. You are going to ruin the Wirral.</p>
DOR03193	<p>I am writing to make comment on the proposal to build 4 house on the car park at Broadway/Kingsway in Bebington. As a local business owner we rely upon the excellent facility provided by the council giving our customers and staff the benefit of a free car park. I have long argued that clearer, more noticeable signage would encourage even more usage. It is well used by staff in all of the businesses on Broadway, the business owners, the residents of the flats above the businesses and the customers for each business. It is a great selling point that encourages people to use our services because they know that the roads around the roundabout are limited to 30 minutes.</p> <p>Residents around the area already have a history of complaining about finding people parking outside their houses because they don't realise there is a free car park easily accessible. The problem for the residents would be made very much worse should there be building on this site. There are many school children who walk home in the area as encouraged by the council. Extra parking on either side of already busy roads will make for dangerous conditions in crossing the roads. I can understand the need for extra housing but I implore the council not to use this valuable site and damage our businesses</p>
DOR03194	<p>I am writing to you to state my objections to the proposed car park and civic centre planned change of use for the following reasons.</p> <p>CIVIC CENTRE & LIBRARY - The civic centre and library are used on a daily basis by various community groups and private functions and is the focal point of the Bromborough village and its residents/community so to lose this facility would be a major blow to all who use it.</p> <p>CAR PARK - In Bromborough there are 71 local businesses/shops who rely on this free parking facility for their staff and customers and if taken away it would create a loss in customers and revenue resulting in closures of many of the businesses/shops and unemployment for local people. The loss of the car park would also create more parking problems around the local village road system due to people parking on them resulting in congestion and making it difficult passenger busses or large vehicles who frequently use these roads and increasing the possibility of accidents. I urge to reconsider or drop your planned proposals for Bromborough as if carried out would turn the village into a place full of vacant shops with a large unemployed population with no community facilities.</p>
DOR03195	I wish to record my disagreement to the proposed plans. I believe building in Grange Road will cause extreme congestion in and out of West Kirby. Building by the war memorial will ruin a beautiful walking area in West Kirby.
DOR03196	Before you and the rest of the council come up with ridiculous ideas like building on Bromborough village carpark, why not use the peel holdings site, 13,500 houses could be built on there, also Livingstone street where my mum used to live for 48 years that the council compulsory purchased over ten years ago, that land for 400 houses has been waiting for over ten years.
DOR03197	<p>I live in the Wirral and understand that there are plans for housing developments that will infringe onto the greenbelt including Claremont Farm. The amount of houses that are to be developed is ludicrous, such numbers are not required in the North West where population is less than in London and surrounding areas and especially when more suitable brownfield areas are available. Wirral is well known for its green spaces and when there are already areas marked for housing development - shouldn't this be used?! I write to ask that you make the right choice and do not build on Wirral's greenbelt.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03198	<p>I am one amongst thousands of Wirral residents who is very concerned with the plans that the Council have to allow building on green belt land.</p> <p>There are several points I wish to make:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. You have had a couple of years to make a decision on this point and get the information to government, but you have done nothing. 2. Peel Holdings submitted plans in April, I understand, to develop Wirral Waters which, with offices and other businesses, will provide hundreds of housing units, but they still await to hear from the planning department. This location provides potential for progressive ideas such as Zeeland Docks Amsterdam with modern infrastructure taking workers into Birkenhead and Liverpool without the requirement for more cars etc. 3. There is space for 18,000 houses on Brownfield sites on the Wirral, which is more than is required to meet the target, but obviously the developers don't want these areas as their profit margins would reduce. The Council needs to tell developers that if they want to build houses on the Wirral, then there will be restrictions - take it or leave it. 4. The areas you have suggested would only provide housing for the people who can afford these houses (i.e. already in work, well paid, middle-income or higher). Developers won't want to build cheap houses on this land as it wouldn't be to their advantage. 5. We need housing to be provided in areas of deprivation, in an attempt to bring these areas to a higher standard of living. If people have decent housing, they are more likely to look for suitable work and improve their standards of living. 6. Are Wirral Council challenging the government's targets? Does central government actually know what amount of housing is required in our particular area? 7. It is a known fact that the population of the Wirral is decreasing. An estate agent recently commented that most of the houses sold and purchased on the Wirral are by people already living here, either buying bigger houses to meet their family's needs, or down-sizing as their families leave home. You will end up with more housing stock than is required. 8. The Council should not allow the influence of large housing companies to put pressure on them; they are in it for profit; the Council is an elected body elected by the people, so should make decisions which are best for the area and the people of the area. 9. Further development of green belt land will add to congestion on already congested side roads, more children requiring schools which are over-subscribed already, and you can't get a GP appointment when you want it already without adding to the population even further, and the effect on A&E doesn't bear thinking about. 10. Further traffic will add to pollution and increase in accidents. 11. If you get rid of green belt land, not only will these areas be lost forever, but animals and insects, etc. will lose their habitat. Having these species on green belt land helps with the natural processes and green land assists with the chlorophyll process which in turn helps eliminate some of the pollution. Many children in built up cities already suffer with chest complaints purely due to pollution. Do we want this for our children, grandchildren and further children down the line? 12. Flooding is a large issue in this country because of general over-development. More concreted areas will only serve to increase flooding. Is the council prepared to cope with this? Is the council going to take measures to prevent flooding in the future? You only have to look at the Environment Agency's website to see how many areas on the Wirral are already a flood risk.
DOR03199	<p>I am writing to express my concern about further building development on the Wirral. The figure of 12000 new homes does not seem realistic, as my experience of being a landlord tells me that there is not a shortage of property on the Wirral. In my opinion there should be a full audit of empty properties, both currently residential and commercial. There are so many empty properties in several areas; Birkenhead, Seacombe. In my opinion New Ferry should be redeveloped as a housing area. In addition the promised development at Wirral Waters should be progressed as soon as possible. I am afraid that the Council will take the option of allowing private developers to take the most profitable route of building executive homes on green belt rather than entering partnership schemes to refurbish/ rebuild/redevelop on presently unloved brownfield sites. I would urge the Council to conduct its affairs openly and transparently, as local public trust in its ability to come to a fair and honest conclusion is low.</p>
DOR03200	<p>I am writing to vehemently oppose the development and building plans being suggested in Bebington, Wirral. In particular at Claremont Farm. This is part of our valuable green belt that is under threat and disappearing before our eyes for political reasons - not for the benefit of social housing! It is a well-known fact that the government's targets for housing are vastly exaggerated. You, the Council are not being "forced" by the government to act on these targets. You are making a choice to act on them for political gain. There is space on brown field sites to accommodate around 18,000 homes in Wirral alone (not to mention around 3,000 empty properties in Wirral). This is enough space to meet and exceed the Government's 15 year housing target so this is the confirmation that Green Belt areas need not be touched, and nor should they!</p> <p>Please refrain from building on our precious, Green Belt land.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03201	<p>I am appalled and horrified at your continuing nibbling away at green belt land on Wirral. There is all the housing that is springing up on patches of green all over Wirral. The housing on the green land on the road that cuts from Moreton to Upton on both sides of road. The fire station at Saughall Massie . To name but two. And now Claremont Farm</p> <p>I realise that councils are very strapped for cash and building on fields cuts the cost of having to clear the many acres of unsightly brownfield sites that are all over Wirral, and couple this with your lack of interest in the environment and conservation and what the people of Wirral actually want it's easy to see how these short sighted don't give a damn schemes develop. I don't live in Bebington by the way I live in Hoylake. I do frequently visit Claremont Farm not only for the excellent food sold in its shops and the cafe but to support the ethos of this enterprise. My grandson who is six recently benefited from a farm visit recently and came home full of tales of Farmer Andrew. I cannot think of anywhere locally that does as much indeed anything to draw school children in to the keeping of farm animals and the growing of crops in a farm environment. What we now have is government in spite of the people not for the people because clearly you don't give a damn about Wirral and it's heritage and don't hide behind the governments instructions on building housing and local plans. You can build on brownfield sites, but then that would require effort from you and erosion of the great god profit for the builders. If the government had managed the immigration policy we would not now be in the situation of requiring all this building and seeing the huge pressure on local services but it doesn't spoil the environment in their ivory towers it is communities like Wirral that are paying the price. I have seen green fields all over Wirral disappear since I was a girl it's becoming a sprawling conurbation and you our elected representatives are not following the will of the people and defending Wirral. Shame, shame on you !</p>
DOR03202	<p>I have been a resident of Bromborough for 52 years. During that time I have witnessed a vast expansion of housing which has the obvious consequences of traffic and pressure on local services. Now, there are to be another 200 houses built on the acre lane site plus 4/6 houses built on allport road to replace a perfect bungalow which was demolished! Recently, houses have been built on mark rake near the church and a public house, The Archers, was demolished to accommodate new flats. Also, the builders yard in bridle road has had an estate built on that and slightly further afield in Eastham the rugby club is having part of their land used for housing. What do all these houses come with? At least one car . Where do they park to use local services? In the car park. Now, it has been brought to my notice that the labour council wants to dig up the car park and build what? Yes more houses with what? Yes, more cars. Is it logical to remove a car park which is already widely used for local services? If it was hardly used I could possibly see the sense but this car park is very busy and also essential to local businesses . I would expect more from a labour council as they are supposed to help the working man not put obstacles in their way. Bromborough residents voted labour with good faith so hopefully the council will act on their behalf not against them.</p>
DOR03203	<p>I object to the proposed change of use on this land. I am a resident of Bromborough although my vote comes under the Eastham Ward. Both the library, civil centre and car park are used on a daily use by all of Bromborough, Eastham and wide communities of Wirral. The car park is full on a daily basis with people visiting the local amenities. Bromborough is a thriving village and requires the amenities it has. I believe that a charter was granted back in 1278 for a market to be held every Monday by Edward 1. Obviously, over the centuries Bromborough has changed for the better and since the late 1930s Bromborough has expanded to what we now know to be Bromborough Village and is used constantly and has a lot of businesses there. The amount of people who visit either by car or foot is impression and is a great reflection on what Bromborough has to offer. By taking the car park, civic centre and library away from the local residents, this will cause detrimental issues to the wider community and the various groups that use these amenities daily. I do believe that the original owner of this land, Charles Frances Kynaston Wainwaring wanted the residents of Bromborough to be able to use this land as a community. Thereby, you are going against his wishes on the covenant that was given with this land. This was mentioned at the local meeting that was held on Friday 14th September at Bromborough Civil Centre by a member of the public and therefore, this should be taken into account.</p>
DOR03204	<p>I write with very grave concerns regarding the development and building on Wirral's greenbelt Land. The main purpose of the Greenbelt Policy is to protect designated land around large urban centres from urban sprawl as well maintaining the areas of forestry and agriculture, also providing a habitat for wildlife. It stops increased car use, also stops the neglect of brown land sights and dilapidated buildings. Greenbelt also includes significant local biodiversity - the variety of plants and animal life which is considered to be of great importance. It also protects heritage sites. Its trees, plants and open spaces soak up our carbon emissions as well as providing recreational space. Without greenbelt land our villages and towns would merge thus losing all identity. Two thirds of our greenbelt is agricultural land and is being depleted at an alarming rate. We are losing almost 7 dairy farms per week in England and Wales. This must stop. We only produce two thirds of our food in the UK and with leaving the EU we should be more efficient. Green House Farm, Greasby. The current tenants are its second generation tenants. The Farm has been passed on to them from their parents who originally took the farm on in 1961. They have overcome many difficulties - foot and mouth in 2001 and the main barn burnt to the ground shortly afterwards. They have seen a fall in the price of both beef and milk. Battery hens were replaced with free range Hens. Recent updates to the farm include a new purpose barn providing housing for cows in the winter. It incorporates a modern computerised milk parlour, in addition to housing for many other things appertaining to the Farm. They have built up their herd of cows and this has taken many years. They are producing top quality milk and in the last year is selling his raw milk directly to the public.</p> <p>Their free range eggs are sold all over the Wirral. They have risen to every challenge; even now are giving work experience to the next generation of Farmers and Vets. A lot of loyal staff are employed on the farm with a wealth of experience. The wildlife on the farm is rich and varied. It has no voice but ours. There are Owls (Barn, little and Tawny). Common and Harvest Mice and Shrews. There is also an abundance of Sparrows, Robins, Wrens, Tits, great flocks of Starlings, Chaffinch, Greenfinch, Rooks, Crows, Magpies, Cuckoos, Pheasants, and Herons. Berwick's swans and little egret seem to use the land as a resting place. There are birds of prey including kestrels, Sparrow hawks. Swallows and House Martins come in their droves every spring from wintering in South Africa to their nests on the farm to breed and feed. Other wildlife present on the farm includes Frogs, Toads, Newts and Foxes. At dusk there is an abundance of Bats. By tenancy and contractually, they should be passing Green House Farm on to their sons. Tennant Farmers can pass on farms to a third generation. The family are a very necessary and respected part of our Greasby community all this will be flattened and built on. They deserve better. We cannot let this happen. We have heard enough statistics to know there is enough brown belt land and empty</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	property to meet with the Government's requirement of houses to be built. I have been online under the Freedom of Information Act to find out about the Government asking the Leverhulme estates to release Green Belt Land. It Says 'Government Leverhulme Missing'. In the Greasby area alone, 534 new homes are proposed at Greasby Copse and a further 147 proposed between Mill Lane and Hillbark. A total of 681 houses are proposed. We do not have the infrastructure, schools or healthcare facilities to support this number of housing. What we have already is inadequate. Much has been made of the new Signs into Greasby "Gravesberie, Greasby One of the Earliest Settlements in Britain 8500BC" Rich in Heritage and Artefacts.
DOR03204	One that is proposed to be built on, even ring fencing the Copse trees will do nothing to save this precious site. A person who spoke at the meeting at the Greasby Community Centre on 1st September works with people who are homeless and have poor housing in Birkenhead, they said the type of houses they are proposing to build on greenbelt will be far too expensive for the people who need them. The Council needs to build affordable homes in Birkenhead and improve the area and facilities. These will be executive homes on prime land, commanding a high price. Of course developers will be queuing up to get in on the act. At that meeting all 4 Political Parties, Labour Conservative, Liberal Democrats, and Green Party. We're of one voice. Also everyone at the meeting on a show of hands said a resounding NO to any use of Green Belt Land on the Wirral. Please be a responsible Council and think again, you are elected servants of people who put their trust in you to do the right thing these are People's Lives you are dealing with you are causing a lot of misery and anxiety. What you are proposing will rip the heart out of the Wirral. It is very clearly driven by money.
DOR03205	I totally understand the need for development & new housing however I believe that any plans that would jeopardise either the car park behind the allport shops or the village hall in Bromborough could result in a decline in the village usage that would never be able to recover. Speaking for myself it is unlikely I would continue to use the village shops if I could not easily park close to them. I am lucky enough to be able to drive elsewhere if needed but obviously not everyone can or wants to. I have no issues with the housing proposal on acre lane, in fact I agree with this development, but would respectfully suggest that if you are looking for a larger population & a thriving village community the idea of building more homes then risking the village itself & it's facilities to support the community seems wrong. There are few things sadder than a deserted high street and the loss of businesses on them.
DOR03206	<p>I want to say that I am opposed to the development of the Green Belt in Wirral but I understand after listening to the presentation that some development is going to be inevitable. Some sites however may be more suitable than others. The site I mentioned on Tuesday morning is the parcel of land SP059B, SP059C, SP059D on Thurstaston Road, Irby. The reasons I am against the development of this particular site are given below.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The building of family housing would further increase pressure on local schools. Namely Dawpool Primary and Irby Primary both of which are full beyond their capacity and oversubscribed. This in turn means that parents have to transport their young children to schools further away thus increasing road traffic. 2. There is already traffic congestion and an appalling parking situation around the School Lane/ Thurstaston Road junction and it is creeping up to the Sandy Lane/ Thurstaston Road junction as well. Please see attached images taken around 15.30 Wednesday 19th September. Daisy and Jake Nursery have only a few places for parking so parents park across the pavement causing obstruction. Dawpool Primary has no parking at all except on School Lane where walkers and the general public also park. Benty Farm Tea Room has no on-site parking and is only accessible on foot, visitors leave their car on School Lane. Building a housing estate on Thurstaston Road will increase this congestion. 3. There is a lack of public transport on this side of Irby. Only 2 buses a day to West Kirby and 4 to Heswall. Otherwise it is a walk to the village or again, the car. 4. Shopping in the village is very poor. A car journey. 5. The G.P. Surgery is now at Thingwall. A car journey. 6. At busy times of day Hillside Road and Sandy Lane becomes a rat run for cars trying to avoid congestion in Irby Village. <p>There would be little access to local services for residents other than by car. There have been some planning permissions already granted regarding Thurstaston Road: APP/14/00504; APP/16/00385; APP/17/00235. The latest being LDC/17/01249 which was withdrawn by the applicant North Point One, a local property development company. Despite permission being granted to replace the bungalow with a 4 bedroom detached house no work has been done. Permission has also been granted for a vehicular pavement crossing at the site giving access to the Green Belt land. Again no work has been done. However a landowner at Thurstaston Road as installed new hedging and fencing which would make it easier to straighten the bend in the road. Access to his property has also been widened. Why do I get the impression that development on this land is already a done deal at least verbally! I have two questions:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. What are the "special circumstances" that would allow this parcel of Green Belt land to be developed? 2. What further investigations does the Council intend to carry out to determine its suitability for development?
DOR03207	The Wirral is a small peninsula that does not have that much green belt as it is, so we do not need more houses built on it, plus it will make the very small country lanes even more dangerous to drive on as some people drive way in excess of the speed limits anyway!! Why cannot houses be built on brown land which we seem to have plenty of, plus lots of wasteland and derelict buildings and also on Wirral Waters which was planned for more than they are now saying! If you're on the A554 coming towards New Brighton all you can see in the distance is houses, Wallasey is full as it is, they have even put in traffic lights at the A554 roundabout by B & Q to try and ease congestion. In recent years the Wirral has got busier and busier so I presume it is because more people live here now, so it has meant more traffic on our roads which causes queues which you see a lot of now, and not just at peak times, so people are taking short cuts through side roads just to get to where they want to go! My husband has to travel on the M53 daily and he calls it "Helter Skelter" I call it "Wacky Races" this motorway is now a nightmare just like the others in the UK and not just at peak times it is daily now and this is because if there are more houses built then there are more people and then more of everything is required, and the UK is only a small island and it is at breaking point! But we are told we need more houses in the UK and we are only a small Island and the Wirral is only a small Peninsula where will it all end I dread to think? Save our Green

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	Belt as it is the only place left of beauty on the Wirral for us and people to visit we should preserve it for the future!
DOR03208	<p>Firstly, the letter is addressed to the Occupier when you have all of our details through the electoral register at your disposal. Secondly, there is no mention of the date of any public meeting or date to discuss this proposal so please furnish me with these details. When we bought our property, we did so due to the fact that we were not overlooked at the front and by looking at the very poor details and plans, it appears that we will be if this development goes ahead. This is something that I am very unhappy about and certainly object to. Furthermore, I am assuming that the proposed properties will consist of affordable housing and this will certainly have an impact on the value of our property. Again, I object to this proposal and how it will have a detrimental effect on the value of properties within the local area. Please clarify the type and tenure of those properties that are proposed to be built. We have been complaining to the Local Authority regarding the volume of traffic and speed along Mount Road as this has got progressively worse over the last few years. I have recently met with [a Council Officer] regarding this matter amongst others. Should there be an increase of properties near to our property then the volume of cars using Mount Road would automatically also increase and I certainly object to this proposal due to the consequences. This matter needs to be re-considered as Mount Road is such a dangerous place due to the speed and number of cars that this would become a fatal accident waiting to happen if there are additional properties built. As I work in the Housing Industry, I am aware of the type of tenants/residents that may be attracted as the houses may be under 'affordable housing' bracket. I do not want my property de-valued due to the typical behaviour and stigma attached to affordable housing. Therefore, I strongly object to the proposed development.</p>
DOR03209	<p>I'm a resident of Poulton Green Close, off Poulton Royd Drive and I, together with local residents from both sides of Poulton Road, have grave concerns regarding the land belonging to the Lancelyn-Green family at Claremont Farm bordering Colmore Avenue, Poulton Royd Drive and Poulton Green Close. It's fair to say that the local residents I have spoken to regarding this matter are deeply concerned, alarmed and distressed about this. Residents living close by, but not adjacent to, the land in question are also deeply concerned about the increased pressures on already stretched local services, not to mention the increase in traffic, noise and pollution it would bring to the neighbourhood. Local traffic levels at peak rush hour time are already totally unacceptable causing delays in travel times to and from local roads and homes, high pollution levels, noise, danger to local pedestrians and cyclists with vehicles speeding through our neighbourhood to the M53 at Clatterbridge roundabout, Bromborough retail and business park, Birkenhead via Bebington village and even down Poulton Road itself to Dibbinsdale Road and Allport Road. There are a high number of children attending local schools on foot and a high number of elderly and retired people locally who already have trouble with traffic in the local area and could really do without the added pressure from higher levels of polluting traffic speeding through their neighbourhood.</p>
DOR03210	<p>I would like to express my concerns for the growth of housing numbers, the sites proposed to build on and speed at which you aim to achieve them. I agree with you 100% that we must create our own local plan and I agree 100% that you are correct to challenge the number of housing needing to be built as one rule does not fit all. We do not need 12,000 new homes by 2035. In light of this we must create a local plan and we must not agree to build on green belt land. This is not necessary and damaging to our borough. There are many sites available in Wirral that are not green belt land and there are many houses left empty in need of renovation. You speak about "protecting our local character of Wirral" and "local plan should be underpinned by and entirely based on the needs and aspirations of local people". I cannot think of any green belt land that any Wirral resident would agree to build on. I cannot think of any Wirral resident who would want more houses that are actually needed. I cannot think of any Wirral resident who would jeopardise their own house value for the sake of an increase in housing. I have heard many rumours which suggest that your desire to protect our borough is not genuine and that you are planning to build in the wrong places at a vast rate causing many issues for us the residents of Wirral. For this reason I ask you the below frank questions :-</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Can I have your commitment not to build on green belt land? • Can I have your commitment that you will refurbish houses currently left empty? • Can I have your honesty that you have in fact already maximised ALL non green belt land for building first and that you have not made any plans to build on any green belt land. • Can you confirm that you are a full time resident of Wirral? • Can you confirm that you will not build on any Green belt land without our consent? • Can you confirm that all non-green belt plans for building will still be taken for consultation with local residents of those areas? <p>I feel that I have made my thoughts clear and would ask that you respond in writing but I am also happy to speak over the phone or meet face to face if this would help.</p>
DOR03211	[SAME AS DOR03204]
DOR03212	<p>That Peel Group is not intending to fulfil the promise they made to build more than 13,000 houses at Wirral Waters, undertaking now to build only 2400 over 15 years. I hope the council will be asking why - and is there no penalty clause they could be made to pay? Presumably they signed some agreement with you? I also read the report of the protest against loss of greenbelt in yesterday's paper and am quoting this from memory. The government is obliging the council to build some 12,000 houses on the Wirral. Yet there are already 6000 empty properties here. Why are you not having these properties made habitable, if refurbishment is what is needed? To bring down the number required by a half seems like a good idea to me, people can be housed more quickly and there is instantly less pressure on the green belt. I can never understand why houses are left empty. I asked why was that small terrace by the library demolished. True it was only a few houses, but better than nothing, there is obviously something I am missing here.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
DOR03213	<p>The site is more appropriate for development than initially identified within the SHLAA. The site contains no policy constraints besides the Green Belt allocation preventing its future development. The site doesn't contribute significantly to any of the 5 purposes of the Green Belt as outlined in the NPPF and Local Plan. The proposed site would create piecemeal and more appropriate development proposal for Irby rather than simply releasing a large site to release. Therefore we conclude that the proposed site should be included and assessed as part of any further Green Belt assessment across the Wirral. Based upon the supporting information we believe that the proposed site at Sandy Lane does not significantly support the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and its release from the Green Belt would be considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF to bolster housing requirements across the Borough. [Report and appendices attached]</p>
DOR03214	<p>The site is allocated by the Wirral UDP (2000) as Green Belt Land, but is unconstrained by any other policy. Wirral Council are currently preparing a new Local Plan and this document is prepared to support the release of the site from the Green Belt. The Council do not currently have the ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and are yet to agree on an accepted housing need for the plan period. However without any economic growth scenarios, it is expected to be a minimum 12,045 new dwellings, which is the equivalent of 803 dwellings per annum. A shortage of developable land has been identified, and the Council is considering a number of options for increasing the housing land supply including releasing surplus employment land and increasing the density of development (amongst others). The site was not submitted to or identified within the SHLAA (2016), however it is adjacent to two other SHLAA sites, SHLAA1948 and SHLAA0648. These sites have been identified as category 3 sites under the SHLAA, and as such have been considered for development within 11-15 years. Sites in the area score highly in most categories, although moderately so in terms of accessibility, and clearly wider public transport improvements can be delivered as part of wider allocations in the area and due to the sites' Green Belt designation. The site has limited planning history, although consents have been provided for the erection of a 21.5 metre high telecommunications tower (albeit temporary and now understood to be removed) in 2004 and again in 2007, as well as a consent by Port Dredging Ltd in order to operate the site as landfill. The latter application has already provided consent in principle for an adequate and safe access to the site from Raby Hall Road for the large number of vehicle movements for this use.</p> <p>Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas</p> <p>It is considered that the site when assessed alongside other adjacent sites performs a limited contribution towards this purpose as the site is contained by the M53. Despite this, the site is not mentioned within the Green Belt Assessment as being an area which performs well against this purpose and as such is identified for release.</p> <p>Purpose 2: To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>The Site does not and cannot extend beyond the M53 to the west, and as such is well contained (evident in the Green Belt Review with the SP046 having an urban enclosure score of 44%). The site is not located in an area where merging of settlements would be a key issue. It is considered that the Site performs no contribution towards the purpose.</p> <p>Purpose 3: To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>The M53 has already encroached on the countryside in this location, although the Council are of the opinion that the site does contribute to the purposes of safeguarding the countryside from encroachment albeit to a lesser extent than other Green Belt sites which have been proposed for further investigation. The previously developed nature of the site also performs in the sites favour in that it is not a 'countryside use'.</p> <p>Purpose 4: To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>The site is not considered to perform well in preserving the historic character of towns due to its location. This has been confirmed as the Councils opinion.</p> <p>Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict land and other urban land</p> <p>The site however is one which has been previously developed given it has been subject to landfill, and as such serves no benefits against this criteria.</p> <p>Whilst there are additional previously developed sites throughout Wirral which present some development potential, these are not expected to amount to a scale which would allow development solely on Brownfield Land.</p> <p>to the functions of the Green Belt and when fully appraised should be considered 'weak' in terms of its Green Belt function. The summary table is set out below. The emerging Local Plan recognises that the Wirral must provide new homes both to meet the needs of its population and to underpin economic growth. Wirral Council state that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through a review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>Vision Document sets out how the land at Raby Hall Drive, Raby Mere can provide a high quality sustainable residential development. It will provide attractive and well-built family homes as</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The release of the site from the Green Belt is wholly justified and necessary. It represents a logical location for release, as evidenced by Wirral's Green Belt review, which will have relatively limited harm to the general extent of the Green Belt. The land parcels which front Raby Hall Road are well contained by the M53, Bromborough Golf Club and Raby Mere woodland, presenting an opportunity to enhance the existing community at Raby Mere and would not set precedent for future sprawl in this location. It is considered by us that the site makes a limited contribution part of a sustainable environment. It will help Wirral to meet its housing needs on a previously developed site.</p> <p>The Site can be brought forward using a comprehensive master planning process, with significant involvement from both Wirral Council and national housebuilders who have shown strong interest in developing this site.</p> <p>This Vision Document provides the evidence to demonstrate that the Site at Raby Mere represents a logical and sustainable development opportunity.</p> <p>Operations and Considerations</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The Site is not subject to any restrictive environmental designations. There are no constraints which present an obstacle to development. Instead, the Site has substantial opportunities to create an exemplar residential development. Strong place-making and high quality landscape features can be provided, which will ensure that the Site is an attractive and tranquil residential neighbourhood with a distinct and long-lasting environmental character.</p>
DOR03215	<p>We have significant concerns in relation to the Council's overall approach to the preparation of the Local Plan; including the failure of the Council to publish a Local Plan for consultation. The Council, to date, has published a number of evidence base documents in relative isolation. Those documents have sought to understand the level of development needed within the borough, including Strategic Housing Market Assessments 2016 and later followed by the Liverpool City Region's Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment 2017. The Council has sought to understand the supply of housing land within the borough through the publication of the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment (SHLAA) in 2016 and an Updated SHLAA Methodology in September 2017. As noted within our Client's representations at the time, each of the above evidence based documents made evidently clear that the Council's housing needs far exceeded the housing land supply that could be achieved on non-Green Belt land, such that a review of the Green Belt would be necessary as part of the Local Plan. The Council subsequently published an Initial Green Belt Review Proposed Methodology for consultation in October 2017.</p> <p>Our Client's response to those consultations stressed the importance of the Council publishing a draft Local Plan which sought to address how the Council balanced the housing needs of the borough against the supply of housing land and, if necessary, determining the extent to which exceptional circumstances exist to justify a review of the Green Belt. In the event that a review of the Green Belt was required, which the evidence base very clearly pointed towards being the case, the Local Plan should propose land to be released from the Green Belt for housing.</p> <p>As set out in case law, which our previous representations detailed in full, to robustly review the Green Belt in a manner that is considered a sound approach, the Council must do so as part of a comprehensive balancing exercise weighing the development needs of the borough against any harm that might be caused to the purpose and function of the Green Belt. Such a sound and robust approach can only be achieved as part of the proves of adopting a Local Plan; indeed, the NPPF requires that Green Belt Reviews are only undertaken as part of a Local Plan Review.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Council has to date, failed to provide any such assessment and, notwithstanding our Client's representations to the Initial Green Belt Review Methodology, the Council has still not published a detailed Green Belt Assessment; but rather made further adjustments to its methodology and provided only a high level initial review; our Client provides comments on that high level review later in these representations. Our Client urges the Council to proceed with producing its Local Plan which addressed the development needs of the borough and identifies a supply of housing land required to deliver those needs as matter of urgency; including a review of the Green Belt. At the time of writing, the Council's website lists the updated Broad Spatial Options Revised Assessment Report document as a background document to the Development Options Review but does not publish it. We understand from the Council that the document has not yet been approved for consultation. There is therefore no indication as to the level growth that each settlement will accommodate over the plan period. In the first instance, we stress that the Council should progress with a draft Local Plan rather than consulting on the individual elements of the emerging evidence base in isolation. It is not considered necessary to consult on the Broad Spatial Options Assessment in advance of a draft Local Plan; the evidence base for the Local Plan should be published with the Local Plan.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the above, the Council has sought consultation responses to the potential Green Belt Sites for Further Investigation now. However, it has done so without having published an updated 'Broad Spatial Options' document and without a completed Green Belt Assessment. Whilst the opportunity to input into the plan making process is welcomed, it is incumbent on the Council to provide the evidence base for the consultees and stakeholders to comment on. It is insufficient for the Council to seek comment on the potential of Green Belt Sites to come forwards without setting out the Council's overarching evidence for the distribution of development. It is not the role of the local community to provide the Council with that evidence or assess the acceptability of all of the potential development Sites within the borough. Further to the above, our Client notes that further background documents relating to the Development Options Review have been listed on the Council's website including the Development Viability Baseline Report April 2018 and the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment April 2018; neither document has been made available for review. If both of the above documents are considered to have informed the Development Options Review process, which should be the case, then both should be made available for review in seeking comments on their outcomes.</p> <p>Housing Need and Green Belt Release - The Council's Report to Cabinet dated 23 July 2018 - Table 3 of the Cabinet Report notes that, taking into account the required backlog and buffer calculations the Standardised OAN methodology leads to a requirement of 13,369 dwellings over the 15 years from 2018-2033. The proposed requirement is set against an identified supply of 7,635 available without Green Belt Sites being released.</p> <p>"The above is considered to result in a shortfall of 5,894 dwellings, or 4,794 if delivery of some 1,100 homes from Wirral Waters comes forward during the plan period. The Cabinet report makes clear that there is no realistic alternative to meeting that shortfall on Green Belt land within Wirral. The Council should proceed with preparing its Local Plan on that basis. We note that since the publication of the above Cabinet Report, and the Development Options Review, the Office of National Statistics has published 2016 based Population Projections. Those population projections reduce significantly the estimated population growth at Wirral compared to previous population projections. On the basis of the revised population projections the OAN in Wirral using the Standardised Methodology would drop to 488dpa; this equates to a 15 year requirement of some 7,320 dwellings. Our Client's urge the Council to treat the above reduced housing needs figure with exceptional caution. In the first instance, on a national level, the revised population projections reduce the level of projected population growth significantly; applying the Standardised OAN Methodology nationally results in a similarly drastic reduction in the OAN across the Country. Application of the Standardised Methodology against these revised projections would result in the Government delivering significantly less housing nationally than it pledged in its manifesto. It is important to note that the Standardised Methodology was devised as a means for the government to meet its proposed target for housing growth (and solve the housing crisis) nationally whilst also simplifying the plan making process. We consider that it is incumbent on the Government to now re-</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>visit its Standardised Methodology in light of the above population projections to ensure that OAN across the country is revised upwards to meet their manifesto pledge and tackle the housing crises.</p> <p>More importantly for Wirral specifically is what a significant reduction in the housing requirement for the borough would mean. Even were the revised Standardised Methodology derived figure of 488dpa be taken as the OAN for the borough, this does not account for the economic aspirations of the borough or the wider Liverpool City Region. We note that 'OAN' is a 'policy-off' figure which is distinct from a 'housing requirement', a 'policy-on' figure which can be set out within a Local Plan to meet the overall development requirements of the borough. As set out clearly within the above Cabinet Report, the Council sought to rely on the previous Standardised OAN figure of 803dpa because it aligns with the housing need figure derived from the Liverpool City Region SHELMA which factors in the Economic Growth Scenario; i.e. the figure of 803dpa is considered by the Council to be sufficient to meet its economic growth aspirations and to play its role in the economic growth of the wider City region.</p> <p>Clearly, a move towards a lower figure of 488dpa (significantly outside the SHELMA range) will not achieve the level of development required to meet the SHELMA derived growth scenario. The Council should avoid basing its housing requirement on an OAN figure that would prevent it meeting the economic aspirations of the borough. "</p> <p>"Moreover, as expanded upon later in these representations, the borough has other socially driven policy objectives beyond the wider economic aspirations of the borough. Wirral has areas of deprivation and exclusion within the borough that should be addressed within the plan that require investment which can only be driven through development. In line with national planning policy, there is a need to boost significantly the supply of housing in the area, increasing housing choice across the borough and a chance to draw in outside investment, including in those areas of greatest need, through delivering housing development.</p> <p>We consider that the Council should proceed with its Local Plan on the basis set out within the Report to Cabinet dated 23 July 2018 to deliver the boost in housing delivery that the borough is in need of.</p> <p>Initial Review of the Green Belt - Revised Methodology</p> <p>As above, the Council have sought to consult on a Revised Methodology for the Initial Green Belt Review (GBR) as part of the Development Options Review. In the first instance, it is not clear what changes have been made to the GBR Revised Methodology since the 2017 GBR was published.</p> <p>Paragraph 1.4 of the Revised Methodology for the GBR states that information on the comments received in relation to the previous GBR, and the 'actions taken in response' is available in a separate report for consultation. We have been unable to locate any such consultation report. Regardless of such a report being available, it is considered appropriate that, in publishing a revised methodology for consultation, the Council should make clear the reasons for undertaking such a revision and the main changes that have been made. "</p> <p>"Indeed, paragraph 1.2 of the Background Report for the GBR states that the Initial GBR has been prepared in line with the methodology published in October to December 2017. Paragraph 2.5 notes that the requirement for land to be identified for development within the Green Belt is dependent on the results of the most up-to-date assessment of the borough's housing land supply (SHLAA) which is due to be released in September 2018. As above, at the time of writing, no such assessment has been published. Clearly, it is not helpful for the Council to provide a document for consultation which is predicated by information which is not available. Our previous representations welcomed the preparation of a high-level Green Belt methodology document for public consultation. However, it is disappointing to find that some 12 months after consulting on that methodology that the Council has not produced a detailed Green Belt Assessment capable of informing a detailed Green Belt Review; indeed, we consider it is vital that the Council produces a detailed Green Belt Review to inform the Local Plan as a matter of urgency.</p> <p>Background Report - Preface/Introduction/Background</p> <p>Paragraph 1.10 of the GBR noted the limitations of the GBR and states that the high level screening of potential impacts and constraints that has been undertaken will need to be supplemented with additional information on the precise impacts of and constraints. That information is proposed to be gathered from engagement with stakeholders in response to the background report. As set out later in these representations, these representations are accompanied by an updated Development Framework Document (DFD) and updated illustrative development masterplan (and accompanying visualisations) which demonstrate how our Client's Site can be delivered. We support the Council's approach in this regard and provide a response to paragraph 1.14 of the GBR which states that the public and other stakeholders are now therefore being asked to: "</p> <p>"• provide their views on the initial findings set out in this report and the accompanying "Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment";</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirm and refine the factual information about the assessment of each individual parcel and site, in terms of their performance against the purposes of including land in the Green Belt; and • identify any additional issues that may need to be considered, if development was to be permitted on any of the sites identified. <p>Paragraph 1.16 goes on to ask landowners and developers to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • confirm the baseline data for each site; • confirm whether the sites are viable and can be delivered within the plan period to 2035 and if so, when; provide any additional information that would help the assessment of the relative performance of sites, particularly in terms of the need for any additional supporting infrastructure and their potential contribution to a sustainable pattern of development; • identify the nature of any additional benefits that could be secured for the local community; and • indicate how any constraints identified could be addressed. <p>Initial Assessment of Green Belt Purposes - Purpose 1 – To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The GBR measures the level of enclosure of each Green Belt Parcel and Green Belt SHLAA Sites by measuring the percentage of the boundary that is directly adjacent to the existing urban area. The existing urban area is defined as the boundary around each of the urban Settlement Areas. Parcel SP049 is identified as having an enclosure of 41%. As set out previously within our representations previously, an assessment based on a mathematical calculation alone is too simplistic and the output is unlikely to be meaningful. We consider that a planning judgement is, therefore, required that not only considers the relationship with the existing urban area but also the strength of these boundaries and how these features contributes to a sites' level of containment; and thus, the extent to which urban sprawl is resisted. Our Client's land at New Chester Road, Site 891, forms part of Green Belt Parcel SP049 and is contained on its eastern boundary by New Chester Road, to its north by the existing urban edge, to the west by an area of woodland and to the south by a mixed use development. These are clearly strong and durable boundary features in line with the thrust of the Initial Green Belt Review document.</p> <p>The wider parcel, SP049 is bound across its entire northern edge by urban development and its southern edge by the M53 Motorway. In reality, the extension of this urban edge of Eastham is a logical extension to within the Green Belt and, cannot realistically add to any ongoing urban sprawl by virtue of the M53. The assessment disregards these features would prejudice Green Belt Parcels and SHLAA Sites on the edge of existing settlement and is not a robust basis for testing sites against Purpose One of the Green Belt. "</p> <p>"The above deficiencies in the assessment methodology are highlighted by the fact that Appendix 3 of the GBR (Initial Background Data) lists Site SP049 as not contributing to the prevention of urban sprawl on the basis that development will be contained by the M53 Motorway.</p> <p>As above, we refer the Council to our Client's Green Belt Assessment undertaken within the previously submitted DFD.</p> <p>Purpose 2 – To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>The Council proposes to measure the impact on separation distances between settlement areas on the basis of the likely potential impact on the existing linear distance between adjoining urban Settlement Areas.</p> <p>Our Client made several observations in relation to the GBR Methodology in previous representations including the lack of guidance as to how Green Belt Parcels and SHLAA Sites would be classified when separation distances are reduced; i.e. where the GBR does not conclude 'no impact'. There is also no indication how this would be considered in terms of the level of impact on this purpose of including land in the Green Belt.</p> <p>Site SP049 has been identified within the 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' as part of the wider north-south separation between Settlement Area 4 – Bromborough and Eastham and Ellesmere Port in Cheshire West and Chester (2km); the separation between Eastham and the M53 Motorway; and the separation between Eastham and Roften (500m) and Eastham and Hooton in Cheshire West and Chester (650m). As such, the Site has not been listed as a Site that has 'no impact' on separation distances. We consider that the above assessment (or either having 'no impact' or being unclassified) is too simplistic, and the output lacks meaning. The crucial test here is considered to be to what degree any reduced level of separation is harmful and whether it would result in neighbouring towns merging into one another.</p> <p>Whilst our Client's Site, and Site SP049 extends into the open countryside and would reduce separation distances (at varying degrees) with other Settlement Areas this is not considered to cause harm to purpose 2 of the Green Belt. The Site is contained by strong defensible boundaries and would not provide a direct connection with any other Settlement Area. The development of this Site would therefore, have a low impact in terms of merging settlements together. Moreover, as set out within the enclosed DFD, the development of our Client's Site eases pressure on other Sites where gaps are considered to add meaningfully to the purposes of the Green Belt. Indeed, the Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' notes that, even though the Site would be visible from the M53 Motorway, that "Development would have limited impact on the separation with Ellesmere Port to the south"; this conclusion was drawn in relation to the whole of Site SP049, of which our Client's Site (Site 891) would have an even lesser impact.</p> <p>We consider that in undertaking a detailed review of the Green Belt the Council should provide, and rely on, such a qualitative assessment of the contribution a Site makes to separating towns from merging rather than the quantitative assessment that the initial review relies upon.</p> <p>Purpose 3 – To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>The GBR assessed Green Belt Parcels against the extent to which a site can be said to be in 'countryside use' and the extent to which any new development would intrude discordantly into the open countryside. Sites not subject to an existing countryside use and that would not intrude discordantly into the open countryside will be considered to have the lowest impact.</p> <p>Appendix 3 of the GBR concludes that the Site is within a 'Countryside Use' and as such concludes that encroachment will occur. There is no further explanation within Appendix 3. "</p> <p>"Our Client considers that the above assessment criteria is poorly defined and does not provide a qualitative assessment of a 'countryside use' nor the extent to which development would comprise an intrusion into the open countryside. As such, the assessment is considered to be unhelpful as differentiating factor in assessing sites against this purpose of the Green Belt.</p> <p>Our Clients Site, like many other Green Belt sites, is currently in agricultural use; the 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' notes that 91.3% of SP049 is considered to be best and most versatile agricultural land. As such, based on the Council's proposed assessment such sites would all score poorly.</p> <p>However, as noted within the accompanying letter from 'Wirral Turf Company' the site is not within an agriculturally productive use and has not been for over 15 years; indeed, the letter concludes that the Site is unlikely to become agriculturally productive in the future. At the moment the Site is used for turf growing and due to problems with antisocial behaviour at the Site is not considered to be suitable for any higher value crops which would be more susceptible to damage from that behaviour. Whilst the Site is clearly within a 'countryside use' we consider that the GBR assessment</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>of what that use contributes in terms of preventing encroachment into the countryside is misleading. The Site currently contributes little to the countryside in terms of enjoyment or production."</p> <p>"Purpose 4 – To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>The Council considers that the Site does not contribute to this purpose. Our Client agrees with this assessment. Purpose 5 – To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land The Council propose for the initial assessment that the release of any Green Belt site in Wirral is likely to have a negative impact on urban regeneration and that all proposed Green Belt Parcels and Green Belt SHLAA Sites would currently fulfil this purpose in equal measure. We consider that there should be no doubt that Green Belt land will need to be released through the Local Plan to meet the housing needs of the Borough, and this decision would have to take regard to the Council's strategy for regeneration. Our Client recognises development of their Site (Site 891) would not directly comprise urban regeneration, it would assist in meeting the housing need of the Borough that cannot be met through the allocation of brownfield land alone. As such, the development of the Site should not be considered to conflict with the urban regeneration aims of the borough. Moreover, Appendix 19 of the GBR identifies Sites within areas of greatest need (i.e. areas falling within the lowest 20% of scores in the latest Index of Multiple Deprivation for England). Our Client's Site, as part of Site SP049 falls within an area of greatest need as set out within Appendix 19. As set out earlier within these representations, there is a borough wide need to tackle areas of deprivation and exclusion within the borough; with those areas requiring investment which can only be driven through development. One of the ways to secure that investment is to boost significantly the supply of housing in the area, increasing housing choice across the borough and a chance to draw in outside investment, including in those areas of greatest need, through delivering housing development. "</p> <p>"Allocating Green Belt Sites, such as Site SP049 close to areas of deprivation will help improve market conditions for investment and will help meet the needs of those most in need of housing through the provision of affordable housing. Further to the above, and as set out within the accompanying DFD, the development of the Site also provides opportunities to link the area to the north of the Site to the railway station to the south of the Site by providing enhanced pedestrian links. The development will help resolve anti-social behaviour problems within the Site and, in particular, the woodland area within SP049 which is currently an attraction for anti-social behaviour including fly-tipping. This woodland area can be managed through the development of the Site and be provided as a community resource for leisure and wildlife and improve the facilities available to this area of 'greatest need'.</p> <p>Summary - Overall, our Client is concerned that proposed assessment is too simplistic and does not provide a meaningful assessment of Green Belt Parcel SP049 in terms of its lack of contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt. Notwithstanding the above, we welcome the inclusion of Site SP049 as a 'Green Belt Site for Further Investigation' as set out within Appendix 14 of the GBR. We consider that the above qualitative points for the further assessment of the Site should be addressed in that further investigation. Initial Assessment of Additional Physical or policy constraints - Chapter 4 of the GBR, along with Appendix 7 of the GBR, address whether there are any other existing constraints that may prevent some sites from being considered suitable to accommodate new development. "</p> <p>The GBR does not identified our Client's Site (Site 891, or the wider parcel SP049) as having any constraints that would prevent it being suitable for development. We support the conclusions of the GBR insofar as it demonstrates that the Site is not located within Flood Zone 3 and is not in a Core Count Area for the Wetland Bird Survey. However, as mentioned above, part of our Client's Site forming the woodland area to the west of the Site is identified as falling within a Core Biodiversity Area and the majority of Site SP049 (91%) is identified as an Area of High Quality Agricultural Land. We have previously addressed those matters within our representations to the Initial Green Belt Review in December 2017. In light of the Council's re-iterated request for additional information from land owners and developers we have provided an update in relation to those points below.</p> <p>Biodiversity and Nature Conservation - In relation to our Client's Site at Eastham it is not clear what assessment of the Site has been undertaken to inform its designation as a Core Biodiversity Area but the woodland at the Site is currently unmanaged and an initial walkover of the Site suggests that the woodland identified is of relatively poor quality. Moreover, as set out above, within the enclosed letter from Wirral Turf Company and within the Client's DFD, the woodland is subject to ongoing anti-social behaviour including fly tipping and dog-fouling. On the above basis, we do not consider that the Site merits any kind of designation for its biodiversity offering. However, importantly, the development of the Site provides an opportunity to bring the woodland into a management regime to enhance its biodiversity and arboricultural value and resolve anti-social behaviour at the Site for the amenity of current and future residents. The Site offers a significant opportunity to enhance the biodiversity offer of the Site and wider borough.</p> <p>As above, it is vital that factors such as these are considered in undertaking an assessment of the Site. The Site owner is happy to provide the Council with further evidence in relation to the current arboricultural and ecological value of the Site on request.</p> <p>Agricultural Land Classification - As set out within previous representations, our Client strongly objects to the implication that the Agricultural Land Classification may be prohibitive to development as a matter of principle. In the first instance, the NPPF requires local planning authorities to take into account Best and Most Versatile (BMV) land but does not prohibit development on it. Whilst the Green Belt Review is unclear as to exactly how an assessment of BMV will be undertaken, it does state that owners and developers must prove that there is 'no significant implications' for BMV. It is possible to read that assertion as a prohibition on development of BMV land which is not a sound approach and not compatible with national planning policy. As set out within the NPPF, the impact of development on BMV must be assessed as part of the overall planning balance for both decision taking and plan making.</p> <p>Moreover, the overall impact of development on BMV (and the extent to which it can be lost) is a consideration for the Local Plan as a whole (and the Sustainability Appraisal) which needs to take into account the amount of development likely needed on Greenfield land as well as the amount of BMV land available along with all other factors. This is not a matter which the Green Belt Review can assess in isolation and certainly not something that the Green Belt Review should be identifying as a prohibitor to development. It is important to note here that, as set out in paragraph 4.3 of the GBR, high grade agricultural land covers 39% of the Green Belt within the Wirral. We consider that development within the Green Belt is inevitably going to lead to the loss of some BMV land</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>which, as demonstrated by the above statistic, is in relative abundance within the Wirral Green Belt. As such, it is unlikely that any loss of BMV land in the above context would be so significant as to prevent development."</p> <p>"Moreover, the above assessment of the Site (which concludes 91% of the Site is BMV) appears to be based on the low resolution maps provided by DEFRA. Those maps are a useful indicator of agricultural land quality but do not provide a detailed assessment. Indeed, those maps do not differentiate between Grade 3a and 3b agricultural land, with only 3a comprising BMV and 3b comprising only moderate value land.</p> <p>Furthermore, and as set out above, regardless of its agricultural land classification, the enclosed information demonstrates that by virtue of the Site circumstances, the land is unlikely to provide agriculturally productive yields and continues to be used for turf production. The loss of the land as agricultural land would not have any significant impact on agricultural production from BMV land.</p> <p>Summary of Initial Findings - Chapter 5 of the GBR provides a summary of the initial findings of the above assessment. As above, we welcome the identification of Green Belt Parcel SP049 as an area for further investigation. We support the conclusions of paragraph 5.3 of the GBR which acknowledges the strategic importance of a number of higher level physical boundaries including the M53 Motorway and agree that one of the main strategic opportunities exists at the boundary of Settlement Area 4 which would maintain the countryside beyond the M53 Motorway. Parcel SP049 is considered to form part of that strategic opportunity. We support the designation of the Site within an area of highest accessibility as set out within Appendix 20 of the GBR. The enclosed updated DFD prepared by our Client demonstrates how the Site is sustainably located to existing services and facilities. We consider that Table 4 of the GBR underestimates the capacity of Green Belt Parcel SP049. The attached DFD demonstrates, through an illustrative development masterplan, that Site 891 alone can deliver circa 200 dwellings."</p> <p>" Officers will note from the enclosed DFD that the Site also offers an opportunity to provide access to the southern and western parcels of land within Parcel SP049 which would enable further development to come forward in excess of the 307 units estimated within Table 4 of the GBR. Conclusions We welcome the opportunity to comment on the Council's Development Options Review. However, our Client stresses the need for the Council to progress its Local Plan and to undertake a comprehensive assessment of the borough wide development needs and the borough's ability to meet those needs; including undertaking a review of the Green Belt. Our Client considers that the Local Plan should be progressed on the basis that the borough should at least meet the level of housing development required to achieve its economic growth aspirations. In summary, our Clients view is that the Methodology for the review of the Green Belt is overly simplistic and as a more detailed review of Green Belt land emerges it must be able to more meaningfully differentiate Green Belt Parcels from one another in terms of their contribution towards the Green Belt. Nevertheless, the Applicant welcomes the GBR conclusions regarding the need for further investigation into the Site. Our Client's Site is not considered to meaningfully contribute to the five purposes of the Green Belt and should be considered as a priority site for Green Belt release. Furthermore, the Site is suitable for development and is in a highly sustainable location. The development of this site would contribute towards to the Council's housing needs in an area of greatest need and should be allocated for housing development within the emerging Local Plan as part of a Green Belt Review. "</p>
DOR03216	<p>There is a compelling case to allocate them for new housing development in the emerging Local Plan. Both parcels of land are extremely well contained by surrounding housing and urban infrastructure including the Cross Hill reservoir and road network. 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. 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. 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. 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. 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 impediments to new development as such. There are no heritage considerations and the degree of impact on the surrounding landscape will be negligible. 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>
DOR03217	<p>The site is currently designated within Wirral's Unitary Development Plan Policies Map (2000) as an Area Requiring Landscape Renewal, within the Green Belt, and partially within a Site of Biological Importance. The site lies within Flood Zone 3, but benefits from flood defences. Therefore the chance of a river flood happening each year is as low as 1%. Wirral Council are currently preparing a new Local Plan and this document is prepared to support the release of the site from the Green Belt. The emerging Core Strategy follows a call for sites which occurred in 2016, which this site was submitted and again in 2018 where North West Construction made a formal submission identifying the site as suitable for residential development. The Council do not currently have the ability to demonstrate a 5 year housing land supply and are yet to agree on an accepted housing need for the plan period. However without any economic growth scenarios, it is expected to be a minimum 12,045 new dwellings, which is the equivalent of 803 dwellings per annum. A shortage of developable land has been identified, and the Council is considering a number of options for increasing the housing land supply including releasing surplus employment land and increasing the density of development (amongst others). None of the options considered would close the gap such that Green Belt release is the only realistic alternative, in order to reach its housing targets.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The Council identified the site within its SHLAA (2016). It was cited for the potential to provide 79 dwellings, with allowances made for portions of the site that would need to form public open space and planting, noise mitigation from the M53 and railways lines. The site was allocated as a category 3 site under the SHLAA (Ref. 738), and as such was considered for development within 11-15 years. This is due to the flood risk score of 0 and Green Belt score of 0.</p> <p>Notwithstanding the acceptance of the Council that the site could be delivered within 11-15 years, the recent SHLAA submission identifies that the site could actually accommodate 225 residential units.</p> <p>There are also errors in the SHLAA assessment insofar as the flood risk score is incorrect due to the flood defences such that the site has low probability of flooding and in respect to Green Belt as the site is previously developed and given the railway and raised motorway to the north and west of the site there is limited harm to the openness of the Green Belt. Given that Countryside are interested in delivering homes on the site, this could start to deliver new market and affordable housing within 5 years.</p> <p>Purpose 1: 'To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas'</p> <p>It is considered that the site performs no contribution towards this purpose as the site is not located adjacent to Moreton or Wallasey. Therefore it does not contribute to the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas. The existing Borderlands railway line and M53 protects the site against unrestricted sprawl to the north and west. This is identified in the initial Green Belt Review which states that SHLAA 738 could potentially provide an alternative strong boundary to a revised Green Belt.</p> <p>Purpose 2: 'To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'</p> <p>The Site does not extend beyond the Borderlands railway which acts a physical barrier and settlement boundary edge. The release would be a benefit as it reduces the pressure on other Green Belt sites. It is considered that the site performs no contribution towards the purpose.</p> <p>Purpose 3: 'To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment ' The Site is not considered to be part of the wider countryside as it sits within development within the wider area. The degree of openness is considered to be low by the existing development/ properties located to the south of the site, and the M53 and railway line to the north and west. It is therefore strongly considered that the Site performs a weak contribution to this purpose.</p> <p>Purpose 4: 'To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns '</p> <p>Bidston is a historic settlement, but it is not considered to provide any special character or setting that would be affected by this development. Fender Lane is located along the edge of an established 'infrastructure corridor', where major railways, the M53 and a number of electricity pylons are located. The development of this site it not considered to harm the character of the area to any degree that is more than existing modern development. Purpose 5: 'To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict land and other urban land'</p> <p>Bidston is not a settlement which benefits from significant amounts of Previously Developed Land (PDL). The most prevalent examples of PDL exist adjacent to Bidston Station, and include areas of the 'Fender Lane' site which historic mapping shows was occupied by some form of military buildings and anti-aircraft gun.</p> <p>Whilst there is previously development sites throughout Wirral which present development potential, these are not expected to amount to a size which would allow development solely on Brownfield Land.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The release of the site from the Green Belt is wholly justified and necessary. It represents a logical location for release, which will have relatively limited harm to the general extend of the Green Belt. The surrounding urban features will form new defensible and permanent boundaries to the Green Belt. The railway tracks to the north and west in particular prevents encroachment into the Green Belt to the north.</p> <p>It is considered that the site makes a limited contribution to the functions of the Green Belt and when fully appraised should be considered 'weak' in terms of its Green Belt function. The summary table is set out below.</p> <p>Conclusion</p> <p>The emerging Local Plan recognises that the Wirral must provide new homes both to meet the needs of its population and to underpin economic growth. Wirral Council state that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered in exceptional circumstances, through a review of the Local Plan.</p> <p>This Vision Document sets out how the land at Fender Lane, Bidston can provide a high quality sustainable residential development. It will provide attractive and well-built family homes as part of a sustainable environment. It will help Wirral to meet its ground housing needs.</p> <p>The Site can be brought forward using a comprehensive masterplanning process, with significant involvement from both Wirral Council, the existing local community and national housebuilders. This Vision Document provides the evidence to demonstrate that the Site in Bidston represents a logical and sustainable development opportunity.</p>
DOR03218	<p>The status of the land as Green Belt is clearly an anomaly as it doesn't form any importance in preventing neighbouring towns merging, nor does have countryside importance as identified in the assessment of the green belt. The site is always considered to be suitable for the potential release from the Green Belt. The site benefits from the fact that it has defensible boundaries and could therefore be released in isolation (SP059B) or it could also be released as a part of a wider parcel (SP059). In either case the site is considered to not contribute to any of the five purposes of the Green belt as outlined in the NPPF. Although the proposed site is small in the context of the housing numbers required it can be considered to be sustainable and appropriate for release in a village</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>location where development size needs to be a serious consideration. Within the appendix it states that the site has weak field boundaries. We do not believe this to be true, to the north and east are existing residences which make up Irby settlement and to the west is Greasby Brook which provides a physical barrier to prevent any future sprawl. Both of these boundaries are permanent and strong identifiable features which help to guide areas for new development. We believe this site therefore has a strong boundary strength especially if it were to be combined with the neighbouring sites. This would therefore provide for an obvious choice when looking to release sites from the Green Belt. the impact of the Greasby Brook to the south west would help prevent any urban sprawl beyond the plan period. Both the combined land of SP059 B, C and D or SHLAA1765 in isolation could be considered for release and still maintain a high degree of containment which would prevent any further sprawl. The site has potential for infill. We would therefore conclude that an infill allocation on this site is not appropriate and a more robust and sustainable development should be considered.</p> <p>Appendix 13 shows that the site has no constraints which would prevent the development of the site or even a part of the site. There are no issues envisaged with regards to drainage of the site. The proposed development is located in a residential area and no noise or air pollution nuisance is anticipated around the proposed site. Within the SHLAA it states that the site is 'heavily vegetated', this is no longer the case as the site is maintained throughout the year and any vegetation is now controlled creating a suitable ground condition. Its location would not lend itself as being appropriate to be allocated in the future as employment land due to the residential nature of the area. The site has no green or open space allocation and it is not currently used for any recreational purposes. It would not be appropriate for any future Greenspace designations. It is not anticipated that flooding impacts would prevent any development from coming forward. The site does not hold any high ecological value and any future development would be able to implement reasonable action for the protection and long-term conservation of fauna. There will also be a good opportunity to enhance local ecology. As discussed in the green Belt assessment the proposed site does not contribute significantly to the purposes of the Green Belt. The proposed site has an identifiable and permanent defensive boundary which other sites across the Wirral identified for release do not have. This would prevent any further encroachment in the future making the site safe to release with no future extension opportunities.</p> <p>Due to the matters discussed we believe the Green Belt Score should be higher than the zero published in the SHLAA2016 as the site doesn't significantly contribute to the purposes of the Green Belt. The site is not located near to or within a conservation area nor are there any heritage allocations near to the site. This site should be considered to be sustainable with good, close access to local services and amenities. The Vision Statement will support the release of the land at Greenheys Nursery from the Wirral Green Belt. The site doesn't contribute significantly to any of the 5 purposes of the green Belt as outlined in the NPPF and Local Plan. Based upon the supporting information we believe that the proposed site at Greenheys Nursery does not support the 5 purposes of the Green Belt and its release from the Green Belt would not be considered to be sustainable and in line with the NPPF to bolster housing requirements across the Borough. This site should be looked on very favourably by Wirral Council and should be supported for the release from the Green Belt. The land at Greenheys Nursery measures 0.7 hectares and would be able to contribute to this target if it were to be released from the Green Belt. [Report and appendices Attached]</p>
DOR03219	<p>On behalf of [a developer], we are pleased to submit the attached representation in respect of land off Brookhurst Avenue, Eastham - Site SP046</p> <p>Compelling need to release Green Belt land to meet needs of the local population and economy. Preparation of Local Plan is the appropriate time to release Green Belt which is shown to not perform and important Green Belt role Brookhurst Avenue should be considered for residential allocation in the Draft Local Plan.</p>
DOR03220	<p>[Our client] recognises the rationale for a Green Belt Review presented to the Cabinet and set out clearly in the Council's Development Options Review Briefing Presentation of September 2018. The Council's briefing presentation confirms its evidence-based findings that the capacity of housing land supply within the urban area (beyond that part of the Authority area designated as Green Belt) is limited to just 90 sites with a capacity of 2403 dwellings.</p> <p>The Council's evidence-based Objectively Assessed Housing Need substantially exceeds this figure and, regardless of the final housing target taken forward within the Council's draft Local Plan, it seems inevitable, given the limited scale of housing land supply available within the urban area, that some amendment of existing Green Belt boundaries will be necessary to enable the Council to meet housing needs.</p> <p>Given this position, a formal assessment of land against the purposes of including land in Green Belt is clearly an important and necessary part of the plan making process. [Our client] therefore accepts the need for an assessment.</p> <p>The objectives of the Initial Green Belt Assessment report are set out as to investigate whether there would be any sites that could potentially be suitable for release from the Green Belt in terms of the purposes of including land in the Green Belt as set out in the National Planning Policy Framework and any other high-level constraints.</p> <p>The Council will be aware of the views expressed in our consultation response to the proposed Methodology for this Initial Review (submitted in December 2017) that the assessment of 'other high-level constraints' does not form part of a review against the purposes of including land within the Green Belt set out in national policy.</p> <p>The view of [our client]'s professional advisors is that this is an additional assessment which contributes towards an understanding of whether, if found suitable for release from Green Belt, land might host sustainable development.</p> <p>Our views have not changed in this regard. We recognise, however, that national policy⁴ requires that the need to promote sustainable development should be considered when drawing up or reviewing Green Belt boundaries and that, consequently, the Council's approach to consider additional constraints is useful.</p> <p>Overall [our client] supports the outcome of the Council's initial assessment, which it finds to be entirely logical. The recommendation of the [our client]'s professional advisors is that the Council's assessment responds well to the characteristics of the Wirral, the shape, form and boundaries of its existing Settlement Areas, and takes full account of natural and strategic boundaries.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The choice of sites for further investigation leave a robust and defensible boundary for the remaining Green Belt area which ensures that, when considered as a whole, it continues to deliver against the five 'Green Belt purposes' set out in national policy. [Our client] therefore supports the Council's overarching findings.</p> <p>SUMMARY OF INITIAL ASSESSMENT</p> <p>[Our client] supports the outcome of the Initial Assessment as set out in the Summary document and shown on the map included as Appendix 14 Sites for Further Investigation to the Council's Initial Green Belt Review Background Paper.</p> <p>IDENTIFICATION OF SITES FOR FUTURE INVESTIGATION</p> <p>We expressed concerns in our response to consultation on the proposed methodology about the planned approach to assess individual SHLAA sites against Green Belt purposes, arguing that this should be restricted to a more strategic review of Green Belt parcels. We accept, however, that the process employed, to review parcels first and then consider if any part of a parcel might be suitable for further investigation, is helpful, valid and has led to a sensible and useful outcome.</p> <p>TECHNICAL ASSESSMENT OF CONTRIBUTION TO GREEN BELT PURPOSES</p> <p>[Our client's] professional team has reviewed the Council's Initial Assessment in detail. They have considered the chosen methodology and critically compared it with other recent Green Belt assessments. [Our client] is confident that the methodology chosen and set out by the Council has been logically and consistently applied and that, considered as a whole, the outcome is credible and valid.</p> <p>PURPOSE THREE – ENCROACHMENT ANALYSIS</p> <p>Whilst [our client] supports the ultimate outcome of the Council's assessment, [our client's] advisors have raised a concern regarding the approach taken to assessment against Purpose Three, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. The Council has, in their view, introduced an element to this assessment which is irrelevant (to the purpose) when it considers the extent to which any development would 'intrude discordantly' into the open countryside. Purpose Three addresses the principle of urban sprawl and the importance attached to retaining areas of countryside around urban areas. The issue of 'discordance' (incongruous or jarring) is a matter of landscape and visual impact rather than of encroachment. In our view, it has no place in an assessment against Green Belt purposes and, if it is to be included, should form part of the constraints analysis contributing towards the assessment of the contribution to sustainable development that any change in Green Belt boundaries can make.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS</p> <p>The Council will be aware that we have expressed reservations about the inclusion of this element within the initial assessment of land against Green Belt purposes. We recognise that paragraph 139 of the Framework requires plan makers considering changes to Green Belt boundaries to ensure consistency with the development plan's strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development. It is accepted that in an area like the Wirral, which is heavily constrained by the Green Belt, a review of Green Belt boundaries could be used as a mechanism to direct development to more sustainable locations. Whilst we do not, therefore, have any objection in principle to this element of assessment, we consider it should only be carried out once an initial review of Green Belt purpose has been completed. It seems probable, from the reporting of the Council's assessment process, that the 'constraints analysis' has followed on from rather than formed part of the assessment against Green Belt purposes. However, in our view, the process would be demonstrably sounder if further clarity can be provided around the sequential approach taken.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS – FACTUAL INFORMATION AND MATTERS ARISING</p> <p>We have reviewed the information included in the assessment relating to [our client's] land and, insofar as we can determine from the documents provided, are content that it is both accurate and has been effectively applied.</p> <p>To inform the ongoing assessment of sites identified for further investigation, [our client] has prepared a plan-based constraints analysis of each site/parcel. These are provided in our Appendices A to I of this consultation response.</p> <p>This assessment is based on a combination of desktop and primary research and incorporates national and local designations as well as site-based analysis of matters, including areas of priority habitat, incidence of woodland, hedgerow and water bodies, relationship with heritage assets and potential for impacts, Public Rights of Way, flood and highways.</p> <p>We have paid particular attention to the extent of 'permanent features' within each site, which we have taken to include only those constraints which present a physical restriction to development which cannot be resolved through the design process, including, for example, Sites of Biological Importance, Priority Habitats, Flood Zone 3 and utilities easements.</p> <p>The narrative below provides some headline information and is offered as a reference and introduction to the individual Constraints Plans. All site areas are approximate and subject to site survey.</p> <p>SHLAA 879/SPO10A East of Rigby Drive</p> <p>The site extends to c. 23.63 hectares. It contains a permanent feature (Greasby Copse – PH/SBI) extending to some 1.83 hectares, and hedgerows which have potential for retention within the developable area. The site also includes the farmyard and steading of Greenbank Farm on Arrowe Road (on the northern boundary).</p> <p>Greasby Copse is a deciduous woodland designated as SBI and Priority Habitat and lies within the Thurstaston Common SSSI Impact Zone.</p> <p>SHLAA 1952/SPO19B East of Glenwood Drive</p> <p>The site extends to c. 40.3 hectares. It contains permanent features (woodland – PH, SBI and electricity cable) extending in all to some 7.11 hectares.</p> <p>The site includes deciduous woodland to the western boundary designated as Priority Habitat and Limbo Lane Pond SBI. It lies within the Thurstaston Common SSSI Impact Zone. There are small areas of land within Flood Zones 2 and 3 to the north of the site, alongside the watercourse that forms part of the northern boundary.</p> <p>SHLAA 881, 882, 883 / SPO61 (part) North of Gills Lane & SHLAA 884 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby</p> <p>These sites extend to c. 29.57 hectares collectively. They comprise a series of four enclosures to the north and south of Gills Lane. Two of the sites contain limited permanent features (PH, Flood Zone 3) extending in all to some 0.35 hectares.</p> <p>3.29: The sites adjoin Barnston Dale SBI and Priority Habitat (to the south east) and are adjacent, in part, to the Barnston Conservation Area. They lie within the Heswall Dales, Dee Estuary and Thurstaston Common SSSI Impact Zones.</p> <p>SHLAA 1946 & 1955 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby</p> <p>These two sites extend to c. 34.25 hectares. They include permanent features (woodland, PH, SBI) extending to some 1.42 hectares.</p> <p>The sites adjoin Barnston Dale SBI and Priority Habitat (to the north east) and are adjacent, in part, to the Barnston Conservation Area. They lie within the Heswall Dales, Dee Estuary and Thurstaston Common SSSI Impact Zones. Part of the site relating to Barnston village is likely to be within the influence of the setting of the listed Christ Church in Barnston.</p> <p>SHLAA 1956 & 877 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby</p> <p>These two sites extend to c. 50.13 hectares. There are no permanent features such as PH/SBI but they include an extensive network of hedgerows and some water bodies. The site also includes an area currently developed as a farm yard and steading (Carnsdale Farm) to the north east corner.</p> <p>The sites adjoin Whitfield Common (designated Open Space) to the south and are in close proximity to the southern edge of the Barnston Conservation Area at the north eastern corner. The sites are within the Impact Zones for the Heswall Dales SSSI and Dee Estuary SAC.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>The sites adjoin Heswall Primary School on the south western corner.</p> <p>SHLAA 1962 / SPO36 North of Red Hill Lane, SHLAA 1963 / SPO41 West of Brimstage Lane, SHLAA 1969 & 866 / SPO37 East of Brimstage Lane</p> <p>These sites extend to c. 92.09 hectares. There is a small area of National Forestry Inventory Mixed Conifer woodland in Site SHLAA 1969 which equates to a permanent feature of around 1.55 hectares. In addition, there is an extensive network of hedgerows and some small water bodies (some of which are included within the WMBC Biodiversity Audit). The area also includes Priority Habitat (deciduous woodland) and a Group TPO in the south west corner and adjoins the multi-designated Storeton Woodland (RIG, SBI, LGS and TPO) to the north east. Adjacent to the sites there are listed buildings and a Scheduled Ancient Monument (Storeton Hall) outside the site boundary to the north west. The western boundary of this area is formed by the M53 Motorway which could give rise to noise and air pollution.</p> <p>Site SHLAA 878 / SPO71 (part) Land on Chester High Road</p> <p>This small site extends to c. 4.13 hectares. It forms part of a larger parcel to the north west, not included in [our client's] ownership. The site includes hedgerows to its boundaries. The situation adjacent to the railway on the eastern boundary provides potential for some noise and air pollution (from diesel units).</p> <p>SHLAA 648, 649 & 1947 / SP045 West of Raby Drive</p> <p>These three sites collectively extend to 15.28 hectares. They adjoin (in part) or are within the influence of Raby Mere SBI, TPO and Priority Habitat (deciduous woodland) and within the impact zone of Dibbendsdale SSSI (Site 1947 is adjacent to the SSSI on its northern boundary). Permanent features together equate to 3.37 hectares. The sites are tangibly different in character; each contain elements of hedgerow. Site 1947 includes an area designated included on the Priority Habitat Inventory and Biological Importance.</p> <p>SHLAA 1948 / SPO46 (part) West of Plymyard Drive</p> <p>This site extends in total to c. 101.38 hectares. It includes the golf course, occupied and run by Bromborough Golf Club¹⁰. In addition to the area utilised as a golf course, the site area includes ponds designated as SBI (Bromborough Golf Course and Hargrave House Farm ponds) and deciduous woodlands to the west designated as Priority Habitat. The site is adjacent or within the impact zone of Priority Habitat (deciduous woodland), TPO, SBI and Ancient woodland on its eastern boundary. Within the site boundaries there is an extensive network of hedgerows. Permanent features equate to 20.64 hectares (excluding the golf course). The area used as golf course is designated as public open space, the site is within the Impact Zone of the Dibbendsdale SSSI. There is a very small area of the site, within an area recorded as Flood Zone 3, on the eastern boundary. The location of the M53 Motorway to the western boundary gives rise to the potential for noise and air pollution.</p> <p>CONSTRAINTS ANALYSIS AGRICULTURAL LAND CLASSIFICATION (BEST AND MOST VERSATILE LAND)</p> <p>The Council's constraints analysis includes Best and Most Versatile Land (BMV11) as a factor. This is based on the requirements set out in National Planning Policy¹² to recognise the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land (and of trees and woodland).</p> <p>The Framework directs that, where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, areas of poorer quality land should be preferred to those of a higher quality. The Council has based its assessment on the area of land designated as Best and Most Versatile in each parcel or site, and on the percentage of the site area that this represents. Whilst this is a technically valid approach to measuring the incidence of BMV in each parcel, it does not provide any analysis of the economic and other benefits of this land, or of the context within which this assessment should be made.</p> <p>To help inform such analysis, [our client] has invested in a high-level investigation of Agricultural Land Classification across the Wirral.</p> <p>The report (produced by Strutt & Parker) identifies a significant consistency of land quality across the Wirral, with the majority falling within two soil types (Clifton and Bridgenorth series) and land quality classifications (mainly Grade 3a and 3b).</p> <p>The report sets out the distribution of BMV across [our client's] land area and explains that this is such that most/many field enclosures include land classified as both Grade 3a and Grade 3b. This is important because the potential for cropping, and so the economic value of the land, is determined by the poorest quality land in the enclosure.</p> <p>The implication of this is twofold; first, whichever land is considered for release, it is likely to include some area of BMV, and, second, the economic benefits associated with this BMV are limited</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>because the parcel will also include land of Grade 3b quality and it is this that will be the determinant factor in the economic benefits arising from the land. It is consequently our view that any weight applied to the loss of any Best and Most Versatile Land should be limited.</p> <p>HOW SITES COULD CONTRIBUTE TO ACHIEVING SUSTAINABLE DEVELOPMENT</p> <p>[Our client's] sites have the potential to deliver sustainable development, creating great places to live which deliver a range of wider social, economic and environmental benefits.</p> <p>SHLAA 879 / SPO10A East of Rigby Drive</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that the site East of Rigby Drive can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Access will be via Arrowe Road to the north. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • strengthening the local retail centre on Arrowe Road through increased customer population and demand; • re-routing school traffic from Arrowe Road through the site to help ease congestion experienced on Rigby Drive; • enabling works to help resolve local drainage issues; • utilising hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network; • the introduction of new Public Rights of Way connecting to existing footpaths to the south of Arrowe Brook Farm on Arrowe Brook Lane, creating a circular route via Arrowe Bridge and Arrowe Road; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the south (between the site and Arrowe Brook Lane). <p>SHLAA 1952 / SPO19B East of Glenwood Drive</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that the site East of Glenwood Drive can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Access will be via Thingwall Road to the south. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of new small-scale retail, employment or community facilities facing Thingwall Road; • utilising hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connections into Arrowe Park and into the countryside to the north; • the introduction of new Public Rights of Way to provide connections to Arrowe Park (both from the development and for the existing residential areas to the east) and northwards towards Greasby; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the north (between the site and Arrowe Brook Lane). <p>Sites SHLAA 881, 882, 883 / SPO61 (part) North of Gills Lane & SHLAA 884 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby (part)</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that the sites North of Gills Lane and East of Pensby (north of Barnston Dale) can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Access to sites 883, 882 and 684 will be via Gills Lane and, for Site 881 from Barnston Road to the east. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancement to the setting of Barnston Dale to ensure ongoing separation between Pensby and Barnston village; • lower density development and screening adjacent to Barnston Dale; • utilising hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Barnston Dale; • the introduction of new Public Rights of Way to provide connections (via [our client's] adjacent land) to Barnston village, and Pensby; • the creation of a buffer and visual enhancement to Barnston Conservation Area and listed buildings in Barnston; • support for off-site highway improvements associated with the Barnston Dip and Thingwall corner; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the east of Barnston village.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>SHLAA 1946 & 1955 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby (northern part)</p> <p>Whilst [our client]'s ownership extends to part rather than all of Parcel SP062 (a triangle of land in the centre of the parcel is owned by third parties) our investigations demonstrate that the whole parcel can host sustainable development.</p> <p>The specific comments below related to the northern part of Parcel SP062 within [our client]'s ownership (see constraints plans).</p> <p>Access to sites will be via Pensby Road to the east and Barnston Road to the east. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of new small-scale retail, employment or community facilities to the west of the site facing Pensby Road; • provision of east/west links through the site from Pensby Road to Barnston Road, connecting Barnston village with Pensby; • utilise hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Barnston Dale; • the creation of a buffer and visual enhancement to the Barnston Conservation Area and listed buildings in Barnston; • the introduction of new Public Rights of Way to provide connections (to Barnston village) to link into the existing public footpath running north-south, connecting Barnston village and Heswall Primary School; • support for off-site highway improvements associated with the Barnston Dip and Thingwall corner; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the east of Barnston village. <p>SHLAA 1956 & 877 / SPO62 (part) East of Pensby (southern part)</p> <p>Whilst [our client]'s ownership extends to part rather than all of Parcel SP062 (a triangle of land in the centre of the parcel is owned by third parties) our investigations demonstrate that the whole parcel can host sustainable development.</p> <p>The specific comments below related to the southern part of Parcel SP062 within [our client]'s ownership (see constraints plans).</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that this part of parcel SP062 can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Access to sites will be via Barnston Road to the east and Whitfield Lane to the south. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • provision of new small-scale retail, employment or community facilities within the site; • potential for economic, leisure or tourism diversification associated with Carnsdale Farm; • utilise hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Barnston Dale; • the introduction of new Public Rights of Way to provide connections to Heswall Primary School, Whitfield Common, town centre and station; • support for off-site highway improvements associated with the Barnston Dip and Thingwall corner; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the east of Barnston village. <p>SHLAA 1962 / SPO36 North of Red Hill Lane, SHLAA 1963 / SPO41 West of Brimstage Lane, SHLAA 1969 & 866 / SPO37 East of Brimstage Lane</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that these four sites can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Multiple access is enabled by the existing of lanes, including Rest Hill Road, Red Hill Road and Mount Road. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • enhancement of historic Storeton village core, and settings of listed buildings and open space to north east; • provision of new small-scale retail, employment or community facilities which could potentially be located both in the centre of the site (perhaps connecting to National Cycle Route No 56, facing onto Brimstage Lane) and facing onto Mount Road opposite Brackenwood Golf Course; • potential for economic, leisure or tourism diversification associated with Storeton House Farm; • utilise hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Storeton Woods; • the introduction of an east-west route and new Public Rights of Way to provide connections between Brimstage and Bebington, making use of the [our client's] private motorway crossings (underpass and bridge) and historic tree lined avenues; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the west of the M53.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>SHLAA 878 / SPO71 (part) Land at Chester High Road</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that this site, which forms part of parcel SP071, can host sustainable development. This site forms part of a much larger area to the north east and we expect it to come forward for development as part of that parcel (subject to release from Green Belt and appropriate commercial arrangements being reached). Access is likely to be from Chester Road to the west. In the event the land is developed in this way, it has the potential to help screen new housing from the impact of the railway.</p> <p>SHLAA 648, 649 & 1947 / SPO45, West of Raby Drive</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that the three SHLLA sites which form parcel SP045 can host sustainable development.</p> <p>Access will be from Raby Hall Lane (Site SHLAA 648) and Blakeley Road (Sites SHLAA 1947 and SHLAA 649). Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • habitat enhancements and creation of new public open space to form an appropriate setting to Raby Mere; • additional tree planting to screen the M53 on the western boundary of sites 1947 and 646, providing enhanced connections to Raby Mere and Dibbendsdale SSSIs; • utilise hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Raby Mere and Dibbendsdale SSSIs; and • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the west of the M53. <p>SHLAA 1948 / SPO46 (part) West of Plymyard Drive</p> <p>Our investigations demonstrate that these two sites that form part of parcel SP046 can host sustainable development. Access will be from Raby Hall Road to the north. Subject to arrangements with the neighbouring landowner to the south east, it may also be possible to create an access from Brookhurst Avenue opposite Eastham Rake Railway Station. Wider opportunities created by the development of the site will be likely to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • creation of new public parkland areas and linear green space, adjacent to the watercourse; • additional tree planting to screen the M53 on the western boundary; • utilise hedgerows for enhanced ecological corridors and green infrastructure network, providing connectivity to Dibbendsdale SSSI; • potential for supporting community facilities clustered around commercial, leisure or tourism diversification at Hargrave House Farm, or making use of the existing golf course pavilion; • new pedestrian connections south from Raby Hall Road providing new connections towards Raby and Eastham Rake Railway Station (over third party land); • off-site environmental and access enhancements on [our client's] land remaining in the Green Belt to the west of the M53; and • lower density development within a wooded landscape surrounding the SBI. <p>INFRASTRUCTURE AND ANY OTHER OFF-SITE CONSTRAINTS</p> <p>Highway capacity</p> <p>We recognise that the scale of cumulative development associated with the sites identified for further investigation will have some impact on the operation of the existing highway network. [Our client] is ready and willing to work with the Council to identify and enable opportunities for improvements using, where appropriate, land within its control. In the event multiple sites in [our client's] ownership are released, [our client] will be able to work with the Council to effectively align phasing of development with the strategy for off-site improvements. [Our client]'s professional team has carried out some preliminary investigations and have identified a package of measures which our professional advisers believe are likely to align well with Council's needs. [Our client] will be willing to work with the Council on such matters relating to sites identified for further investigation within its ownership.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Public transport</p> <p>The advice of [our client's] professional team is that the cumulative volume of housing enabled from the release proposed will create opportunities to materially enhance current public transport provision, including the possible re-introduction of services recently discontinued.</p> <p>Walking and cycling</p> <p>We are aware that the Council is working on a city region-wide initiative into Local Cycling and Walking Improvement Plans. [Our client's] will be seeking to include provision for safe walking and cycling associated with any of its land that may be required for development. It will be pleased to work with the Council on the improvement plans initiative and to enable enhanced access via walking and cycling where achievable.</p> <p>Schools and healthcare</p> <p>The responsibility to provide education and health care facilities rests with national and local government. We expect that the Council will be working towards an Infrastructure Delivery Plan to address requirements for increased capacity and the provision of any new infrastructure.</p> <p>In the event that land in [our client's] ownership is required for development, [our client] will be pleased to work with the Council to identify and respond to any requirements that arise.</p> <p>Utilities and drainage</p> <p>In respect of utilities and drainage, we look forward to sight of views from the statutory undertakers following this consultation process. [Our client] will be pleased to engage in discussions with utility companies as and when required.</p> <p>VIABILITY AND PHASING OF DELIVERY</p> <p>[Our client]'s sites are viable and can be delivered in a phased manner to support the Council's delivery trajectory.</p> <p>[Our client] has reviewed and assessed each site identified for further investigation for viability and to consider phasing of delivery. We have also reviewed the sites and relevant settlement areas against the findings of the Council's Development Viability Baseline Report (2016).</p> <p>This assessment has satisfied us that each site identified is viable.</p> <p>[Our client] has also considered when each site/parcel will deliver new housing. Our conclusions are set out in Table One [Attached to consultation response].</p> <p>It should be noted that some 17 of [our client's] land included in sites identified for further investigation form part of larger areas with third party owners, which will require a comprehensive and strategic master planning approach.</p> <p>[Our client] will be willing to play its part in such a process, but it is important to note that the phasing and timing of delivery put forward above is a best estimate at this time.</p> <p>[Our client] will be willing to engage in discussions with the Council on viability and phasing of delivery, as prove useful.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL BENEFITS TO THE LOCAL COMMUNITY</p> <p>[Our client]'s ownership extends across a large part of that area designated as Green Belt on Wirral and, consequently, it is exceptionally well-placed to support the Council in delivering against this objective in the event it is asked to release land for development that is currently within the Green Belt.</p> <p>[Our client] has a long history of place making on Wirral. [Our client's] legacy extends well beyond the boundaries of [our client's] land; it has a history of supporting sustainable growth across the Wirral peninsula, as well as further afield. Parts of the existing settlements of Heswall, Pensby, Bromborough and Bebington are built on land formerly in [our client's] ownership. Arrowe Park Country Park and Cemetery were created on land donated to the community by [our client] and the Lever Causeway and the tree-lined drives remain important landscape features.</p> <p>[Our client] understands that the creation of new homes and communities brings with it both opportunities and responsibilities. In the event the Council seeks to bring its land forward to help meet housing and economic needs, it will expect to work alongside the Council, communities and other stakeholders to create new communities and a wider legacy to be proud of.</p> <p>[Our client] will seek to deliver additional benefits to local communities that include:</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>a. the enhancement of public access to, and enjoyment of, the countryside via the creation of a more integrated network of green connections between people and places, including an enhanced off-road cycle network and Public Rights of Way;</p> <p>b. the delivery of net environmental gain via investment in, and works to, enhance biodiversity, including the replacement of habitat lost through development, and enhancements for the benefit of wildlife across [our client]'s remaining agricultural estate;</p> <p>c. addressing issues associated with local and strategic movement, including improved east-west connectivity and resolving congestion hotspots;</p> <p>d. supporting sustainable travel choices through the design of new places, based on walkable layouts, with accessible local facilities and employment, and in locations which support enhancements to public transport;</p> <p>e. the creation of new rural businesses and the enhancement of tourism and leisure activities in the countryside, supporting the rural villages;</p> <p>f. enhanced access to the countryside and historic villages from surrounding towns in support of Wirral's tourism strategy; and</p> <p>g. enabling the proportionate growth of the Wirral's rural communities to maintain and enhance their vitality.</p> <p>We will look to deliver these benefits, working alongside the Council and relevant partners, through a strategic approach to delivering compensatory improvements the environmental quality and accessibility of remaining Green Belt land within the [our client] ownership.</p> <p>ADDITIONAL SITES FOR CONSIDERATION</p> <p>[Our client] invites the Council to consider SHLAA site 1945, Land at Landican, to the west of M53 to the south of Woodchurch Road for employment use. The site extends to c.13 hectares and, save for a hedgerow around the perimeter of the site, has no permanent or distinguishable features. The site has no constraints (save from the potential for noise and air pollution from the M53 immediately adjacent to the east) and can be accessed from the A552 to the north.</p> <p>VILLAGES</p> <p>It is our view, however, that the social and economic needs of the Wirral's rural communities will not be well-served by a response that relies purely on infill within boundaries established for villages 'washed over' by the Green Belt.</p> <p>National planning policy is positive and enabling for rural areas. Paragraphs 77 and 78 of the Framework seek to enable the delivery of new housing where it will enhance or maintain the vitality of rural communities. Paragraph 83 seeks to enable the sustainable growth of businesses of all kinds in rural areas, both through the conversion of existing buildings and well-designed new buildings. Policy relating to Green Belt is far more restrictive, limiting the development of new housing to (limited) infilling or (limited) affordable housing for local community needs, and of new buildings to those associated with agriculture and forestry, outdoor sport, recreation, cemeteries, burial grounds and allotments.</p> <p>A reliance on infill alone will therefore restrict sustainable growth across the entirety of the rural area of the Wirral (there is no 'countryside' on Wirral, only Green Belt) to that which can be brought forward by extension, conversion or redevelopment of existing buildings or by limited infill (within village boundaries).</p> <p>It is our view that this situation is too constrained and is clearly inconsistent with national policy relating to rural areas. This is due in no small part to the fact that Wirral faces very particular circumstances in having no part of its rural area beyond the Green Belt and, currently at least, none of the settlements in the rural area 'inset' from the Green Belt.</p> <p>The situation can be positively addressed by a change in Green Belt boundaries which enables settlements to be 'inset' from the Green Belt rather than 'washed over' by it.</p> <p>Such an approach would be entirely consistent with national policy set out in the Framework, which makes it clear 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, the village should be included in the Green Belt.</p> <p>The policy goes on to say that if the character of the village needs to be protected for other reasons, other means should be used, such as conservation area or normal development management policies, and the village should be excluded from the Green Belt</p> <p>We recommend that the Council consider in detail the contribution that the character of villages currently washed over make to the openness of the Green Belt, with a view to determining if villages should remain within the Green Belt or excluded from it.</p> <p>Our expectation is that such as review will lead to findings which support the exclusion of the larger villages such as Thornton Hough, Barnston and Brimstage from the Green Belt.</p>
DOR03221	<p>Our client controls a site which is within the presently defined Green Belt, adjacent to the settlement boundary of Newton to the immediate south of the B5139 Frankby Road. We confirm that the site has been brought to the Council's attention in previous call for sites submissions.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> We welcome the Council's acknowledgement of the need to undertake a review of the Green Belt in Wirral and its recognition that the preparation of the new Local Plan is the appropriate time to release land which is shown to not perform an important Green Belt role.

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The Green Belt in Wirral covers almost half (45 per cent) of the Borough and is tightly drawn around settlements. Most of the existing Green Belt boundary in Wirral was defined several decades ago (in 1983), with the various settlements having been gradually developed in the intervening years between then and now, leaving very little residual developable land within certain settlement boundaries. • There is a compelling need to release Green Belt land for development, without which it will not be possible to meet the needs of the local population and the economy. <p>We are pleased to see that our client's site is covered in the Background Report, albeit we are disappointed that it is effectively disregarded on the basis that a relatively small proportion of the site's perimeter adjoins the existing settlement boundary. For the reasons outlined in Section 3 of our current submission, we believe that the Council should be affording more weight to other factors, including the advice in paragraph 138 of the NPPF that identified needs should be met in sustainable locations. 1.9 We consider that the our client's site at Frankby Road is much better related to Newton/West Kirby/Grange (Settlement Area 6) than other SHLAA sites. This is readily apparent from the plan which forms Appendix 8 to the Background Report.</p> <p>Initial Green Belt Review: Proposed Methodology (December 2017) 1.10 In the light of the findings from earlier consultations on options to meet the Borough's identified needs, the Council acknowledged in 2017 that there was a need to conduct a review of potential development options that may be available on sites within the Green Belt, and in October 2017 it published a Proposed Methodology for the review.</p> <p>In our submission to the Proposed Methodology, dated December 2017, we explained why Green Belt land in sustainable locations will need to be released from the Green Belt in order to meet the Borough's housing needs. We agreed with the need for urban regeneration in certain parts of the Borough, but we emphasised that this must be pursued as part of a strategy which releases sufficient deliverable sites in parts of the Borough that are attractive in market terms.</p> <p>We explained why the Council needs to take urgent action to rectify the significant shortfall in housing land supply across the Borough, and why there is a compelling and urgent need ('exceptional circumstances' in NPPF terms) to undertake a comprehensive review of the Green Belt in Wirral.</p> <p>Furthermore, we highlighted some of the key economic challenges which Wirral is facing, from the 'Wirral Growth Plan: A 2020 Vision':</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low economic productivity – lowest GVA per head in England • Low commercial property values • Evidence of market failure and viability constraints and lack of occupier confidence • Constrained development sites • Low jobs density ratio • Lower than average employment rates compared to the North West and England • Lack of modern quality business space • Lack of higher value jobs in the Borough • Large net daily migration of workers out of the Borough for employment purposes • Low educational attainment levels • Declining working age population <p>We noted that, to address the various issues and capitalise on Wirral's strengths, the same document recognises that a 'Strategic approach [is] needed to consider the balance between the supply and demand issues regarding employment land and housing sites'. The Council has therefore publicly recognised that, if left to market forces, the economic performance gap between Wirral and elsewhere is not likely to reduce. Delivering good quality new business premises will only be worthwhile if the local workforce is sufficiently skilled to make Wirral an attractive place for new businesses to want to invest in. Improving the skills base of Wirral's workforce requires investment in the Borough's educational infrastructure, and ensuring that there is sufficient good quality housing to attract new businesses and workers to Wirral. Making housing sites sufficiently attractive to developers is in turn partially dependent on the release of new high quality employment sites and instilling confidence that there are enough people who will want to buy the new housing.</p> <p>In our submission, we concluded that the lack of sufficient deliverable sites for residential development and the need to fulfil the objectives of the Council's Growth Plan represent the 'exceptional circumstances' that the NPPF advises need to be demonstrated in order for land to be released from the Green Belt. Failing to provide sufficient land for good quality housing, including the right amount of Green Belt land in sustainable locations that are attractive in market terms, will inevitably mean that the Council's ambitious corporate objectives will not be achieved.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>We also made detailed submissions regarding the strong credentials of our client's site. Our submission was comprehensive and so we do not repeat its content in full here, but for ease of reference we consider it worthwhile summarising key points, as follows.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Our client's site is well-related to Newton/West Kirby/Grange (which together form Settlement Area 6, as shown on the plan which now forms Appendix 1 to the Background Report3). • The north-western part of the site adjoins the boundary of Settlement Area 6. Whilst the remainder of the site's western boundary does not adjoin the boundary of Settlement Area 6, that is only because it is separated from it by allotments and Newton Park, which contains children's play facilities, tennis courts, a bowling green and football pitches. The site is therefore very well situated. • The site forms part of Green Belt Parcel SP008 (as defined on the plan which now forms Appendix 2 to the Background Report), but the land controlled by our client is a smaller parcel, namely site ref. 927 as defined on the plan in Appendix 8 to the Background Report. That is an important point because our client's site: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ is wholly within Flood Zone 1 (land at a low risk of flooding), as confirmed by the Environment Agency's online Flood Map for Planning; ○ does not contain any Core Biodiversity Areas (as confirmed by the plan which now forms Appendix 5 to the Initial Green Belt Review Revised Methodology of September 20184); ○ is not within an area of High Quality Agricultural Land (as shown by the plan which forms Appendix 7 to the Revised Methodology); and ○ represents a much more modest expansion of Settlement Area 6 than would be the case if Green Belt Parcel SP008 was released in its entirety. <p>We asserted in our submission of December 2017 that the smaller area of land controlled by our client should be assessed as part of the Green Belt Review, instead of (or as well as) the larger Green Belt Parcel SP008.</p> <p>We also confirmed in our submission of December 2017 that our client's site has been submitted as part of previous call for sites consultations (site ref. CS/EB/070) but was excluded from earlier SHLAA assessments, the stated reason being 'Entire site within an area of supporting habitat.'</p> <p>We explained, however, that our client's site does not contain any Core Biodiversity Areas and whilst it is located within a WeBS Core Count Area, that does not warrant the exclusion of the site from the Green Belt Review process. We elaborated on this critically important point in Section 3 of our December 2017 submission as well as the note from PBA's Associate Ecologist, Helen Evriadiades MCIEEM, which was provided as Appendix A to that submission. For ease of reference, we reproduce our ecologist's note as Appendix A to this current submission.</p> <p>Policy requirements in relation to green belt</p> <p>National Planning Policy Framework</p> <p>Paragraph 7 of the updated NPPF (published on 24 July 2018) states that the purpose of the planning system is to contribute to the achievement of sustainable development, and paragraph 10 advises that at the heart of the NPPF is a presumption in favour of sustainable development.</p> <p>Green Belt is covered in Chapter 13 of the revised NPPF. Paragraph 79 of the original NPPF has been carried forward into paragraph 133 of the updated NPPF, which confirms that the Government attaches great importance to Green Belts, and that '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.'</p> <p>Paragraph 134 confirms that the Green Belt serves five purposes, which are unaltered from the earlier version of the NPPF: 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> <p>The text previously at paragraph 83 of the NPPF has been replaced with the following text at paragraph 136 of the revised NPPF: 'Once established, Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified, through the preparation or updating of plans. Strategic policies should establish the need for any changes to Green Belt boundaries, having regard to their intended permanence in the long term, so they can endure beyond the plan period. Where a need for changes to Green Belt boundaries has been established through strategic policies, detailed amendments to those boundaries may be made through non-strategic policies, including neighbourhood plans.'</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Paragraph 137 of the revised NPPF introduces a new set of requirements relating to the demonstration of exceptional circumstances necessary to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, as follows:</p> <p>‘Before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries, the strategic policy-making authority should be able to demonstrate that it has examined fully all other reasonable options for meeting its identified need for development. This will be assessed through the examination of its strategic policies, which will take into account the preceding paragraph, and whether the strategy: a) makes as much use as possible of suitable brownfield sites and underutilised land; b) optimises the density of development in line with the policies in chapter 11 of this Framework, including whether policies promote a significant uplift in minimum density standards in town and city centres and other locations well served by public transport; and c) has been informed by discussions with neighbouring authorities about whether they could accommodate some of the identified need for development, as demonstrated through the statement of common ground.’</p> <p>Furthermore, previous paragraph 84 of the NPPF has been amended by new paragraph 138. As well as carrying forward the previous advice that the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, paragraph 138 includes the following additional text: ‘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 also 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 remaining Green Belt land.’</p> <p>Accordingly, the revised NPPF sets out a range of new and additional requirements that need to be satisfied before concluding that exceptional circumstances exist to justify changes to Green Belt boundaries. The burden of evidence placed upon LPAs has therefore increased, albeit there remains no statutory approach or standardised methodology for assessing exceptional circumstances, and so ultimately it is for LPAs to determine an appropriate approach and reach a view as to whether they consider that exceptional circumstances exist to justify removing land from the Green Belt.</p> <p>Whilst the revised NPPF does not refer to it, a High Court Judgment of 21 April 2015⁵ may be instructive to LPAs which are considering amending their Green Belt boundaries. In paragraph 50 of his Approved Judgment, Mr Justice Jay found that the existence of an objectively assessed need is not sufficient to amount to exceptional circumstances. In paragraph 51, Mr Justice Jay then set out the following five matters for consideration in assessing whether there are exceptional circumstances with regard to the release of Green Belt land through the local plan process:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • the acuteness/intensity of the objectively assessed need; • the inherent constraints on supply/availability of land prima facie suitable for sustainable development; • the consequent difficulties in achieving sustainable development without impinging on the Green Belt; • the nature and extent of the harm to the Green Belt (or those parts of it which would be lost if the boundaries were reviewed); and • the extent to which the consequent impacts on the purposes of the Green Belt may be ameliorated or reduced to the lowest reasonably practicable extent. <p>When defining Green Belt boundary changes, paragraph 139 of the NPPF recommends that local planning authorities should apply the following criteria, which are substantially unaltered from paragraph 85 of the original NPPF:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) ensure consistency with the development plan’s strategy for meeting identified requirements for sustainable development; b) not include land which it is unnecessary to keep permanently open; c) where necessary, identify in their plans areas of ‘safeguarded land’ between the urban area and the Green Belt, in order to meet longer-term development needs stretching well beyond the plan period; d) make clear that the safeguarded land is not allocated for development at the present time. Planning permission for the permanent development of safeguarded land should only be granted following an updated to a plan review which proposes the development; e) be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and f) define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent. <p>Local Planning Policy Context</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Local Planning Policy Context 2.10 The majority of the existing Green Belt boundary in Wirral was established by the Merseyside Green Belt Local Plan, which was adopted in 1983.</p> <p>As we explained in Section 1 of this submission, the Council has conducted various consultations on the Borough's housing needs and land supply over recent years, as part of the preparation of the emerging Local Plan. The Council has taken account of supply from existing planning commitments as well as sources from sites that are not within the Green Belt.</p> <p>As Section 2 of the Initial Green Belt Review Background Report explains, the Council's assessments have found that there are insufficient development opportunities to meet the likely need for new housing. Accordingly, in February 2017, the Council's Cabinet approved the undertaking of a wider review of potential development options before any decision is taken on the final sites to be included in the Local Plan.</p> <p>The Council has duly completed its Initial Green Belt Review, which is the subject of the current consultation. In Section 3 of this submission, we provide our observations regarding the findings from the Council's Initial Green Belt Review.</p> <p>Overarching Observations on the Green Belt Methodology</p> <p>Before we comment on the detail of the Council's Initial Green Belt Review Background Report, we have the following headline observations regarding the Council's methodology:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • As we explained in our submission of December 2017, to focus only on the larger parcels would have run the risk of overlooking sites that are well-placed to contribute to meeting the Borough's challenging growth requirements. We therefore endorse the Council's approach of assessing smaller areas of land – that is, the SHLAA sites, including our client's site at Frankby Road – in addition to the larger Green Belt Parcels. • We also provided our view in our December 2017 submission that assessing greenfield Green Belt sites against only the five NPPF 'purposes' invariably makes it difficult to distinguish between the credentials of candidate sites. That is because all greenfield Green Belt sites are, by definition, outside of settlement boundaries and their release will therefore result in a narrowing of the gaps between neighbouring towns, and some degree of encroachment. Accordingly, paragraph 138 of the NPPF advises that when local authorities are deciding where to accommodate growth, it is important to take into account sustainable patterns of development. • Furthermore, we observed in our previous submission that the fourth Green Belt 'purpose' is largely redundant except in locations such as York, Chester and Bath and so most sites will perform the same in relation to that purpose. Similarly, most sites also achieve a similar rating against the fifth purpose. • Against the background outlined above, we agree with the Council's view (as stated in paragraph 5.4 of Initial Green Belt Review Background Report) that, of the five Green Belt purposes, only the first two appear to allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites. Those two purposes are quite similar in nature, however, for the reasons outlined below. • Accordingly, we firmly believe that decisions on which sites are best placed to meet identified needs should be informed by a broader range of factors, including the need to promote sustainable patterns of development, as directed by paragraph 138 of the NPPF. <p>In our submission of December 2017, we highlighted the statement in the proposed methodology for the Green Belt Review that boundaries should be defined using 'mainly roads and railways'. We noted that the penultimate bullet beneath paragraph 85 of the NPPF did not advise that durable boundaries should be confined to roads and railways.</p> <p>We also highlighted the further advice within paragraph 85 of the NPPF. A slightly amended version of that advice has been carried through into paragraph 139 of the updated NPPF, which advises that when defining Green Belt boundaries, plans should: 'e) be able to demonstrate that Green Belt boundaries will not need to be altered at the end of the plan period; and f) define boundaries clearly, using physical features that are readily recognisable and likely to be permanent.'</p> <p>Thus, the updated version of the NPPF does not restrict boundaries to roads and railways. As we explained in our December 2017 submission, the release of our client's site would enable the provision of much-needed development in a sustainable location, but only up the boundary of the higher-quality agricultural land to the east of the site. Releasing our client's land up to the existing hedge-line boundary would not set a precedent for further incremental encroachment beyond that boundary, because that land would remain within the Green Belt and any calls to release it at the end of the forthcoming plan period could be resisted on the basis that it constitutes higher quality agricultural land.</p> <p>Furthermore, we are aware of situations where a local authority has specifically required the planting of new trees to further bolster existing durable boundaries. Should the Council wish to release</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>our client's land for much-needed residential use, our client would be amenable to bolstering the existing hedge-line boundary and it has engaged a landscape architect (Environmental Associates) to work up initial proposals.</p> <p>Assessment against the Green Belt Purposes</p> <p>Purpose 1 – To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas</p> <p>Paragraph 5.4 of Green Belt Review Background Report provides the Council's view that of the five Green Belt purposes, only Purposes 1 and 2 appear to allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites.</p> <p>Regarding Purpose 1, the Green Belt Parcels were assessed in terms of their degree of 'urban enclosure', namely the proportion of the Parcel's total perimeter that is adjacent to the existing urban boundary. Green Belt Parcel SP008 achieved an 'urban enclosure' score of 23 per cent and was rated as poorly enclosed.</p> <p>The SHLAA sites were assessed against the same measure, but paragraph 3.13 of the Background Report states that none of the SHLAA sites was identified as 'highly enclosed'.</p> <p>In response, we confirm that the north-western part of our client's site adjoins the boundary of Settlement Area 6. We acknowledge that the remainder of the site's western boundary does not adjoin the boundary of Settlement Area 6, but that is only because it is separated from it by allotments and Newton Park, which contains children's play facilities, tennis courts, a bowling green and football pitches. The site is therefore very well situated in relation to the existing settlement and we believe that the low 'urban enclosure' score assigned to our client's site does not provide a true representation of the site's excellent locational sustainability.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above it is clear that a residential scheme at our client's site at Frankby Road will not represent urban sprawl. Our client's site is much smaller than Parcel SP008 and is very well related to the existing settlement boundary, far more so than SHLAA site refs. 1943 and 1965, and in our view also SHLAA site ref. 1944, which is arguably better-related to Settlement Area 6 than the other two sites but is still inferior to site ref. 927 because of its irregular shape. The relationship of the four SHLAA sites to Settlement Area 6 is shown in an extract from the background report.</p> <p>Purpose 2 – To prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another</p> <p>The Council's analysis identified some 54 Green Belt Parcels that, if developed, would have no impact on separation (Purpose 2). Parcel SP008 is not one of the 54 Parcels within Table 2 of the Background Report.</p> <p>The table within Appendix 5 to the Background Report indicates that the release of Parcel SP008 would 'remove' the separation between Settlement Area 6 and Frankby. The commentary provided in Appendix 5 for Parcel SP008 is worth reproducing in full here, for ease of reference: 'Would remove the physical separation between Greasby (SA5) and Newton (SA6) and the physical separation between Greasby (SA5), Newton (SA6) and the rural village of Frankby, which could affect the character, appearance and distinctiveness of Frankby Conservation Area.' Crucially, the comments in Appendices 5 and 6 relate to Green Belt Parcel SP008, which extends considerably further to the east than our client's site. We reiterate that our client's site (ref. 927 on the plan above) is much smaller than Parcel SP008 – 13.15 hectares versus 89.37 hectares – and is very well related to the existing settlement boundary. The eastern extent of our client's site is only very slightly beyond the existing eastern boundary of Settlement Area 6 and so the release of the site for residential use would certainly not remove the gap between Settlement Area 6 and Frankby / Greasby.</p> <p>Furthermore, we reiterate that, should the Council wish to release our client's land for much-needed residential use to help meet identified needs in this part of the Borough, our client would be amenable to supplementing the existing hedge-line boundary in order to create a suitably robust and enduring boundary. Our client will be pleased to work collaboratively with the Council's planning and landscape teams to design a suitably robust boundary that will represent an enduring new Green Belt boundary.</p> <p>Purpose 3 – To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment</p> <p>Appendix 3 to the Background Report provides the Council's assessment of the extent to which each Green Belt Parcel would assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment. As would be</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>expected given their status as greenfield sites within the Green Belt, most of the Parcels are recorded as being 'subject to existing countryside uses.' The exceptions are a handful of Parcels which are either within a conservation area or another defined area (such as an infill village or a hospital site) which restricts further intrusion.</p> <p>Accordingly, it is difficult to distinguish between regarding their performance in relation to Purpose 3, which explains the Council's comments in paragraph 5.4 of the Background Report, namely that it is only Green Purposes 1 and 2 which allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites.</p> <p>Purpose 4 – To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns</p> <p>It is not possible to distinguish between the Green Belt Parcels in terms of their performance regarding Purpose 4, given that none of the Parcels are thought to preserve the setting of a historic town and so they all achieve the same score/rating.</p> <p>Purpose 5 – To assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land</p> <p>As with Purpose 4, all of Green Belt Parcels perform equally in relation to Purpose 5, the notes in the table within Appendix 3 to the Background Report stating 'All sites achieve this.'</p> <p>Green Belt Purposes – Summary</p> <p>All of the Green Belt Parcels perform the same in relation to Purposes 4 and 5, and Purpose 3 (with a handful of exceptions), for the reasons outlined above. Accordingly, we agree with the Council that only Green Purposes 1 and 2 allow for an objective and robustly measurable differentiation between individual sites, insofar as the five Green Belt purposes are concerned.</p> <p>Our client's site only achieves a modest 'urban enclosure' because it is separated from the settlement boundary by allotments and Newton Park, which contains children's play facilities, tennis courts, a bowling green and football pitches. The site is therefore very well situated in relation to the existing settlement. We believe that the measure used for the first Green Belt purpose does not provide a true representation of the site's excellent locational sustainability. It is clear that a residential scheme at our client's site at Frankby Road will not represent urban sprawl.</p> <p>Furthermore, our client's site is much smaller than Parcel SP008 – 13.15 hectares versus 89.37 hectares – and it will not result in coalescence of settlements.</p> <p>The remaining three Green Belt purposes are essentially neutral.</p> <p>Accordingly, when assessed against the Green Belt purposes, there is no objective evidence for resisting the proposed release of our client's site at Frankby Road. The reason our client's site has not been put forward for further consideration is essentially because it is within a much larger Green Belt Parcel that would reduce the gap between Settlement Area 6 and Frankby/Greasby.</p> <p>Rather than focusing only on the first two Green Belt purposes – noting again that the other three purposes are neutral – we believe that the Council should afford much greater weight to the merits of candidate SHLAA sites in its deliberations. Paragraph 138 of the NPPF advises that identified needs should be met in sustainable locations. The NPPF does not advise that decisions in which sites to release should be largely informed by measuring the proportion of a site's perimeter that is coincident with an existing settlement boundary.</p> <p>Against the background outlined above, we urge the Council to review the accompanying Delivery Statement, which demonstrates that there are no physical, environmental, ecological or other constraints that will prevent our client's site coming forward for housing.</p> <p>Other considerations</p> <p>Sites for further investigation</p> <p>Appendix 14 to the Background Report shows the location of the Green Belt sites that have been identified for further investigation. Most of the sites are adjacent to Settlement Area 4 in the eastern part of the Borough, and there are 13 adjacent to Settlement Area 7.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>In contrast, only two of the sites for further investigation are adjacent to Settlement Area 6, despite Settlement Area 6 comprising the settlements of West Kirby, Grange and Newton. We also note that one of the two sites for further investigation – namely Green Belt Parcel SP013 – contains land that is a Core Biodiversity Area.</p> <p>Furthermore, the Proposed Housing Allocations document only identifies seven sites in West Kirby, with a combined notional capacity of just 74 units. 4.4 Accordingly, insufficient provision is being made to meet the residential needs – both market and affordable – of the Newton/Frankby/West Kirby area. Wirral's identified housing requirements are very challenging and it is essential that sufficient land is released in strong market areas rather than focusing too narrowly on the eastern part of the Borough.</p> <p>We will make representations regarding the amount and type of housing that is needed in Wirral, at the appropriate juncture, although we note here that the scale of the challenge will inevitably be very significant. Wirral is unable to demonstrate a five-year supply of deliverable housing land when measured against the current target (500 dwellings per annum) and the Council's evidence acknowledges that the target is set to rise by several hundred dwellings per annum.</p> <p>We will also provide submissions regarding the Council's claimed supply when the SHLAA is published for consultation, suffice to reiterate here that any supply claimed from SHLAA sites needs to be realistic.</p> <p>For the reasons outlined above, we therefore urge the Council to give further consideration to our client's site at Frankby Road, which is free from significant constraints and is deliverable in the short-term, being wholly within the ownership of our client.</p> <p>Ecological Considerations</p> <p>As noted above, one of the two sites for further investigation adjacent to Settlement Area 6 (Green Belt Parcel SP013) contains land that is a Core Biodiversity Area. In contrast, whilst we understand that part of the wider Green Belt Parcel SP008 contains a Core Biodiversity Area, we confirm that our client's site does not contain any Core Biodiversity Areas.</p> <p>Furthermore, for the reasons explained in detail as part of our December 2017 submission, whilst our client's site is located within a WeBS Core Count Area, that does not warrant the exclusion of the site from the Green Belt Review process. The Council has not yet formally identified functionally linked land for waterbirds, and so it should not be ruling out sites on the basis that they might have potential for waterbirds. Please refer to the note from PBA's Associate Ecologist, MCIEEM, which was provided as Appendix A to our earlier submission and is reproduced as Appendix A to this current submission.</p> <p>Our client has commissioned Wintering Bird Survey covering its site at Frankby Road, and the wider Caldby Fields WeBS count sector within which the site is located. The survey commenced in September 2018 and will continue at monthly intervals until March 2019. The purpose of the survey is to record and map bird distribution and use (behaviour and within sector movements), with a focus on the SPA qualifying species, in order to determine the importance (or not) of the Count Sector in relation to nearby designated areas associated with the coastline. To provide the most useful information, each monthly survey event will cover both low and high tide states at the nearby coast, to pick up potential bird movements through the tidal cycle.</p> <p>The analysis of the recorded bird data from the ongoing bird surveys will be used to inform scheme design over the coming months. Other Matters</p> <p>The entry for our client's site within Appendix 9 to the Background Report refers to a 'weak field boundary'. We reiterate, however, that our client would be amenable to bolstering the existing hedge-line boundary and it has engaged a landscape architect to work up initial proposals, working collaboratively with the Council's planning and landscape teams. Furthermore, as we emphasised in Section 3, the updated version of the NPPF does not restrict Green Belt boundaries to roads and railways.</p> <p>As well as the excellent locational sustainability that we highlighted earlier in our submission, we note that our client's site falls within one of the Borough's 'Areas of Highest Accessibility', as depicted on the plan within Appendix 20 to the Background Report.</p> <p>We have reviewed the 'Development Options Review – Briefing Session' document (September 2018) are surprised to see SHLAA site refs. 1943 and 1965 described as 'no separation sites' (page 31). The plan is low-resolution and so we do not reproduce it here, but it is immediately apparent from inspection of the plan that those two sites encroach into the open countryside much more significantly than our client's site at Frankby Road, which extends only very slightly beyond the existing eastern boundary of Settlement Area 6.</p>

DOR REF	RESPONSE
	<p>Other Matters</p> <p>The entry for our client's site within Appendix 9 to the Background Report refers to a 'weak field boundary'. We reiterate, however, that our client would be amenable to bolstering the existing hedge-line boundary and it has engaged a landscape architect to work up initial proposals, working collaboratively with the Council's planning and landscape teams. Furthermore, as we emphasised in Section 3, the updated version of the NPPF does not restrict Green Belt boundaries to roads and railways.</p> <p>As well as the excellent locational sustainability that we highlighted earlier in our submission, we note that our client's site falls within one of the Borough's 'Areas of Highest Accessibility', as depicted on the plan within Appendix 20 to the Background Report.</p> <p>We have reviewed the 'Development Options Review – Briefing Session' document (September 2018) and are surprised to see SHLAA site refs. 1943 and 1965 described as 'no separation sites' (page 31). The plan is low-resolution and so we do not reproduce it here, but it is immediately apparent from inspection of the plan that those two sites encroach into the open countryside much more significantly than our client's site at Frankby Road, which extends only very slightly beyond the existing eastern boundary of Settlement Area 6.</p>