

Contents

Consultation Statement	
1 Introduction	3
2 Background	3
3 Initial Consultation	5
4 Issues, Vision and Objectives	6
5 Spatial Options	6
6 Preferred Options	7
7 Settlement Area Policies	7
8 Proposed Submission Draft	8
Policy Development	
9 Spatial Portrait	9
10 Spatial Vision	11
11 Spatial Objectives	13
12 Broad Spatial Strategy	16
Strategic Policies	
13 Housing Growth	20
14 Employment Growth	32
15 Town Centres	34
16 New City Neighbourhood	38
17 Green Infrastructure	41
18 Minerals	44
19 Waste Management	45

Contents

20 Renewable Energy	47
Settlement Area Policies	
21 Settlement Area Policies	49
Development Management	
22 Development Management	52
23 Developer Contributions	58
Delivery Framework	
24 Delivery Framework	60
25 Monitoring, Targets and Indicators	61
Appendices	
26 Record of Compliance With Statement of Community Involvement	62
27 Specific Consultation Bodies Consulted	66
28 General Consultation Bodies Consulted	67
29 Other Consultees	72

1 Introduction

1.1 This document is the consultation statement required to accompany the publication of a Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy for the Metropolitan Borough of Wirral under Regulation 19 of the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012⁽¹⁾.

1.2 The document sets out the background to the consultation undertaken by the Council to inform the preparation of the Core Strategy and records:

- the bodies and people that were invited to make representations on the emerging Core Strategy;
- how those bodies and people were invited to make representations;
- a summary of the main issues that were raised by those representations; and
- how those issues have been addressed in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy.

1.3 Separate more detailed reports of consultation have been prepared at each stage of the preparation of the Core Strategy and are referred to as relevant throughout this document.

1.4 This document also reports on work undertaken to satisfy the duty to co-operate introduced by the Section 110 of the Localism Act 2011, which requires the Council to co-operate with a number of specified bodies and agencies on strategic matters, to maximise the effectiveness of the Core Strategy with regard to the sustainable development or use of land or in connection with infrastructure that is strategic and has or would have a significant impact on at least two district council planning areas.

1.5 For further information please contact: Wirral Council, Regeneration Housing and Planning, Town Hall, Brighton Street, Wallasey, Wirral CH44 8ED - Telephone 0151 691 8192 - Email lauramyles@wirral.gov.uk

2 Background

2.1 The Core Strategy is a long term planning document that will set the overall framework for future development and investment in Wirral over the next 15 years to 2028. It is not intended to set out site-specific proposals, which will be included in a site-specific land allocations document that will be prepared once the Core Strategy has been adopted.

2.2 Once adopted, the Core Strategy will form part of the statutory Development Plan for the Borough and will be used as the basis for the determination of individual planning applications and for other decisions taken under the Planning Acts.

1 SI 2012 No. 767

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

2.3 The Core Strategy will replace some of the policies and proposals in the Unitary Development Plan for Wirral adopted in February 2000⁽²⁾.

2.4 A Core Strategy must be prepared in accordance with national procedures for Development Plans, including the Planning and Compulsory Purchase Act 2004 (as amended), the Town and Country Planning (Local Planning) (England) Regulations 2012 and the National Planning Policy Framework published in March 2012.

2.5 The content of the Core Strategy has been subject to public and stakeholder consultation on four previous occasions. This has included:

- initial consultation on strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and local needs in October 2005, with comments invited through an open letter followed by public workshops in November 2006 and further consultation with under-represented groups during summer 2007;
- consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives in February 2009, with comments invited on a consultation document including a spatial portrait and a series of consultation questions;
- consultation on Spatial Options in January 2010, with comments invited on a consultation document including an extended spatial portrait, associated evidence base documents and a consultation questionnaire;
- consultation on Preferred Options in November 2010, with comments invited on a series of consultation documents including a revised spatial portrait, options assessment report, further evidence base documents and a consultation questionnaire; and
- consultation on Settlement Area Policies in January 2012, with comments invited on a series of draft policies and associated background information for each of eight identified settlement areas.

2.6 Reports of consultation from each stage are available for public inspection alongside this document. A summary of each stage is set out in the table below:

Document/Stage	Consultation Period	Report of Results
Initial Consultation	17 October - 2 December 2005	Initial Report of Public Consultation (July 2006)
Workshops	November 2006	Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009)
Under-Represented Groups	June - October 2007	Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009)

² a list of the policies affected is set out in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Document/Stage	Consultation Period	Report of Results
Issues, Vision and Objectives	2 February - 27 March 2009	Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives (January 2010)
Spatial Options	11 January - 5 March 2010	Report of Consultation on Spatial Options (November 2010)
Preferred Options	15 November 2010 - 7 January 2011	Report of Consultation on Preferred Options (December 2012)
Settlement Area Policies	30 January 2012 - 12 March 2012	Report of Consultation on Settlement Area Policies (December 2012)

Section 3 of the Council's Statement of Community Involvement adopted in December 2006 set out the methods of community involvement that were likely to be undertaken throughout the process of preparing a development plan document. The types of method that were employed and the volume of responses received at each stage in the preparation of the Core Strategy are set out in the table in Section 26 of this document.

2.7 The remainder of this document summarises the documents made available for public consultation and sets out how the responses to each stage of consultation have been used to inform the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy.

2.8 The main consultation documents for each of the previous stages in the plan preparation process set out below can still be downloaded from the Council's website <http://www.wirral.gov.uk/my-services/environment-and-planning/planning/local-development-framework/core-strategy-development-plan>

3 Initial Consultation

3.1 Initial consultation involved the issue of consultation letters inviting open comment on the strengths, weaknesses, opportunities, threats and needs of the Borough to contacts from the Council's Local Development Framework database, as well as to MPs, Councillors and Area Forum representatives. The results of the analysis of responses were set out in an Initial Report of Public Consultation (July 2006).

3.2 In November 2006, two workshops were held to consider the findings of the initial consultation, to help to prioritise the issues raised and to begin to consider the possible objectives for the Core Strategy and some of the options likely to be available for future development in the Borough. The results of this additional consultation were set out in the Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009).

3.3 Subsequent consultation during summer 2007, with groups under-represented at the workshops, including people representing the mid-Wirral settlements, younger people, BME groups and disabled people, confirmed many of the comments already submitted but also included new comments related to their principal areas of concern.

3.4 The results of the consultation with under-represented groups were also contained within the Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009).

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

3.5 The results of this initial consultation were used to inform the developing issues, vision and objectives for the Core Strategy.

4 Issues, Vision and Objectives

4.1 Consultation on the Issues, Vision and Objectives took place on the following documents, accompanied by the two previous reports of consultation:

- an Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009);
- an Initial Sustainability Appraisal Report (February 2009); and
- an Initial Equality Impact Statement (February 2009).

4.2 Comments were invited on any part of these documents. The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report also invited comments on nine consultation questions designed to focus attention on specific areas of the document.

4.3 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report included a brief spatial portrait of the Borough, including a summary of the social, economic and environmental context; information related to natural resources and quality of life; the results of previous consultation; the wider regional planning and corporate policy context; the available evidence base; current and emerging regeneration activity; emerging issues and challenges; an initial spatial vision; potential strategic policy objectives; and some initial thoughts about the future framework for delivery.

5 Spatial Options

5.1 Consultation on Spatial Options took place on the following documents, accompanied by the three reports of previous consultation:

- Core Strategy Spatial Options Report (January 2010)
- Spatial Options Interim Sustainability Appraisal (January 2010)
- Spatial Options Initial Equality Impact Statement (January 2010)
- Habitats Regulations Assessment - Interim Screening Assessment (November 2009)

5.2 The Spatial Options Report set out a Spatial Portrait for the Borough, including a Borough profile and eight Settlement Area profiles; a revised Spatial Vision; eleven suggested Spatial Objectives; three Broad Spatial Options; and policy options for housing; employment; retailing; renewable, decentralised and low carbon energy; design; development management; developer contributions; and green infrastructure.

5.3 A short, 8-page taster booklet, summarising the content of the Spatial Options Report and each of the three Broad Spatial Options; and a separate paper questionnaire were also circulated.

5.4 Comments were invited on any part of these documents. The Spatial Options Report also invited comments on twenty-two consultation questions designed to focus attention on specific areas of the document. A separate consultation question asked if any other policy areas should be included in the Core Strategy (Consultation Question 22, page 199).

6 Preferred Options

6.1 Consultation on Preferred Options included the following documents, accompanied by the four previous reports of consultation:

- Core Strategy Preferred Options Report (November 2010)
- Core Strategy Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010)
- Core Strategy Preferred Options Revised Spatial Portrait (November 2010)
- Preferred Options Sustainability Appraisal Report (November 2010)
- Preferred Options Equality Impact Statement (November 2010)
- Preferred Options Habitats Regulations Assessment (November 2010)
- Preferred Options Draft Delivery Framework (November 2010)
- Preferred Options Implications for Unitary Development Plan Policies and Proposals (November 2010)

6.2 The Preferred Options Report set out twenty-one Preferred Options including options related to the plan period; proposed Settlement Area policies; the Preferred Spatial Vision; seven Preferred Spatial Objectives; the Preferred Broad Spatial Strategy; and policy options for housing; employment; town centres and retailing; renewable, decentralised and low carbon energy; design; development management; developer contributions; green infrastructure; minerals; waste management; and strategic locations.

6.3 A separate paper questionnaire; A4 colour copies of the Key Diagram; and a shorter Extract of the Preferred Options, setting out only the text to each Preferred Option, were also circulated.

6.4 Consultation on the findings of a Wirral Open Space Assessment and a Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment was also undertaken alongside the Preferred Options Report.

6.5 Comments were invited on any aspect of these documents. The Preferred Options Report also invited comments on twenty-four Consultation Questions designed to focus attention on specific areas of the document. A separate consultation question asked for any other comments on the Preferred Options Report and its supporting documents (Consultation Question 24, page 88).

7 Settlement Area Policies

7.1 Consultation on draft Settlement Area Policies included the following documents:

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

- Background Information for Additional Consultation on Settlement Area Policies (generic document)
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 1 - Wallasey
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 1 - Wallasey
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 2 - Commercial Core
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 2 - Commercial Core
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 3 - Suburban Birkenhead
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 3 - Suburban Birkenhead
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 4 - Bromborough and Eastham
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 4 - Bromborough and Eastham
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 5 - Mid-Wirral
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 5 - Mid-Wirral
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 6 - Hoylake and West Kirby
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 6 - Hoylake and West Kirby
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 7 - Heswall
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 7 - Heswall
- Draft Settlement Area Policy - Settlement Area 8 - Rural Areas
- Draft Settlement Area Policy Map - Settlement Area 8 - Rural Areas
- Map Legend (generic document)

7.2 In each case, respondents were asked to comment on a short summary vision statement for each Settlement Area; a draft Settlement Area Policy, which set out the principal spatial priorities that were to be applied within each Settlement Area; and a reasoned justification, which set out some of the latest available figures and background to why the priorities had been identified.

8 Proposed Submission Draft

8.1 Consultation on the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy will include the following documents, accompanied by the previous reports of consultation:

- Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Spatial Portrait (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal Non-Technical Summary (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal Baseline Review (December 2012)

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

- Proposed Submission Draft Equality Impact Statement (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Habitats Regulations Assessment (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Delivery Framework (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Infrastructure Plan (December 2012)
- Proposed Submission Draft Monitoring Plan (December 2012)

8.2 The Proposed Submission Draft will invite comments on a series of forty-five draft policies, together with their reasoned justification. An impact matrix, which accompanies each policy in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, summarises the main findings of the Sustainability Appraisal; Habitats Regulations Assessment; and Equality Impact Assessment; and summarises the main risks, alternatives, monitoring indicators and evidence base for each policy.

8.3 Comments will be invited on the legal compliance and soundness of any of the draft policies and on any aspect of the accompanying documents.

8.4 The remainder of this document sets out how the responses to each stage of consultation have been used to inform the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy and broadly follows the format of the Preferred Options presented in the Preferred Options Report.

9 Spatial Portrait

9.1 A spatial analysis of the characteristics of Wirral and the key issues and challenges facing the Borough first appeared as background information in the Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009), based upon the findings of Initial Consultation and Annual Monitoring Reports prepared since December 2005.

9.2 The spatial analysis included an introductory summary (Issues Vision and Objectives Report, page 5) and five separate sections under the headings of social context (page 8), economic context (page 9), environmental context (page 10), natural resources (page 12) and quality of life (page 13), each followed by a separate consultation question asking for comments about their accuracy.

9.3 Consultation suggested that the analysis was too simplistic; that further detail was required; and that key conclusions and issues needed to be drawn out (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 7). These and other comments on current and emerging regeneration activity, emerging issues and challenges and potential strategic policy objectives (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 37, page 53 and page 104 refer), were used to inform revisions to the Spatial Portrait to be contained within the Spatial Options Report.

Spatial Options

9.4 A more detailed Spatial Portrait first appeared as part of the Spatial Options Report (January 2010), to set out a brief description of the main features of the Borough followed by a description of each of the Borough's main settlement areas, alongside further information from the emerging evidence base.

9.5 The Borough Profile set out summary text under the headings of Borough context; historic context; economic context; social context; housing context; transport context; environmental context; community facilities; waste management; and a list of key issues and key statistics for the Borough as a whole (Spatial Options Report, page 5).

9.6 The series of Settlement Area Profiles set out summary text under the headings of socio-economic background; housing; local heritage; town centres; employment; recreation and culture; social and other infrastructure; coast and flooding; and addressed any distinctive features and/or development opportunities alongside a list of key issues and a common list of key statistics for each Settlement Area (Spatial Options Report, page 19).

9.7 The approach was welcomed by most respondents and published as an example of good practice by the national Planning Advisory Service.

9.8 A separate consultation question asked whether the spatial portraits were agreed and whether anything else needed to be included (Spatial Options Report, page 69).

9.9 Responses provided detailed comments and observations, ranging from detailed historical corrections to the need for transport studies to be undertaken but a number of respondents wanted the Core Strategy to be more explicit about the Borough's strengths and assets (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 10).

Preferred Options

9.10 The Spatial Portrait was amended in light of the comments received and provided as a separate background document to the Preferred Options Report (November 2010), which now only set out a summary of the main changes to national policy; national economy; national statistics; progress on major developments; and a list of "key assets" and "drivers for change" (Preferred Options Report, page 6).

9.11 The Revised Spatial Portrait (November 2010) set out a revised Borough Profile setting out summary text under the headings of Borough context; historic context; economic context; social context; housing context; transport context; environmental context; community facilities; waste management; minerals; and a revised list of key issues and key statistics for the Borough as a whole (Revised Spatial Portrait, page 3).

9.12 The Revised Spatial Portrait also set out eight revised Settlement Area Profiles under the headings of socio-economic background; housing; local heritage; town centres; employment; tourism; development opportunities; community facilities; open space and nature; transport accessibility; other infrastructure; air quality; coast and flooding; and a revised list of key issues and key statistics for each Settlement Area (Revised Spatial Portrait, page 23 and onwards).

9.13 Consultation on the Revised Spatial Portrait prompted a smaller number of more focused comments, primarily providing additional local details (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 7) and the information provided was used to inform the background to the consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies undertaken in January 2012.

Proposed Submission Draft

9.14 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy is, again, accompanied by a separate, updated Spatial Portrait, amended to take account of comments received in response to the consultations on Preferred Options (November 2010) and Draft Settlement Area Policies (January 2012) and the results of ongoing monitoring; allowing the Proposed Submission Draft to concentrate on presenting a summary of the major strategic relationships with the surrounding areas (Proposed Submission Draft, page 6).

9.15 The Monitoring Plan published alongside the Proposed Submission Draft proposes that the Spatial Portrait should be reviewed and re-published on an annual basis, as part of the ongoing monitoring of the impact and delivery of the adopted Core Strategy.

10 Spatial Vision

10.1 The second session of each of the two workshops held in November 2006 were asked to consider the future vision for Wirral, in terms of what they would want Wirral to be, what they thought the Council should be trying to achieve and how the themes and priorities of the Community Strategy Getting Better Together 2003-2013 could be delivered. The results are set out in the Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009, page 8).

10.2 The workshops shared a general consensus that Wirral should seek to be different from Liverpool. Participants considered that the focus of any new vision for Wirral should focus on promoting jobs, leisure and tourism alongside the protection of unique features such as the natural environment, coastline and heritage. Less emphasis should be placed on addressing east-west divisions and more on local distinctiveness, care over the design of new development and meeting identified local needs. Continued regeneration in and around Birkenhead and the Docks was supported, to address the underlying problems of the surrounding areas and improve quality of life.

10.3 The main priorities identified for a future strategy were jobs, affordable family housing, meeting local needs, improved design quality, brownfield regeneration, the reuse of existing buildings and vacant units, improvements to the waterfront and the protection of heritage and open countryside, better public transport to reduce the impact of traffic and parking and more support for local centres, social enterprise and small businesses. Climate change and sustainable development were also identified as significant priorities for the future.

Issues, Vision and Objectives

10.4 An initial outline of potential fifteen-point draft Spatial Vision was first set out in the Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009, page 40). A separate consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with the Spatial Vision and if not, how it could be improved (page 41). Comments sought further detail to be included and a further explanation for the rationale for the emerging Vision (Report of Consultation on Issues Vision and Objectives, page 98).

Spatial Options

10.5 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out a more detailed, sixteen-point Spatial Vision, with clearer references to individual Settlement Areas (page 80) and provided additional background information on the wider context that had informed it, related to the Wirral Investment Strategy, Sustainable Community Strategy⁽³⁾, Local Area Agreement, Council Corporate Plan and wider policy context including the Green Belt, Regional Spatial Strategy and other national, regional and sub-regional initiatives (page 70). A separate consultation question, again, asked whether respondents agreed with the amended Spatial Vision and if not, how it could be improved (page 82).

10.6 Consultation showed a broad level of support but a number of people thought that the Vision was now probably too long to be easily understood. Some thought the Vision was over-ambitious; that the Council was pinning most of its hopes on Wirral Waters, with no "Plan B"; and that greater reference should be made to the limitations of the peninsula and the Borough's traditional role as dormitory to Liverpool. Others did not believe that all the Borough's needs could be met by large scale housing provision in east Wirral and wanted the Vision to refer to the need to secure benefits over a wider area, outside regeneration priority areas and/or to allow for urban extensions. Another wanted a clearer link with other sub-regional initiatives⁽⁴⁾.

10.7 A number, nevertheless, felt that the Vision was too vague with regard to the role of the rural areas and should refer to agriculture, local production, food security and the Green Belt. Cultural facilities, sport and recreation and care for the elderly were also identified as missing items. Other responses sought a greater focus on the environment alongside social and economic concerns; greater clarity on the need to increase the population and reduce out-commuting; better integration with sustainable transport objectives; and wanted climate change and energy security to have a higher priority (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 46).

3 Wirral 2025 - More Equal More Prosperous (April 2009)

4 such as the Atlantic Gateway, Strategic Regional Sites, Liverpool SuperPort, Liverpool John Lennon Airport, the Port of Liverpool, Manchester Ship Canal and Liverpool Waters

Preferred Options

10.8 The revised Spatial Vision contained within the Preferred Options Report (November 2010, Preferred Option 3 - Spatial Vision, page 14) sought to address a number of the points raised in consultation but aimed to concentrate on genuinely strategic issues, to keep the Vision as short as possible and allow any additional detail to be included elsewhere. The revised sustainability appraisal indicated that the Vision was sustainable and would support employment and market renewal, enhance local distinctiveness and sustainable approaches to energy, waste and water. A consultation question asked respondents to say whether they agreed with the Vision and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 16).

10.9 The majority of those who disagreed, were concerned about the continued focus on east Wirral and the reliance on Wirral Waters, rather than on the needs of communities elsewhere. A number thought the references to rural areas were too narrow and did not recognise the role of rural development, particularly in relation to major developed sites and existing rural settlements. Another questioned the appropriateness of measuring economic progress against regional average levels. Others wanted more direct references to sport, heritage, habitats, green infrastructure, a more explicit commitment to energy security and carbon reduction, and greater care over the promotion of tourism to be included (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 18).

Proposed Submission Draft

10.10 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy (December 2012, page 11) largely retained the Spatial Vision contained within the Preferred Options Report but with changes in wording to clarify the focus on existing urban areas; the purpose of the Green Belt; the focus on economic growth within the new city neighbourhood; the role of town, district and local centres; refer to the quality and value of the historic and built environment; to protecting biodiversity and the quality of the natural and semi-natural environment in rural areas; the need for tourism to be sustainable and appropriate, without harming European Sites; the need to promote a sustainable pattern of development, as well as travel; green infrastructure; and the transition to a low carbon Borough. The sustainability appraisal indicates that the revised Vision, if applied, is likely to have a positive, long-term permanent effect (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 117).

11 Spatial Objectives

11.1 Although potential objectives, options and indicators were briefly discussed at each of the two workshops held in November 2006, a full list of potential objectives for the Core Strategy was first presented in the Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009, page 42), following an analysis of emerging issues and challenges (page 29).

11.2 Twenty-nine potential objectives were presented under the five main headings of a stronger economy; housing; building sustainable communities; an accessible Borough; and environmental quality and protection. Consultation questions asked whether respondents agreed with these objectives, whether there were any others that they would like to suggest and how "success" against each of the objectives could be measured (Issues, Vision and Objectives Report, page 44).

11.3 While the majority of objectives were well received, some respondents believed that the final objectives should be more focused on strategic spatial priorities, more geographically specific and should avoid re-stating national policy. It was also unclear how they would tackle the disparity between the east and west of the borough (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 104).

Spatial Options

11.4 The Council consulted on eleven Spatial Objectives for the Core Strategy in the Spatial Options Report (January 2010, page 83), to concentrate on a shorter, simpler list of Spatial Objectives, that concentrated on the spatial priorities that were most likely to influence the future pattern of development across the Borough under the headings of economic revitalisation; vacant urban land; housing market renewal; housing growth; social inclusion; transport accessibility; local distinctiveness; green infrastructure; countryside and coast; climate change; and public safety.

11.5 The sustainability appraisal indicated no outright conflicts but a number of uncertainties, for example, with regard to the relative weight to be attached to economic growth compared to climate change, green infrastructure and local distinctiveness; the relationship between public safety and further growth in the east; and the balance between targeting vacant land and green infrastructure. A consultation question asked whether these were the most appropriate objectives to pursue and whether any further changes or additional objectives were needed (Spatial Options Report, page 97).

11.6 Consultation indicated a wide level of support for the Spatial Objectives presented in the Spatial Options Report. The main issues related to the references to specific Settlement Areas within some of the Objectives, which the majority of respondents believed should apply across the Borough as a whole; a desire to turn the objectives into more detailed policy statements and to refer to specific projects and initiatives; and the need to further reduce the focus of the Spatial Objectives to allow the Council's spatial priorities to be more simply and clearly expressed.

11.7 Other comments indicated that growth and development should be directed across a wider area of the Borough; the need to allow district and local centres to continue to serve the needs of local communities; that economic revitalisation should not be pursued at the expense of the wider character of the Borough; a greater emphasis on the impact of travel choices; opportunities for the development of the rail network; and the need to expand the approach to climate change (Report of Consultation of Spatial Options, page 64).

Preferred Options

11.8 The Preferred Spatial Objectives for the Core Strategy were reduced to seven in the Preferred Options Report (November 2010, page 17) to remove overlapping objectives and to express the priority given to issues related to economic revitalisation; housing growth and housing market renewal; transport accessibility; neighbourhood services; environmental quality; flood risk; and the creation of a new city neighbourhood in east Wirral.

11.9 Spatial Objective 1 was narrowed to refer to existing employment areas in Assisted Areas and existing centres (Preferred Spatial Objective 1, page 17); Spatial Objectives 2 and 5 on vacant urban land and social inclusion were combined within the wider objectives for economic revitalisation, housing market renewal and housing growth; Spatial Objectives 3 and 4 were combined under a single housing objective (Preferred Spatial Objective 2, page 19); Spatial Objective 6 was simplified to refer to easy access to existing centres and high frequency transport corridors, with the list of roads and facilities moved to the Key Diagram and the proposals for Settlement Area Policies (Preferred Spatial Objective 3, page 20); Spatial Objectives 7, 8 and 9 were combined into a single objective for environmental quality (Preferred Objective 5, page 22), with detail to be elaborated in Settlement Area policies; Spatial Objective 10 was reduced to deal with flooding alone, as the most significant local spatial implication of climate change (Preferred Spatial Objective 6, page 24); and references to individual Settlement Areas were removed. New Spatial Objectives were added to promote the provision of neighbourhood services in existing centres (Preferred Spatial Objective 4, page 21) and to refer to the proposal to develop a new city neighbourhood at Birkenhead (Preferred Spatial Objective 7, page 25).

11.10 The revised sustainability appraisal indicated no outright conflicts between the Preferred Spatial Objectives but a number of uncertainties, dependent on how the final Core Strategy was implemented. A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with the Preferred Spatial Objectives and, if not, to give reasons for their answer and explain how they would like to see them changed (Preferred Options Report, page 26).

11.11 Consultation responses were generally positive but concern was expressed at the focus on east Wirral; the prominence, scale and impact of the proposed new city neighbourhood at Wirral Waters; the promotion of Wirral Waters through a spatial objective; the merits or otherwise of out-of-centre development and the focus on existing centres; the limited view of rural areas; the need to reflect the potential benefits of new development for environmental quality; the need for a more balanced approach to flood risk; and the need for an additional objective to address the ambitions for sustainable design and construction expressed in the Spatial Vision (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 25).

Proposed Submission Draft

11.12 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy (December 2012, page 13) retains the majority of the objectives with some revised wording but Preferred Spatial Objective 7 - New City Neighbourhood has been replaced with a new objective to more clearly promote sustainable approaches to the location and design of new development and the transition to a low carbon Borough (Strategic Objective 7 - Sustainable Development, page 16)⁽⁵⁾.

11.13 Strategic Objective 1 - Economic Revitalisation has been amended to support economic growth and a higher density of jobs and businesses; Strategic Objective 2 - Housing Regeneration, to meet local housing needs and support new housing in areas of greatest need; Strategic Objective 3 - Transport Accessibility, to promote sustainable travel including walking and cycling; Strategic Objective 4 - Neighbourhood Services, to reflect the national sequential approach and emphasise the need for facilities to be within easy reach of local communities; Strategic Objective 5 - Environmental Quality, to both preserve and enhance locally distinctive characteristics; and Strategic Objective 6 - Flood Risk, to apply a risk-based approach to all sources of flooding. The supporting text has been amended to clarify that the objectives are, together, intended to support the provision of sustainable development in a Wirral context.

11.14 The sustainability appraisal, again, indicates no outright conflicts but potential uncertainties, for example, associated with the delivery of objectives for housing and employment, that would need to be resolved through the application of other Proposed Submission Draft policies (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal Report, page 114).

12 Broad Spatial Strategy

12.1 The issue of the broad spatial options for the Core Strategy was first addressed in the Spatial Options Report (January 2010).

Spatial Options

12.2 The Council consulted on three Broad Spatial Options in the Spatial Options Report, to set out the scope for different overall patterns of development across the Borough, that were capable of being delivered and likely to be reasonable in the context of national and regional policy:

- Broad Spatial Option 1 - Focused Regeneration (Spatial Options Report, page 100)
- Broad Spatial Option 2 - Balanced Growth (page 107)
- Broad Spatial Option 3 - Urban Expansion (page 114)

5 a separate policy for Wirral Waters is now provided at Policy CS12, on page 44 of the Proposed Submission Draft

12.3 A summary of their spatial Implications including a summary key diagram⁽⁶⁾; the likely fit with existing local, regional and national policies and the emerging evidence base; implications for the Spatial Vision, Spatial Objectives and each of the eight Settlement Areas; a comment on their likely deliverability; a summary of the findings of the initial sustainability appraisal; and of the Council's current assessment, was presented for each of the Broad Spatial Options.

12.4 A series of common aspects were also set out, such as the delivery of Growth Point aspirations in addition to RSS; maximising the use of previously developed land; reducing the leakage of retail spending to outside centres; the continued development of the Strategic Regional Sites at Wirral International Business Park and Birkenhead Docklands; promoting opportunities to boost tourism; maximising accessibility; and protecting the natural and built environment and local distinctiveness (Spatial Options Report, page 98).

12.5 The Council initially indicated that Broad Spatial Option 1 - Focused Regeneration was likely to be the Council's preferred option (Spatial Options Report, page 120), based on prioritising development within the Newheartlands Pathfinder/Mersey Heartlands Growth Point and in areas of greatest need, defined as areas falling within the lowest 20 percent of the national Index of Multiple Deprivation for England in line with Spatial Objective 5, which were illustrated on Picture 4.5 of the Spatial Options Report (page 90).

12.6 The initial sustainability appraisal indicated that Broad Spatial Option 1 scored positively, given its focus on urban regeneration but could have potential for adverse impacts in terms of the separation of incompatible land uses and traffic intrusion over the longer term (Spatial Options Report, page 105). Broad Spatial Option 2 also scored positively, given its focus on the existing urban area but scored less well against issues related to tackling deprivation and support for housing market renewal, primarily because of the more dispersed pattern of development envisaged (Spatial Options Report, page 113). Broad Spatial Option 3 scored least well against local sustainability objectives and the Council concluded that this Option could only be justified as a last resort, when urban regeneration had already been successfully completed and land to meet identified development needs was no longer available within the existing urban area (Spatial Options Report, page 120).

12.7 A separate consultation question for each Broad Spatial Option asked respondents whether this was a fair assessment of its likely implications alongside the reasons for their response (Spatial Options Report, page 106, page 113 and page 121).

12.8 Final consultation questions asked whether respondents agreed that Broad Spatial Option 1 should be preferred; if not, which Broad Spatial Option they did prefer, with the reasons for their preference; and whether there was another Broad

6 a copy of each summary key diagram was included in the taster booklet distributed as part of the consultation on Spatial Options and on large scale presentation boards at the Open Day

Spatial Option that they thought the Council should consider and what the main elements of that alternative Broad Spatial Option would be (Spatial Options Report, page 121).

12.9 Consultation showed limited support for Broad Spatial Option 1 because of the focus on a small area of the Borough and the reliance on a small number of delivery partners. The strongest support was expressed for Broad Spatial Option 2 which would allow a wider range of local issues to be addressed, across the whole of the urban area, alongside the regeneration of the older urban areas. There was support for key elements like Strategic Regional Sites to be retained whatever Broad Spatial Option was pursued and an additional Tourism Regeneration Focus was requested for Birkenhead.

12.10 There was little support for Broad Spatial Option 3, primarily because of its implications for the character and natural assets of the Borough. The majority of people did not believe that another Broad Spatial Option needed to be considered. Those who did, suggested a mix of the existing Options, mainly linked to the promotion of elements of Broad Spatial Option 3 and a more strongly transport orientated approach to the release of development sites, typically in support of their own specific development proposals (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 82).

Preferred Options

12.11 The preferred Broad Spatial Option included in the Preferred Options Report (November 2010) was amended to retain the priorities previously expressed under Broad Spatial Option 1 but to allow for some additional development across a wider area of the Borough, in and around existing centres and high-frequency transport corridors, in line with Broad Spatial Option 2 (Preferred Option 4 - Broad Spatial Strategy, page 27), on the basis that urban expansion was not considered to be an appropriate response to the issues likely to face Wirral during the plan period (Preferred Options Report, page 28).

12.12 Areas of greatest need⁽⁷⁾ and the boundary to Newheartlands Pathfinder/Mersey Heartlands Growth Point were, again, mapped under Preferred Spatial Objective 2 (Picture 6.2, page 19) and shown alongside the Borough's principal centres and main transport routes on the Key Diagram. Wirral Waters was shown for the establishment of a New City Neighbourhood, with Wirral International Business Park as a strategic industrial location (also supported by Preferred Option 21 - Strategic Locations, page 87), alongside an additional Tourism Focus at Birkenhead and along the Mersey coast (Picture 7.1, page 31).

12.13 The accompanying Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 8) presented a revised assessment of each of the Broad Spatial Options, based on the findings of consultation on the Spatial Options; an overall summary of the Council's revised assessment (Assessment Report, page 32); and a further

7 again, defined as areas falling within the lowest 20 percent of the national Index of Multiple Deprivation for England

assessment of the Council's Preferred Broad Spatial Strategy (Assessment Report, page 33) alongside a summary of its associated sustainability appraisal, which showed that Preferred Option 4 would be sustainable but that measures to respond, mitigate and adapt to increased demand on infrastructure would need to be implemented (Preferred Options Assessment Report, page 38). The associated Habitats Regulations Assessment concluded that the Preferred Option was capable of having an adverse effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 30).

12.14 The next best performing option identified was to widen the focus of development still further to reflect the full extent of Broad Spatial Option 2, which was not preferred because it would not adequately reflect the latest spatial priorities for the Borough; did not reflect the level of local support for a more targeted approach to regeneration; and would take less account of the need to reduce the need to travel (Preferred Options Report, page 30).

12.15 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with the Preferred Option and, if not, to give reasons for their answer and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 31).

12.16 Although a third of respondents agreed with the Preferred Broad Spatial Strategy, others believed that Preferred Option 4 would be over reliant on east Wirral and the delivery of Wirral Waters; would fail to address economic decline, by marginalising the most competitive areas; would be detrimental to areas such as Heswall, Hoylake and West Kirby; and that there should be fewer restrictions within the existing urban area, with a focus on making each settlement more sustainable, based on the size of the existing population. A number also sought additional scope for rural development and urban expansion, including retaining the option of Green Belt review if it proved necessary to support the delivery of sufficient housing land. Other issues related to the control of tourism; environmental criteria; sustainable construction; the role of urban sport and recreation; and the size and content of the Key Diagram (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 40).

Proposed Submission Draft

12.17 The Proposed Submission Draft Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18) has largely retained the pattern of Preferred Option 4 but has been amended to clarify the objectives of urban regeneration and environmental enhancement; reflect the national presumption in favour of sustainable development; the closure of the national Housing Market Renewal and Growth Point programmes; the position on Strategic Regional Sites following the closure of the North West Development Agency; and the national designation of the Mersey Waters Enterprise Zone; remove references to proportions, ceilings and upper limits of jobs and homes; clarify the density of development that was likely to be acceptable in different areas and the intended purpose of some of the provisions in areas outside areas of greatest need; add reference to the Borough's district centres; ensure tourism protects European Sites; support the provision of rural services and reflect the national relaxation on

the re-use of previously developed sites in the Green Belt; underline the need for all development to protect and enhance local character, including visual amenity, biodiversity, landscape and heritage; provide for sustainable design and construction; and refer to indoor sport and outdoor sport and recreation (Policy CS2, page 18).

12.18 The Green Belt is now subject to a separate policy, setting out the reasons behind its designation and its protection against inappropriate development, in line with national policy and Core Strategy policies for development management (Policy CS3, page 22).

12.19 The reasoned justification continues to indicate that the Council believes that focused regeneration is incompatible with a strategy of urban expansion and that urban expansion should only be considered as a last resort, where all other options have been exhausted, to ensure that the impetus for regeneration is not undermined, particularly while suitable sites remain available within the urban area (Proposed Submission Draft, paragraph 6.8, page 21), although provision for Green Belt review is now made under Policy CS20 - Housing Contingencies (Proposed Submission Draft, page 62).

12.20 The Key Diagram has been enlarged, to show additional surrounding context; remove the boundary to the Newheartlands Pathfinder, to show only areas of greatest need; show a major employment area at Birkenhead; smaller employment areas at Moreton, Upton and Prenton; the location of major hospital facilities; main routes along the New Brighton waterfront and between Bromborough and Heswall and Junction 4 of the M53; the addition of a countryside recreation notation at Dibbinsdale; and the boundaries to individual Settlement Areas (Proposed Submission Draft, page 24).

12.21 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS2 and Policy CS3 should have a strong positive effect in terms of directing regeneration and growth towards areas in greatest need and that any uncertainties will be mitigated by policies elsewhere within the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 135 and page 143).

12.22 In contrast, the sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS20 is likely to have a a mix of uncertain and negative, long-term, permanent effects (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 256).

13 Housing Growth

13.1 Although the Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) contained five potential objectives for housing (page 42), the main policy options for housing were first put forward in the Spatial Options Report (January 2010).

Spatial Options

13.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) considered options for the spatial distribution (page 127) and phasing of new housing development (page 134); the order of preference in which sites should be developed (page 138); options for the provision of affordable and specialist housing (page 139); and options for providing for gypsies and travellers (page 145) on the basis of the requirements set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy and the Programme of Development for the Mersey Heartlands Growth Point announced by the Government in December 2008.

Preferred Options

13.3 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) set out the Council's preferred options for spatial distribution (Preferred Option 6 - Distribution of Housing, page 40); phasing (Preferred Option 7 - Phasing Housing Development, page 44); affordable and specialist housing (Preferred Option 9 - Affordable and Specialist Housing, page 48); and gypsies and travellers (Preferred Option 10 - Gypsies and Travellers, page 50) but also began to consider options for the future scale of new housing development, to respond to the proposed revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (page 32 and Preferred Option 5 - Local Housing Targets, page 38).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.4 The Proposed Submission Draft now contains a housing requirement figure, based on the still extant Regional Spatial Strategy (Policy CS18, page 56); a housing implementation plan, including an order of search for additional sites (Policy CS19, page 58); a housing contingencies policy, which provides for a review of the Green Belt if sufficient land cannot be identified within the existing urban areas (Policy CS20, page 62); criteria for new housing development (Policy CS21, page 63); requirements for affordable housing (Policy CS22, page 65); criteria for specialist housing (Policy CS23, page 68); and gypsies and travellers (Policy CS24, page 69), supported by revised evidence from the Wirral Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment Update 2012.

13.5 The background to the development of each of these policies is set out below:

Spatial Distribution

13.6 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out four main options for the distribution of housing (page 127):

- Policy Option HD1 - RSS Inner Area with restrictions elsewhere;
- Policy Option HD2 - RSS Inner Area and RSS Outer Area, with restrictions only in the RSS Rural Areas to the west of the M53 Motorway;
- Policy Option HD3 - RSS Inner Area, RSS Outer Area and RSS Rural Area; and
- Policy Option HD4 - RSS Inner Area (reduced contribution), with the remainder made up elsewhere.

13.7 Policy Option HD4 also contained two sub-options:

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

- Policy Option HD2A - RSS Inner Area (reduced contribution) and RSS Outer Area, with restrictions elsewhere; and
- Policy Option HD3A - RSS Inner Area (reduced contribution), RSS Outer Area and RSS Rural Area.

13.8 The geographical division between the Inner Area, the Outer Area and the Rural Area was based on the geographical priorities set out in the former Regional Spatial Strategy⁽⁸⁾. The numbers involved, providing for up to 600 net new dwellings across the Borough (Table 6.1, page 127), were based on the pre-recession targets for additional dwellings set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy⁽⁹⁾ and the Mersey Heartlands Growth Point Programme of Development⁽¹⁰⁾.

13.9 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option HD1 would be the most sustainable, by maximising the use of previously developed land, supporting the restructuring of local housing markets and attracting a wider mix of population to these areas. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option HD1 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis that this would also be supported by the publicly funded programme of renewal within the Newheartlands Pathfinder and the ongoing commitment to increase the level of housing within the Mersey Heartlands Growth Point (Spatial Options Report, page 133).

13.10 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option HD1 should be preferred and if not, asked them to give the reasons for the option that they did prefer (page 133).

13.11 Approximately half the people who responded, preferred Policy Option HD1, on the basis that it was likely to be the most sustainable; would maximise the use of previously developed land; and would take pressure for development away from other areas. Policy Option HD2 was the next most preferred option, on the basis that it would better reflect the objectives of the former Regional Spatial Strategy; and the need to improve social housing outside the Newheartlands Pathfinder Area. Only one response favoured Policy Option HD2A.

13.12 Critics of Policy Option HD1, believed that it would be too restrictive; too reliant on the proposals at Wirral Waters; would fail to offer an appropriate range and choice of location; saturate the market; and place an unwarranted restriction on other sustainable locations. Others believed that it was undeliverable, given the numbers being talked about. A number of respondents were concerned about impacts on quality of life; greenspace; and the suitability of dockside developments for families with children.

8 North West of England Plan 2021 (September 2008)

9 equivalent to an annual average of 500 net new dwellings

10 which sought to support an acceleration in housing delivery within the designated area, at 20% above RSS requirements to 2017

13.13 Supporters of Policy Option HD3 and Policy Option HD4, however, believed that allowing development across a wider area, including urban expansion, would be the only way to deliver the homes that were needed; address the decline in completions; re-use vacant land in other areas; support rural regeneration; stimulate the local economy; and ensure sustainable, mixed communities in all areas of the Borough (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 111).

Preferred Options

13.14 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) amended the Council's preferred option to retain the emphasis on regeneration priorities previously expressed under Policy Option HD1 but to also allow for some additional development in sustainable locations across a wider area of the Borough (Preferred Option 6 - Distribution of Housing, page 41) in line with the amendments to the Broad Spatial Strategy (Preferred Option 4 - Broad Spatial Strategy, page 28).

13.15 The illustrative numbers involved for each Settlement Area and percentage distribution were based on the preferred option for the future housing requirement (Preferred Option 5 - Local Housing Targets, page 38), the supply of deliverable and developable sites from the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for April 2008 (Roger Tym, July 2010) and a conservative assumption about the delivery of new housing at Wirral Waters. A revised summary of the likely implications were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 58).

13.16 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 6 would have a positive impact on urban regeneration, economic growth and viability of centres but would require other controls to be applied in relation to biodiversity, traffic intrusion, waste management, carbon reduction and local heritage. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 6 was capable of having an adverse effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 42).

13.17 Two preferred alternatives were presented, based on the strength of any recovery in the housing market. The Council's preferred alternative was to move closer towards a distribution which included the additional assessed capacity at Wirral Waters but it was accepted, that the final distribution was likely to be determined by the ability to maintain an acceptable five-year supply of housing land (Preferred Options Report, page 43).

13.18 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 6 and if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 44).

13.19 Consultation responses indicated that the figures and percentages for some Settlement Areas were too low; the focus on east Wirral was too great; that housing numbers should be more widely distributed, based on the current population and the assessment of local needs; and that more emphasis should be placed on retaining

flexibility, promoting sustainable development in locations with good access to transport and services and retaining local character (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 61).

13.20 Further information on the distribution of potential housing sites was contained within the consultation on Settlement Area Policies and further responses were received on their likely implications, particularly for greenfield sites and open space in some Settlement Areas (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.21 The proposed distribution of new housing development is now primarily addressed through the Broad Spatial Strategy of the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, to provide a more flexible approach to future housing provision and the capacity of suitable and available sites (Policy CS2, page 18), with safeguards through Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (page 26); Policy CS21 - Criteria for New Housing Development (page 63); and policies for development management (Policy CS42 - Development Management, page 105, and Policy CS43 - Design, Heritage and Amenity, page 107).

Phasing New Housing Development

13.22 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out two options for the future phasing of new housing development (page 134):

- Policy Option HP1 - Borough-wide phasing; and
- Policy Option HP2 - phasing within each Settlement Area

13.23 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option HP2 would be the most sustainable, by focusing new housing on areas of employment growth, directing new housing to restructure local housing markets and attracting a wider mix of population to these areas. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option HP2 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis that it was more likely to be able to deliver outcomes in line with the Spatial Vision and Spatial Objectives (page 137).

13.24 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option HP2 should be preferred and if not, to give reasons for the option that they preferred (page 138).

13.25 Consultation did not reveal any clear preference. Policy Option HP2 was too complicated; could lead to the loss of valuable greenspace; would be less likely to support development in areas of greatest need; and would be difficult to implement. By contrast, Policy Option HP1 would allow brownfield land to be used across the Borough before using greenfield land in the east, where open space is most lacking; and would not limit development to one particular area (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 117).

13.26 The Spatial Options Report, however, also set out a range of choices for the order in which different types of land should be developed (Order of Preference, page 138) and a separate consultation question asked respondents to rank different categories of land based on their location and status as brownfield or greenfield land (Spatial Options Report, page 139). Consultation on this aspect of phasing showed clear support for using previously developed sites before greenfield land and support for using previously developed rural land before urban greenfield sites (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 121).

Preferred Options

13.27 As a result, the preferred option was changed to a Borough-wide approach in the Preferred Options Report (November 2010), because of the benefit of promoting the re-use of brownfield land in all areas of the Borough before releasing any greenfield land in support of the Broad Spatial Strategy (Preferred Option 7 - Phasing Housing Development, page 45) and the use of previously developed land and sites in east Wirral was preferred before sites elsewhere (Preferred Option 8 - Order of Preference, page 46). A revised summary of the likely implications, including the geographical distribution of the existing housing land supply, was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 66 and page 72).

13.28 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 7 would have a positive impact on restructuring housing markets, supporting social inclusion and protecting local distinctiveness by prioritising development in regeneration priority areas (Preferred Options Report, page 45) and that Preferred Option 8 would have a positive effect on urban regeneration and reduce the pressure of development in more sensitive areas but that additional controls would be needed to take account of biodiversity and heritage (Preferred Options Report, page 47).

13.29 The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment indicated that measures to protect the water environment, prevent disturbance to wildlife and loss of habitat would also be needed to prevent an adverse impact on European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 45) but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 47).

13.30 The preferred alternative was to return to phasing development within each Settlement Area, which had previously been rejected as too complicated and unlikely to maximise the reuse of previously developed land (Preferred Options Report, page 45). The only realistic alternative to Preferred Option 8 was to use the order of preference to support an alternative spatial distribution or to simply prioritise the use of previously developed land without applying any additional spatial priority (Preferred Options Report, page 47).

13.31 Consultation questions asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 7 and Preferred Option 8 and if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see them changed (Preferred Options Report, page 45 and page 47).

13.32 Consultation responses indicated that the proposals for phasing were still too complicated; should not be too rigidly applied; and should be better related to the capacity of local infrastructure (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 67). Responses to the order of preference also indicated that too much emphasis was being placed on east Wirral; that previously developed sites should be promoted irrespective of any spatial priority; and that further protection was needed for previously developed sites with value for biodiversity, heritage and sport (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 70).

13.33 Comments submitted in response to consultation on Settlement Area Policies, which included further information on the type of site that would need to be developed to reach the higher levels shown in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment, continued to indicate resistance towards the development of previously undeveloped greenfield sites (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.34 The approach towards phasing new housing development in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy is now primarily expressed through Policy CS19 - Housing Implementation Plan (page 58), which sets out an order of search for maintaining a five-year supply of housing sites to follow the more general sequence of priorities set out in the Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18), with additional safeguards provided through Policy CS30 - Requirements for Green Infrastructure (page 82); policies for development management (Policy CS42 - Development Management, page 105 and Policy CS43 - Design, Heritage and Amenity, page 107); and Policy CS44 - Phasing and Infrastructure (page 110).

13.35 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS19 is likely to have strong positive effects subject to the safeguards contained elsewhere within the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 244).

Affordable and Specialist Housing

13.36 The need for affordable and specialist housing has been a repeated theme since initial consultation was undertaken in October 2005 (Report of Initial Consultation, page 22).

13.37 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010, page 139) set out two options for provision of affordable and specialist housing, based on the findings of the Strategic Housing Market Assessment for Wirral (Fordham Research, September 2007):

- Policy Option AH1 - Borough wide targets; and
- Policy Option AH2 - Settlement Area targets, where evidence shows specific local needs

13.38 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option AH1 would be the most sustainable, by supporting the formation of more mixed, sustainable communities. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option AH1 was likely to be preferred, on the basis that it was more likely to deliver mixed communities and avoid an over-concentration of provision (Spatial Options Report, page 144).

13.39 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option AH1 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 145).

13.40 Consultation indicated overall support for Policy Option AH1, which was considered to be easier to implement and more likely to result in a more even distribution of affordable housing. Some, however, felt that Policy Option AH2 could take greater account of local needs and allow affordable housing to be targeted to the most sustainable locations (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 124).

Preferred Options

13.41 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) continued to follow a Borough-wide approach and Preferred Option 9 - Affordable and Specialist Housing was based on an update to the housing market assessment (Fordham Research, September 2010) and the findings an accompanying viability assessment (Affordable Housing Viability Study, Fordham Research, September 2010), to take account of the impact of the recession (Preferred Options Report, page 48). A revised summary of the likely implications, including an analysis of the likely scale of need for ordinary and specialist housing within each Settlement Area, were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 76).

13.42 The revised sustainability appraisal indicated that Preferred Option 9 would have a positive impact on quality of life, energy efficiency, waste management and carbon reduction, would help to create sustainable communities and should be flexible enough to respond to local variations in viability, and the draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 9 was unlikely to have any effects on European Sites. The only alternative presented was to apply a range of different targets within each Settlement Area, which had already previously been discounted (Preferred Options Report, page 50).

13.43 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 9 and if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 50).

13.44 Consultation indicated that amendments were needed to take account of changes in the availability of social housing grants, including intermediate and fixed term rents and that affordable and specialist housing should be provided wherever there was a need; but several respondents believed the targets were too high, that even 10% was not viable within the Newheartlands Pathfinder and that further detail

was required on how the 30% target for specialist housing was to be applied. One respondent believed that the lower target should be applied over a wider area (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 76).

13.45 The consultation on Settlement Area Policies included further information on existing affordable housing provision within each Settlement Area but no additional comments were received (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.46 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy retains the approach to affordable housing set out in Preferred Option 9, amended to apply the lower rate of requirement to all areas of greatest need and to allow dwelling types and tenures to be related the latest assessment of housing needs (Policy C22 - Affordable Housing Requirements, page 65) and sets out criteria for specialist housing, to provide greater flexibility for the type and scale of provision that is likely to be required (Policy CS23 - Criteria for Specialist Housing, page 68).

13.47 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS22 and Policy CS23 are likely to have long term permanent positive effects, supported by safeguards provided in policies elsewhere within the Core Strategy, although additional controls may be needed if specialist housing was also to be provided to a higher standard than normal market housing (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 275 and page 280).

Scale of New Housing Provision

13.48 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) did not consider matters related to scale of new housing provision as the housing requirement for Wirral had already been set at regional level through the Regional Spatial Strategy (Spatial Options Report, page 124).

Preferred Options

13.49 In response to the announcement that the Regional Spatial Strategy was to be revoked, the Preferred Options Report (November 2010) set out four initial options for the number of net new dwellings to be provided; using a policy model, based on the Submitted Draft Regional Spatial Strategy (Policy Option PO1, page 32); a needs model, based on the Strategic Housing Market Assessment Update 2010 (Policy Option PO2, page 33); a capacity model, based on the capacity identified in the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment for April 2008 (Policy Option PO3, page 35); and a market delivery model, based on two scenarios for market recovery to pre-recession levels of investment (Policy Option PO4, page 36):

- Policy Option PO1A - annual average of 250 - distribution based on urban capacity with Wirral Waters;
- Policy Option PO1B - annual average of 250 - distribution based on urban capacity without Wirral Waters;

- Policy Option PO2 - annual average of 640 - distribution based on the Council's latest housing needs assessment;
- Policy Option PO3A - annual average of 1,235 - distribution based on urban capacity with Wirral Waters;
- Policy Option PO3B - annual average of 620 - distribution based on urban capacity without Wirral Waters;
- Policy Option PO4A - annual average of 455 - based on return to pre-recession levels by 2016, with a distribution based on urban capacity with Wirral Waters
- Policy Option PO4B - annual average of 306 - based on return to pre-recession levels by 2026, with a distribution based on urban capacity without Wirral Waters

13.50 The wider background was set out in further detail in the accompanying Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 39). Figures were shown for each Settlement Area, to illustrate the likely local implications of each of the Policy Options but were not at this stage intended to be final policy numbers (Preferred Options Report, page 32).

13.51 The Council's initial assessment, was that Policy Option PO1 was likely to provide the best balance between the prospects of market delivery and the need to offer flexibility within the capacity of available urban land (Preferred Options Report, page 37) and a consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option PO1 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Preferred Options Report, page 38).

13.52 Preferred Option 5 - Local Housing Targets was based on Policy Option PO1, with minimum targets within regeneration priority areas and maximum targets elsewhere and the mix of housing to follow the proportions for market housing set out in the latest housing needs assessment (Preferred Options Report, page 38).

13.53 The revised sustainability appraisal indicated that Preferred Option 5 would have a positive impact on economic growth and social inclusion, reduce pressure for development in more sensitive areas but that additional controls were likely to be needed to reduce the impact of significant additional housing within a concentrated area. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 5 was capable of having an adverse impact on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 39).

13.54 The suggested preferred alternative, was to reflect the assessed capacity of the urban areas, with or without the additional capacity at Wirral Waters, based on Policy Option PO3 (Preferred Options Report, page 39).

13.55 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 5 and, if not, to give their reasons and to explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 40).

13.56 Consultation indicated that a return to a lower target was unjustified and out-of-date, given the position presented to the RSS public examination; would fail to promote necessary regeneration or market recovery or take account of housing need, the backlog of performance against RSS since 2003 or the capacity shown within the Council's Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment; and that applying maximum targets outside regeneration priority areas would be too inflexible and would unnecessarily restrict sustainable development (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 57).

13.57 Further information on the amount and distribution of potential housing sites was also contained within the consultation on Settlement Area Policies in January 2012. Responses indicated that the scope for additional housing appeared to be over-estimated in some Settlement Areas and that only the lower figures and brownfield sites should be used (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.58 The requirement for new housing is now set out in Policy CS18 of the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, which was again based on the Regional Spatial Strategy, which had not yet been revoked and because of the lack of a reliable alternative on which to base a revised housing requirement figure since the publication of the 2011 Census (Proposed Submission Draft, page 56).

13.59 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS18 would have positive effects, provided the safeguards provided elsewhere within the Core Strategy are applied (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 235).

Gypsies and Travellers

13.60 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out two options for making provision for gypsies and travellers (page 145):

- Policy Option GT1 - a geographically specific target; or
- Policy Option GT2 - Borough-wide criteria

13.61 The Council indicated that Policy Option GT2 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis that this was likely to be the most flexible approach, as the initial sustainability appraisal had suggested that either Policy Option would be just as sustainable (Spatial Options Report, page 148).

13.62 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option GT2 should be preferred and, if not, to give the reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 149).

13.63 Consultation showed almost unanimous support for Policy Option GT2. Only one respondent appeared to favour Policy Option GT1, while a small number of others expressed no preference (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 127).

Preferred Options

13.64 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) continued to follow a criteria based approach, to be supplemented by a Supplementary Planning Document if necessary (Preferred Option 10 - Gypsies and Travellers, page 50). The alternative was to set a geographically specific target, which could not be supported by an appropriate evidence base (Preferred Options Report, page 52). A revised summary of the likely implications were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 82).

13.65 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 10 would help to identify need and address deficiencies but that additional controls were needed to minimise impacts on biodiversity, waste, pollution, heritage and traffic. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment also showed that Preferred Option 10 was capable of having an adverse effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 52).

13.66 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 10 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 52).

13.67 Consultation indicated support for Preferred Option 10, subject to appropriate enforcement; full public consultation on any sites to be provided; controls over flood risk, biodiversity, landscape and heritage; further detail on how need and demand were to be assessed; and the inclusion of travelling showpeople (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 81).

Proposed Submission Draft

13.68 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy has retained the criteria based approach of Preferred Option 10, amended to refer to Travelling Showpeople, with more detailed provision to be made in a future site-specific Local Plan (Policy CS24 - Gypsies and Travellers, page 69).

13.69 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS24 is likely to have a largely uncertain impact, which would need to be addressed through the safeguards provided elsewhere within the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 284).

14 Employment Growth

14.1 The need for additional jobs and investment has been a continual theme since initial consultation was undertaken in October 2005 (Report of Initial Consultation, page 18, page 21 and page 22) and is a major theme of the Council's Investment Strategy. Although the Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) contained seven potential objectives for a stronger economy, the main policy options for employment growth were first set out in the Spatial Options Report (January 2010).

Spatial Options

14.2 The Spatial Options Report set out three main options for the distribution of employment based on the findings of the Wirral Employment Land and Premises Study 2009 (page 149):

- Policy Option EL1 - Concentrate on identified strategic locations in east Wirral
- Policy Option EL2 - Concentrate on existing industrial areas and town centres across all of Wirral
- Policy Option EL3 - Identify a new long term strategic location outside the existing urban area

14.3 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option EL1 would be the most sustainable, by supporting the creation of employment opportunities in areas of greatest need and in the most accessible locations. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option EL1 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis that public resources could also then be concentrated on key strategic facilities and developments (Spatial Options Report, page 157).

14.4 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option EL1 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 157).

14.5 Consultation showed broadly equal support for Policy Option EL1 and for Policy Option EL2 and only limited support for Policy Option EL3. The need to provide for a more balanced pattern of growth was the main issue raised, to use the potential of other existing employment areas to provide more locally-based jobs, address a wider range of needs, reduce the need to travel and support local centres. One respondent suggested the need for a new employment site in the Green Belt at Woodchurch (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 129).

Preferred Options

14.6 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) amended the Council's preferred option to provide for a greater element of Policy Option EL2, based on the pattern of existing development opportunities. Preferred Option 11 set out the intention to provide for up to 177 hectares of new employment development; protect

against the loss of employment land and premises to non-employment uses, subject to supply and viability; set out priority locations for particular types of use and activity; and the intention to negotiate agreements for training and job opportunities for the local community (Preferred Option 11 - Distribution of Employment, page 54). A revised summary of the likely implications, including information on the distribution of the existing land supply and emerging key projects, was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 86).

14.7 The revised sustainability appraisal showed positive impacts on urban regeneration and economic growth, with the need for additional controls to mitigate any adverse impacts on biodiversity, pollution, traffic intrusion and waste management (Preferred Options Report, page 55). The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment indicated potential for a significant effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 56).

14.8 The suggested alternative was to concentrate on a smaller number of strategic locations in line with Policy Option EL1, to focus on the most attractive business locations in the Borough at the two Strategic Regional Sites at Birkenhead and Bromborough, on the basis that the Council had already resolved not to consider pursuing a site in the Green Belt once the remaining potential at Wirral International Business Park had been exhausted (Preferred Options Report, page 56).

14.9 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 11 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 56).

14.10 Consultation responses sought additional provision for maritime-related industries; support for existing businesses; a more even distribution to address the need for employment in all Settlement Areas; suggested that the emphasis on Wirral Waters and Bromborough was too great; that greenfield sites would be needed to meet the Council's aspirations; that a more flexible approach to alternative uses was needed to aid viability; and sought additional information on the Borough's relationship with the wider sub-region (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 83).

14.11 Consultation on Settlement Area Policies in January 2012 included further information on the local opportunities for new employment development within each Settlement Area. The comments received suggested that infill development would not deliver enough jobs to meet the existing needs of the population; questioned the desirability of reducing the reliance on Liverpool for employment; and sought more detailed references in relation to the port and international trade; Cammell Lairds; the impact of industrial uses on Eastham Village; provision for economic growth along the A41 frontage; greater flexibility with regard to a perceived oversupply of employment land at Upton; the expansion of Carr Lane Industrial Estate; a wider range of uses at Clatterbridge Hospital; and provision for economic growth in key rural settlements (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

14.12 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy now contains a series of policies dealing with employment land requirements, based on past take-up and provision for additional growth to reflect the Council's Investment Strategy (Policy CS13, page 48); priority sectors (Policy CS14, page 50); criteria for new employment (Policy CS15, page 52) and port-related development (Policy CS16, page 53); and the protection of employment land, including the consideration of alternative uses (Policy CS17, page 54); supported by the strategic priorities expressed through the Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18); more detailed provisions in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (page 26 onwards); and revised evidence from the Wirral Employment Land and Premises Study Update (September 2012). Additional information on the Borough's relationship with the wider sub-region is provided in the introductory background to the Proposed Submission Draft (page 6 onwards).

14.13 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policies CS13 to CS17 are likely to have positive long-term permanent effects through the provision of land for employment and investment in sustainable locations capable of addressing social inequalities but with uncertain environmental effects and potential negative effects on waste, energy and water use, which would need to be addressed through the application of policies elsewhere within the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, pages 202 to 234).

15 Town Centres

15.1 The poor image of many town centres, the dominance of supermarkets, the impact of hot-food take-aways and drinking establishments and the need for a stronger emphasis on local services has been a common theme since initial consultation was undertaken in October 2005 (Report of Initial Consultation, page 18, page 21 and page 22). Although these issues were identified in the Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009, page 10, page 32 and page 35 for example refer), the main policy options for retailing were first in the Spatial Options Report (January 2010).

15.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) considered the hierarchy of existing centres (page 159) and options for the provision of additional non-food retailing, on the basis of the lack of need for additional convenience floorspace identified in the Wirral Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2009 and an analysis of the opportunities to accommodate within or at the edge of existing centres (Spatial Options Report, page 163).

15.3 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) set out the Council's revised preferred options for the hierarchy of centres (Preferred Option 12 - Retail Network, page 58) and the distribution of new retail floorspace (Preferred Option 13 - Retail Growth, page 63).

Town Centre Hierarchy

15.4 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) sought to present the centres listed in the Unitary Development Plan (adopted in February 2000) in a hierarchy that would be more consistent with the definitions (then) set out in national planning policy⁽¹¹⁾ (Picture 6.5 and Table 6.14, page 161 refer).

15.5 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with the hierarchy of centres set out in Table 6.14, whether any other centres should be included and to give the reasons for their response (Spatial Options Report, page 162).

15.6 Responses indicated that additional centres should be considered at Eastham, Egremont, Greasby, Higher Bebington and Pensby; concerns over where individual centres sat within the hierarchy, related to the designation of Birkenhead as a sub-Regional Centre; Borough Road (Prenton Park); Bromborough Village; Liscard; New Ferry; Wallasey Village; West Kirby; Woodchurch Road (Prenton); the re-classification of Hoylake from a higher tier Key Town Centre in the Unitary Development Plan to a lower tier District Centre; and the role of any future centre at Wirral Waters; and sought recognition of the role of existing out-of-centre facilities in meeting local shopping needs and providing local employment (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 134).

15.7 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) sought to provide greater clarity on the role of each of the centres within the network; on the implications for future growth and development; and included two additional local centres, at Eastham and Greasby, within the network. The preferred option also included criteria for defining centre boundaries; provision for Local Centre Implementation Plans; and signalled the intention to include thresholds for impact assessments and priorities for upper floor and residential uses; and a statement on the role of out-of-centre facilities (Preferred Option 12 - Retail Network, page 59). A revised summary of the likely implications, including a brief review of the available evidence base, was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 97).

15.8 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 12 would safeguard access to employment opportunities and could reduce the need to travel but that heritage and facilities for culture, sport and leisure would also need to be considered in defining centre boundaries. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 12 was capable of having an adverse effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 60).

15.9 No alternative was suggested, as to alter the list of centres and/or adjust their position in the hierarchy could not be supported by the available evidence base (Preferred Options Report, page 60).

11 PPS6 - Planning for Town Centres (ODPM, 2005)

15.10 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 12 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 61).

15.11 Consultation responses emphasised the need for investment in existing centres; to restrict further out-of-centre facilities; and reflect the wider role of some centres for visitors rather than just the local community; but that any thresholds should not unduly restrict new investment or the modernisation of existing out-of-centre facilities. Further comments were submitted on the impact of the re-classification of Hoylake and additional centres were requested at Pensby; and the rural villages at Thornton Hough, Raby, Storeton, Brimstage and Barnston; including the recognition of potential future centres at Wirral Waters, at East Float and Bidston Dock (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 88).

15.12 Consultation on Settlement Area Policies, in January 2012, also set out the implications of the hierarchy for centres within each Settlement Area, including references to the Town, District and Local Centre Study and Delivery Framework 2011. Comments on the position of the individual centres identified related to Hoylake, on the basis of the recent pattern of private investment that was being achieved; the need to reflect the previous strategy for the regeneration of Egremont; and whether Liscard was still the main centre for Wallasey now Morrisons had opened at New Brighton (Report of Consultation on Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

15.13 The Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy retained the hierarchy of centres set out in Preferred Option 12, on the basis of the available evidence base, with additional guidelines for the scale of new A1 retail development in each type of centre (Policy CS25 - Hierarchy of Retail Centres, page 71) supported by the strategic priorities expressed through the Broad Spatial Strategy, amended to also refer to the district centres at Bromborough Village, Hoylake and Prenton (Policy CS2, page 18); and the provisions for each centre in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (page 26 onwards).

15.14 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS25 is likely to have a long-term, permanent, positive effect with some uncertain environmental impacts that would be addressed through policies elsewhere in the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 289).

Providing for Additional Retail Floorspace

15.15 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) also set out two options for the distribution of new comparison retail floorspace, based on the capacity assessment and development options recommended by the Wirral Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2009, which showed no need for additional convenience floorspace but a need for additional non-food provision, particularly if the level of comparison spending retained within the Borough was to improve and to prevent further decline (page 163):

- Policy Option CR1 - Focus on Birkenhead Town Centre and Wirral Waters
- Policy Option CR2 - Focus on Wirral Waters

15.16 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option CR1 was likely to be the most sustainable, on the basis that it would ensure a wider balance of investment and secure the most accessible opportunities for new retail and employment (Spatial Options Report, page 175). The Spatial Options Report nevertheless, indicated that Policy Option CR2 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis of a detailed assessment of potential development opportunities in and around the edge of Birkenhead, which concluded that none of the locations considered were likely to be able to support a major growth in comparison floorspace (Spatial Options Report, pages 164 to 169).

15.17 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option CR2 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 175).

15.18 Consultation showed concern that Policy Option CR2 appeared to be ignoring the scope for locating new development within existing centres; about the potential impact of a large scheme at Wirral Waters; and about the future of Birkenhead Town Centre but no additional locations within the Town Centre were identified. Clarification was also requested on the approach to future convenience retailing (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 138).

15.19 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) was, therefore, amended to direct new comparison floorspace first to existing centres and then to Wirral Waters, recognising that while Birkenhead remained sequentially preferable, delivery would be dependent on suitable opportunities coming forward within the Town Centre. Provision was only to be made for new convenience floorspace, if a local deficiency could be demonstrated. Development at Wirral Waters was, however, to be required to support the objectives of the Birkenhead Integrated Regeneration Study 2010 (Preferred Option 13 - Retail Growth, page 63). A revised summary of the likely implications, including a brief review of the principal alternative options, was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 102)

15.20 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 13 would provide jobs, services and facilities, enhance the vitality and viability of town centres and could have a positive effect on social exclusion and sustainable travel but could increase pollution, surface run-off and waste generation. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed no potential for effects on European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 64).

15.21 The preferred alternative was to base the capacity for additional floorspace on reduced population forecasts, without any population growth at Wirral Waters, which would fail to support the aspiration to establish a new city neighbourhood at the heart of the older urban area (Preferred Options Report, page 64).

15.22 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 13 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (page 65).

15.23 Consultation responses indicated continued concern about the impact and control of Wirral Waters; the scale of future provision being envisaged, including the extent of reliance on leaked expenditure, which could lead to further out-of-centre development; the need to provide for further convenience floorspace, if a need could be proven; and for a greater emphasis on securing improvements to existing centres (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 91).

15.24 Comments submitted to the additional consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, in January 2012, indicated that the Core Strategy needed to set out the scale of development that would be appropriate in each centre; explain how each centre would be safeguarded and enhanced; provide a flexible approach to the types of uses within centres, with additional provision for top-up shopping outside existing centres; reflect the wider importance of centres for uses other than shopping; and the realistic capacity and function of Birkenhead Town Centre (Report of Consultation on Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

15.25 The Proposed Submission Draft (December 2012) now provides guidelines for the scale of new retail provision in each type of centre (Policy CS25, page 71); criteria for development within existing centres, including proposals exceeding the guidelines set out in Policy CS25, for residential development and non-retail uses (Policy CS26, page 74); food and drink uses in existing centres and parades (Policy CS27, page 77); thresholds for retail impact assessments (Policy CS28, page 78); and associated criteria for edge-of-centre and out-of-centre facilities (Policy CS29, page 80), supported by revised evidence from the Wirral Retail Study Update, March 2012.

15.26 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policies CS25 to CS28 are likely to have long-term, permanent, positive effects with any uncertain environmental effects mitigated by other policies within the Core Strategy, applied through Policy CS42 - Development Management. Policy CS29 was, however, found to have a largely uncertain impact, dependent on how future proposals were brought forward and controlled (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, pages 289 to 313 refer).

16 New City Neighbourhood

16.1 The potential to establish a new city neighbourhood at the heart of the urban area on vacant and under-utilised land within the dock estate at Birkenhead, has been a major feature of consultation throughout the preparation of the Core Strategy.

16.2 The history to the 'Wirral Waters' proposals, includes its origins in the transfer of the ownership of the dock estate; the removal of the designation as docklands in the Unitary Development Plan, following a Direction issued by the Secretary of State; the publication of a Strategic Regeneration Framework; the designation of the area

as part of a national Growth Point and as a Strategic Regional Site by the former North West Development Agency; the approval of planning permissions to provide over 15,000 dwellings and almost 600,000 square metres of new commercial, office, leisure and retail floorspace, following notification to the Secretary of State; and national designation as part of the Mersey Waters Enterprise Zone.

Initial Consultation

16.3 The Report of Initial Consultation (July 2006) identified the absence of attractive, high quality jobs; low levels of demand and investment; and poor quality industrial areas as significant weaknesses (page 18 refers). The Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009) identified Birkenhead docks as a major opportunity and as part of the emerging vision for the future of Wirral, principally related to the need for regeneration, inward investment, enterprise and jobs and for brownfield re-development to protect the Green Belt and other green sites.

16.4 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) identified Wirral Waters as one of a number of emerging regeneration initiatives (page 24) and included it in the first statement of the emerging Spatial Vision (Item I, page 40). Consultation responses indicated the need to further embed the proposals in the emerging Core Strategy, consider whether the project would be delivered as a strategic allocation or through an Area Action Plan and promote the highest standards of sustainable design; but also began to question the scale of the proposals, the merits of high rise flat developments and the potential impact on the surrounding area, including the impact of any retail components on Birkenhead Town Centre (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 39 and 98).

Spatial Options

16.5 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) continued to identify Wirral Waters as an emerging development opportunity, in Settlement Area 2 in the Spatial Portrait (page 30) and as part of the emerging Spatial Vision (Item I, page 80); and included it as a common aspect of each of the Broad Spatial Options, as part of the delivery of Housing Market Renewal and the Mersey Heartlands Growth Point (page 98); and as a focus for employment growth and economic revitalisation on each of their illustrative Key Diagrams (Picture 5.1, page 100; Picture 5.2, page 107 and Picture 5.3, page 114). The emerging proposals were also considered as part of the background to the Policy Options for housing (page 124), employment (page 149) and retailing (page 163).

16.6 Consultation drew comments related to all elements of the Spatial Options Report, indicating continued concern about the extent of reliance on Wirral Waters; the scale, impact and delivery of the proposals; its implications for the retail hierarchy, including centres in surrounding districts; alternative delivery options and the prospects of development elsewhere within the Borough; integration with the surrounding areas; the availability of supporting infrastructure; and the provision of sites to meet needs that could not be provided for by Wirral Waters alone (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, sections beginning on pages 20, 50, 100, 111, 129 and 134 refer).

Preferred Options

16.7 By the time of the Preferred Options Report (November 2010), three planning applications had been recommended for approval at Wirral Waters subject to legal agreements and notification to the Secretary of State, for which pre-application consultation had showed significant support (Preferred Options Report, page 27).

16.8 The Preferred Options Report now included the wider intention to establish a new city neighbourhood at East Float: in the Spatial Vision (Preferred Option 3 - Spatial Vision, page 15); as a spatial objective (Preferred Spatial Objective 7 - New City Neighbourhood, page 25); and on the Key Diagram for the Broad Spatial Strategy (Picture 7.1, page 31). The more detailed proposals were also considered alongside Wirral International Business Park under Preferred Option 21 - Strategic Locations (page 83), supported by the Birkenhead and Wirral Waters Integrated Regeneration Study July 2010.

16.9 Based on the advice contained within previous national policy⁽¹²⁾, Preferred Option 21 concluded that Birkenhead and Wirral Waters should be identified as a broad location, as a symbol on the Key Diagram, and that more specific details would then be worked up later in a site-specific Development Plan Document or Area Action Plan (Preferred Options Report, page 87). A summary of the likely implications was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 149).

16.10 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 21 would have a positive impact on employment opportunities, accessibility to jobs, economic prosperity and the protection of greenfield sites but would require additional control under other Preferred Options. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 21 was capable of having a significant adverse effect on European Sites but that avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 87).

16.11 The suggested alternative was to identify the area as a strategic allocation, which would have required a level of certainty that could not have been provided, particularly as the pace of delivery would be largely dependent on market conditions (Preferred Options Report, page 87).

16.12 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 21 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (page 88).

16.13 Consultation responses, again, related to all elements of the Preferred Options Report but were now primarily directed towards viability, timing and delivery; the future extent of the project and the need to ensure that any further proposals remained consistent with what had already been approved; and further clarification over infrastructure requirements and the future of Bidston Dock (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, December 2012).

12 then PPS12: Local Development Frameworks (CLG, June 2008)

Proposed Submission Draft

16.14 By the time of the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy (December 2012), the application for the larger elements of the scheme at East Float had been approved, following the signing of a legal agreement in May 2012, and the site works for the first phase of a 228,000 square metre International Trade Centre had begun at Beaufort Road (Proposed Submission Draft, page 46).

16.15 Although removed as a specific spatial objective⁽¹³⁾ because of the overlap with strategic objectives for economic revitalisation and housing regeneration, the proposal for a new city neighbourhood has been retained within the Spatial Vision (Proposed Submission Draft, page 10); as a priority for economic revitalisation in the Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18); on the Key Diagram (Picture 7.1, page 24); and as a local priority in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS6, including measures to support integration with the surrounding areas (pages 27, 30 and 32).

16.16 Policy CS12 - Wirral Waters now sets out guidelines for the control of new development at East Float, West Float and Bidston Dock, on the basis of the planning conditions and legal agreements already approved (Proposed Submission Draft, page 44). Additional infrastructure required to support the proposals is identified in the accompanying Infrastructure Delivery Plan.

16.17 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS12 is likely to have a series of long-term, permanent, positive effects with uncertain effects mitigated through policies contained elsewhere within the Core Strategy (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 195).

17 Green Infrastructure

17.1 The Report of Initial Consultation (July 2006) identified the peninsula's coastline and scenery, natural environment and landscapes including wildlife, trees and woodlands, open countryside, formal and informal recreation facilities, parks, gardens, golf courses and open spaces as major strengths of the Borough (page 17). The Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009) also identified the lack of maintenance and cuts in funding, especially for recreation and open space as a major weakness (page 7).

17.2 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) identified these features as major contributors to the Borough's environmental context (page 10) and quality of life (page 13) and included green infrastructure and biodiversity in the initial spatial vision (Item M, page 41). Consultation responses confirmed the importance of green infrastructure and biodiversity (Report of Consultation of issues, Vision and Objectives, page 81 and page 98).

13 formerly Preferred Spatial Objective 7 - New City Neighbourhood

Spatial Options

17.3 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out two main options for providing for green infrastructure, based on the emerging findings of a Wirral Open Space Audit (page 192):

- Policy Option GI1 - identify Borough wide numerical standards for different types of green infrastructure
- Policy Option GI2 - identify specific priorities within each Settlement Area to reflect local needs and characteristics

17.4 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option GI2 was likely to be the most sustainable, on the basis that a neighbourhood level approach would take better account of local needs and circumstances (Spatial Options Report, page 198). The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option GI2 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, primarily because this approach would be better able to reflect the distinctiveness of each of the Settlement Areas (Spatial Options Report, page 199).

17.5 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option GI2 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 199).

17.6 Consultation showed strong support for Policy Option GI2 but a number of respondents still wanted some sort of standards to be included. Otherwise, respondents wanted a stronger emphasis on protection; on standards of management; and assurances that the multi-functional value of a fuller range of green infrastructure would be included (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 161).

Preferred Options

17.7 Although no longer identified as a separate Preferred Spatial Objective, because of the overlap with other aspects of environmental quality, the Preferred Options Report (November 2010) set out preferred options for green infrastructure, based on the assessment of the more formal types of open space contained within the Wirral Open Space Assessment (Strategic Leisure, 2010), which was made subject to public consultation alongside the Preferred Options Report (Preferred Option 18 - Green Infrastructure, page 75).

17.8 Preferred Option 18 was still primarily based on Policy Option GI2, to reflect the often unique character of the sites, habitats and features within each Settlement Area but with elements of Policy Option GI1 where it would still be appropriate to apply a numerical standard; and provided for Borough-wide standards for quantity, quality and accessibility for certain categories of site and a hierarchy of provision, including measures for protection and maintenance and the setting of local priorities in Settlement Area Policies (Preferred Options Report, page 77). A revised summary of the likely implications, including a brief review of existing and emerging standards,

were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 131) and additional information was provided on existing provision within each Settlement Area within the Revised Spatial Portrait (November 2010).

17.9 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 18 could help to improve environmental quality, attract investment and create healthy sustainable communities. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment indicated that suitably located green infrastructure, habitat management and enhanced access management may be necessary to prevent harm to European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 78).

17.10 The preferred alternative was an approach based on Policy Option G11 alone, which would only provide standards for restricted types of green infrastructure; would not be appropriate to apply to other significant types of green infrastructure; and would fail to take full account of local distinctiveness (Preferred Options Report, page 78).

17.11 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 18 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 79).

17.12 Consultation responses were critical of the approach taken within the published Open Space Assessment; sought a stronger emphasis on the wider multi-functional and strategic importance of green infrastructure; stronger protection for irreplaceable semi-natural habitats such as ancient woodland; a commitment to new and enhanced provision beyond existing standards; and a greater priority for funding, enforcement and maintenance (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 107).

17.13 Consultation on Settlement Area Policies, in January 2012, included further information on local priorities within each Settlement Area. Responses indicated the need for an up-to-date playing pitch strategy and built facilities strategy; contradictions between references to higher levels of development and shortages of open space; and commented on specific local priorities (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

17.14 The Proposed Submission Draft now includes four linked policies setting out general requirements for green infrastructure (Policy CS30, page 82), to be applied to all new development through Policy CS42 - Development Management (page 105); the approach to the protection of recreational land and buildings (Policy CS31, page 85); the provision of recreational open space in new housing development (Policy CS32, page 86); and the protection of biodiversity and geodiversity (Policy CS33, page 88).

17.15 Policies for green infrastructure are also supported by local priorities set out in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (pages 26 to 44) and a revised Open Space Assessment Update (December 2012). Provision for new, enhanced or replacement green infrastructure is also included in Policy CS45 - Developer Contributions (page 111).

17.16 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS30, Policy CS31 and Policy CS33 are likely to have long-term, permanent, positive effects, with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, pages 314, 320 and 332) but that Policy CS32 is likely to have largely uncertain effects dependent on how the policy is implemented alongside other Core Strategy policies (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 326).

17.17 Policies for green infrastructure also form part of the essential mitigation for the otherwise uncertain effects of other policies within the Core Strategy, including the delivery of the Spatial Vision (page 10); Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18); and Strategic Objective 5 - Environmental Quality (page 15).

18 Minerals

18.1 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) set out the limited nature of Wirral's mineral reserves and indicated that a sub-regional minerals study would report on any areas that may need to be safeguarded (page 12). Consultation identified sites at Carr Lane and Prenton (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 22).

Spatial Options

18.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) included further information on minerals activities as part of the Spatial Portrait, based on the findings of the Merseyside Minerals Study 2008 (page 66). No policy options were, however, included until the Preferred Options Report (November 2010), following representations from the former Government Office North West (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 166).

Preferred Options

18.3 Preferred Option 19 - Minerals identified the intention to safeguard the existing mineral reserve at Carr Lane and include criteria for the design, construction, operation, restoration and aftercare of mineral sites, supported if necessary by Supplementary Planning Documents (Preferred Options Report, page 80) and indicated the potential location on the Key Diagram for the Broad Spatial Strategy (Picture 7.1, page 31). A summary of the likely implications was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 141).

18.4 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 19 could create jobs and improve local economic performance but that additional controls would be needed to prevent negative impacts on biodiversity and residential amenity.

The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment concluded that Preferred Option 19 would have no effect on European Sites, as the main development issues would be addressed through a subsequent site-specific Development Plan Document (Preferred Options Report, page 81).

18.5 No alternative Policy Option was suggested, as the only alternative was not to include a policy in the Core Strategy (Preferred Options Report, page 81). A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 19 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 82).

18.6 Consultation indicated broad support but identified the need to contribute to national needs; make provision for the transportation of building materials; include any Minerals Safeguarding Area on a Proposals Map; refer to the recycling and re-use of aggregates and oil gas and coal bed methane; and the less onerous development management arrangements under the Review of Old Minerals Permissions regime (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 111).

Proposed Submission Draft

18.7 The Proposed Submission Draft now sets out criteria for control of minerals-related development (Policy CS38 - Minerals, page 98); the Key Diagram includes the location of a potential Mineral Safeguarding Area at Carr Lane (page 24); and the supporting text refers to the Borough's contribution to the landing of marine won sand and gravel; the preparation of a joint Local Aggregates Assessment for Merseyside and Greater Manchester; and exploration licences for land-based oil and gas.

18.8 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS38 is likely to have some positive but other potentially negative long-term effects which will need to be mitigated through other Core Strategy policies, through Policy CS42 - Development Management (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 354).

19 Waste Management

19.1 The promotion of waste minimisation and recycling, was identified as an opportunity for the Core Strategy in the Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009, page 7).

Issues Vision and Objectives

19.2 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) recorded progress in levels of recycling and the preparation of a Joint Waste Development Plan Document for Merseyside and Halton as part of the environmental context (page 11); identified sustainable waste management, with a greater emphasis on recycling, as an issue (Issue 28, page 39); and included waste reduction, re-use and recycling in the initial spatial vision (Item N, page 41) and as a potential strategic policy objective (Objective 28, page 44).

Spatial Options

19.3 The Spatial Options Report included a similar summary in the Spatial Portrait for the Borough; listed securing sustainable waste management as a key issue and indicated that many of the issues related to planning for waste, including the identification of suitable sites for new or replacement facilities were to be included in a separate Joint Waste Development Plan Document for Merseyside and Halton, with the next stage of consultation expected to take place in early 2010 (page 17). No Policy Options were, however, included in the emerging Core Strategy until the Preferred Options Report (November 2010), following representations from the former Government Office for the North West (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 166).

Preferred Options

19.4 Preferred Option 20 - Waste Management, indicated support for the provision of sustainable waste management, to minimise the need for landfill; to direct new facilities to industrial and commercial locations away from residential properties; and the intention to include site-specific proposals and additional criteria for development management in the Joint Waste Development Plan Document (Preferred Options Report, page 82). A summary of the likely implications was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 144), alongside expanded references within the accompanying Revised Spatial Portrait (November 2010, page 20).

19.5 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 20 would have a positive impact on economic productivity and the prevention, minimisation and recycling of waste but that additional controls would be needed to prevent negative impacts on biodiversity, heritage and residential amenity. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment concluded that the effect on European Sites would be addressed through the separate Habitats Regulations Assessment for the Joint Waste Development Plan Document for Merseyside and Halton (Preferred Options Report, page 83).

19.6 No alternative Policy Option was suggested, as the only alternative was not to include a policy in the Core Strategy (Preferred Options Report, page 83).

19.7 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 20 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (page 83).

19.8 Consultation indicated a broad level of support; support for the Joint Waste Development Plan Document; measures to discourage the unnecessary transport of waste on the strategic road network; and a specific requirement for the storage and recycling of waste in all new development (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 112).

Proposed Submission Draft

19.9 The Proposed Submission Draft now references the need to secure sustainable approaches to waste management in the Spatial Vision (page 10); retains references within the accompanying Spatial Portrait (Proposed Submission Draft Spatial Portrait, page 25); and refers to the spatial strategy, policy criteria and site allocations in the Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton, which was submitted to public examination in February 2012 (Policy CS39 - Waste Management, page 100).

19.10 Policy CS39 is also supported by reference to the need to make appropriate provision for on-site waste management in Policy CS42 - Development Management (page 105).

19.11 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS39 is likely to have a long-term, permanent, positive effect, subject to the application of the more detailed policies within the Joint Waste Local Plan for Merseyside and Halton (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 358).

20 Renewable Energy

20.1 The promotion of renewable energy and energy conservation was also identified as an opportunity for the Core Strategy in the Second Report of Initial Consultation (February 2009, page 7). The Issues Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) indicated the need to enhance the evidence base for the local feasibility and potential for renewable and low-carbon technologies, including micro-generation (page 12) and included the issue under adapting to climate change (Issue 26, page 38).

Spatial Options

20.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) consulted on three main options for providing for renewable, decentralised and low carbon energy (page 176):

- Policy Option RE1 - set a Borough wide target(s) to be achieved by all types of development
- Policy Option RE2 - set a Borough wide target(s) to be achieved by specific types of development
- Policy Option RE3 - set geographically specific targets for each Settlement Area

20.3 The initial sustainability appraisal indicated that Policy Option RE3 was likely to be the most sustainable but the Council indicated that a combination of Policy Options was likely to be preferred, on the basis that it may be necessary to balance the provision of new stand-alone renewable energy schemes against the application of wider requirements for most types of new development (Spatial Options Report, page 180).

20.4 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that a hybrid approach should be preferred and, if not, to give reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 180).

20.5 Consultation demonstrated wide support for a mixed approach but with little agreement over the detail. The majority of respondents, nevertheless, believed that Policy Option RE1 should remain the underlying assumption and that it was important that all types of development should at least be made to consider the possibilities (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 148).

Preferred Options

20.6 The national approach had been subject to significant change by the time the Preferred Options Report (November 2010) had been prepared, with proposed changes to the Building Regulations and the proposed revocation of regional targets. The Liverpool City Region Renewable Energy Capacity Study (Arup, 2010) had identified the proposed New City Neighbourhood identified under Preferred Option 21 - Strategic Locations as a potential priority zone (Preferred Options Report, page 87 refers), with a capacity for to generate up to 3.5MW of renewable energy through a district heating scheme, and appeared to confirm that the most significant local sources of renewable energy were likely to come from extensions to the off-shore wind farms in Liverpool Bay or the project currently being drawn up to exploit tidal power within the Mersey Estuary (Preferred Options Report, page 66).

20.7 The Council, therefore, concluded that the preferred option should be amended to include a general policy to encourage energy efficiency and the use and development of renewable, decentralised and low carbon energy and to focus on the delivery of the specific opportunities associated with Wirral Waters and the River Mersey (Preferred Option 14 - Decentralised Energy, page 66). A summary of the likely implications was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 111).

20.8 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 14 was likely to have a positive impact on economic growth and climate change mitigation but that further consideration against Preferred Option 15 - Better Design (page 69) and Preferred Option 16 - Development Management (page 70) would be needed to further mitigate any negative impacts. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment also indicated the need for a project level assessment for any project to generate tidal power from the Mersey (Preferred Options Report, page 67).

20.9 No alternative was suggested as national consultation had already begun to indicate that targets for individual developments may no longer be necessary following planned changes to the Building Regulations (Preferred Options Report, page 67).

20.10 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 14 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 67).

20.11 Consultation responses indicated concern at the wider environmental implications of exploiting tidal power; the need to treat all areas equally in terms of requirements on new developments; apply a greater sense of urgency; widen the scope of policy to include the full range of measures to promote energy minimisation, efficiency and conservation, including small scale installations in existing property; and that more than just combined heat and power should be required at Wirral Waters (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 96).

Proposed Submission Draft

20.12 By the time of the Proposed Submission Draft, the proposals for Mersey Tidal Power had been withdrawn and revised proposals to promote zero carbon compliance and micro-generation had been announced.

20.13 Measures to support the transition to a low carbon Borough are now provided in the Spatial Vision (page 10); Strategic Objective 7 - Sustainable Development (page 16); within the Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18); and through Policy CS43 - Design, Heritage and Amenity (page 107). The opportunity to establish a network of strategic renewable energy infrastructure is also identified within the Vision Statement for the Commercial Core (page 29); Settlement Area Policy CS5 (page 30); and Policy CS12 - Wirral Waters (page 44).

21 Settlement Area Policies

21.1 Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) first indicated that the Council was working on a series of more detailed area profiles for the main settlements of the Borough to provide a more local dimension to the emerging evidence base (page 22) but the division of the Borough into eight Settlement Areas first appeared in Spatial Portrait provided as part of the Spatial Options Report (January 2010).

Spatial Options

21.2 The Spatial Options Report defined eight broad Settlement Areas based on the main groups of settlements within the Borough. The Settlement Areas were also used to further explain the likely local implications of each of the emerging policy options.

21.3 Public consultation appeared to welcome the Settlement Areas as a way of making the Core Strategy more relevant to local people, providing that some over-lapping issues were also taken into account. The principal objection was that the boundaries, as currently drawn, would not support the expansion of the existing urban areas to accommodate development proposals within the Green Belt (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 17).

Preferred Options

21.4 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) proposed to continue to use the settlement area approach to better explain the implications of the Core Strategy for local areas and to allow the local distinctiveness of each of these Settlement Areas to be more clearly expressed. Individual policies for each Settlement Area were to take the form of a series of statements about local priorities and assets (Preferred Option 2 - Settlement Area Policies, page 12).

21.5 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 2 was likely to have a positive effect on social inclusion, urban regeneration and economic development and set priorities for maintaining local distinctiveness including landscape quality and local heritage but was capable of having a significant adverse effect on European Sites although avoidance and/or mitigation was likely to be possible through amendments to other Preferred Options (Preferred Options Report, page 13).

21.6 The only alternative identified was to use the three larger geographical units identified in the Regional Spatial Strategy, which was discounted when the Spatial Options Report was being prepared, on advice from the former Government Office for the North West, on the basis that it would fail to capture the local distinctiveness of Wirral's historic settlement patterns. The usefulness of this alternative approach has now been further undermined by the proposed revocation of the Regional Spatial Strategy (Preferred Options Report, page 13).

21.7 While the majority of respondents were happy to approve the principle of a separate policy setting out the local priorities for each Settlement Area, a number were concerned that a draft of these policies would not be available for comment before a final draft Core Strategy was published, when their opportunity to comment would be limited to issues of soundness rather than the substance of the policies themselves (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 13). It was therefore agreed that additional informal consultation on early drafts of the proposed policies would be undertaken before they were included in the Proposed Submission Draft.

Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies

21.8 Settlement Area policies were developed using information from the Revised Spatial Portrait (November 2010) supplemented, where available, by additional more up-to-date evidence, for example, from Local Transport Plan Monitoring Report, Travel in Merseyside 2010; the DEFRA Noise Action Plan; the emerging Water Cycle Study; and associated discussions with the local water supply and treatment company United Utilities.

21.9 Each of the draft Settlement Area Policies followed a similar format, setting out the relevant priorities that would apply within each Settlement Area, accompanied by an illustrative map and a short reasoned justification to explain why each of the policies were being followed and a short background document setting out the scope and reasons for the additional consultation. The accompanying maps, which were provided for illustrative purposes only, showed areas of greatest need; high-frequency

transport corridors; existing centres; employment areas; recreational open space; conservation areas; emergency services; hospitals; GP and dental surgeries; railway stations; and Major Developed Sites in the Green Belt; at a larger, more recognisable scale.

21.10 The majority of comments received followed similar lines to that already raised at earlier stages in the process, with local residents and amenity bodies seeking additional protection for the environment and developers seeking greater flexibility for new development, including urban expansion sites in the Green Belt and a wider range of uses on employment sites. Concern continued to be expressed at the implications of accommodating increased housing numbers within the urban areas; on a perceived over-reliance on Wirral Waters; the impact of continued housing restrictions on the local economy; and the identification of Hoylake as a district rather than higher level centre.

21.11 Newer items included more detailed comments on the implications for flood risk, with regard to employment sites in Wallasey and Moreton, and dock and waterfront sites in Birkenhead; requests to consider the impact of pedestrian and vehicular traffic on level crossings and the potential future designation of additional historic gardens; and further information on the ability of existing water supply and waste water treatment infrastructure to accommodate new development.

Proposed Submission Draft

21.12 The Council responded to the comments received by amending the Settlement Area Policies and their associated vision statements included in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy to clarify that the priorities set out are intended to promote sustainable development within each of the Settlement Areas; express the intention to enhance as well as maintain relevant assets; make provision for the protection of un-designated heritage assets; include the intention to tackle concentrations of worklessness and low incomes within the text of the relevant policies; clarify requirements related to flood risk; water supply and the capacity of waste water treatment works; provide for the promotion of sustainable transport; address the impact of pedestrian and vehicular traffic on railway crossings; and refer to other policies in the Core Strategy, where relevant. The more detailed changes to each Settlement Area Policy are set out in the Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies (December 2012, page 52).

21.13 Matters related to the Broad Spatial Strategy and levels of housing provision; the approach to alternative uses on employment sites; the need for additional design controls and character appraisals; the scale of retail development anticipated in individual centres; the position of Hoylake in the retail hierarchy; out-of-centre retail development; provision for highway safety, buses and coaches; the general approach to green infrastructure, biodiversity and priority habitats and the protection of sports facilities; the principal findings of the revised Shoreline Management Plan; amendments to reflect the changes to national policy for rural areas and Green Belts;

and matters related to the requirement for appropriate assessments under the Habitat Regulations, have been addressed elsewhere within the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy.

21.14 Additional background information on the expected impacts of climate change; the presence of non-designated garden landscapes; information on areas that are highly accessible by public transport and maps illustrating the latest information on high frequency public transport corridors; the location of current national and international nature conservation designations; references to where new housing development had previously been restrained; summary information on the provision of indoor recreation; additional detail related to water supply and the capacity of waste water treatment works within each Settlement Area; and reference to the emerging neighbourhood planning proposals for Greasby; and text that had previously been included within the consultation documents to provide additional local context on the choices facing each Settlement Area, has now been included within the Proposed Submission Draft Spatial Portrait (December 2012).

21.15 The further information on the ability of existing water supply and waste water treatment infrastructure to accommodate new development has also led to the inclusion of Policy CS44 - Phasing and Infrastructure, to ensure that development is not allowed to go ahead where essential infrastructure cannot be provided to an adequate standard (Proposed Submission Draft, page 110).

21.16 The sustainability appraisal indicates that the proposed Settlement Area Policies (Policies CS4 to CS11, Proposed Submission Draft, page 26 to page 44) are likely to have a wide range of positive effects with any uncertain effects mitigated by other policies in the Core Strategy, mainly through Policy CS42 - Development Management (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 151 to page 194).

21.17 Policy CS44 is likely to have positive effects with some uncertain effects on development viability but with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 384).

22 Development Management

22.1 The role of the local planning system in the management and control of development in the determination of planning applications has been a recurrent theme throughout each stage of the consultation process.

Spatial Options

22.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out two main options for providing for development management (page 185):

- Policy Option DM1 - include no specific policy in the Core Strategy
- Policy Option DM2 - set out a list of general criteria within the Core Strategy

22.3 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that Policy Option DM2 was likely to be the most sustainable approach, because of the opportunity to provide more locally specific guidance. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option DM2 was likely to be the Council's preferred option, on the basis that a series of basic requirements would also be useful to developers, agents, the local community and other stakeholders (Spatial Options Report, page 188).

22.4 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option DM2 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 189).

22.5 Consultation showed strong support for Policy Option DM2, to provide additional clarity but one respondent believed that Policy Option DM1 would lead to duplication and confusion and another that such a policy should not be in a Core Strategy (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 156).

Preferred Options

22.6 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) continued to follow an approach based on Policy Option DM2 and set out a list of the main issues that would need to be addressed when considering the appropriateness of any new development proposal or land allocation (Preferred Option 16 - Development Management, page 70). A summary of the likely implications were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 122).

22.7 The revised sustainability appraisal indicated that Preferred Option 16 had the potential to mitigate a number of potential adverse impacts, particularly in relation to the operation of other Preferred Options, depending on how the final policy was drawn up and implemented. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment indicated that an additional commitment would be needed to prevent an adverse impact on European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 72). The alternative was to have no development management policy in the Core Strategy, which would be unlikely to deliver high quality development required by the majority of consultation responses or the objectives of the Core Strategy (Preferred Options Report, page 72).

22.8 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 16 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 72).

22.9 Consultation indicated a wide level of support for the inclusion of a separate development management policy in the Core Strategy; noted that a number of other Preferred Options directly relied on Preferred Option 16 to mitigate any potential negative effects; sought clarification over whether one or more policies would be required; suggested that many issues would require further more detailed advice; and queried the implications for the future of existing Unitary Development Plan policies. Additional issues that should be covered included design; pipeline corridors; heritage, in addition to local distinctiveness; job creation; open space, sport and

recreation; sustainable transport and access; anti-social behaviour; disturbance to residents; Green Belt; energy efficiency and conservation; decentralised energy; and reducing waste; and suggested that the value of biodiversity, aerodrome safeguarding and design quality should be more explicit (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 101).

Proposed Submission Draft

22.10 As a result, Policy CS42 - Development Management (Proposed Submission Draft, page 105) now provides the overarching gateway to other policies that are necessary to provide the essential mitigation for the otherwise uncertain effects of other policies within the Core Strategy, including policies for Green Belt (Policy CS3, page 22); Wirral Waters (Policy CS12, page 44); employment (Policy CS15, page 52) and port-related development (Policy CS16, page 53); housing (Policy CS21, page 63); town centres (Policy CS26, page 74); out-of-centre development (Policy CS29, page 80); minerals (Policy CS38, page 98); and transport schemes (Policy CS41, page 104).

22.11 Policy CS42 also serves to directly support the delivery of the Spatial Vision; Strategic Objectives; Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18); and the local priorities set out in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (pages 26 to 44).

22.12 The safeguards that Policy CS42 directs proposals for new development to satisfy, relate to green infrastructure (Policy CS30, page 82); recreational land and buildings (Policy CS31, page 85); recreational open space in new housing developments (Policy CS32, page 86); biodiversity and geodiversity (Policy CS33, page 88); flood risk and coast protection (Policy CS34, page 90); drainage management (Policy CS35, page 93); pollution and risk (Policy CS36, page 95); contamination and instability, including invasive species (Policy CS37, page 97); on-site waste management (Policy CS39, page 100); transport requirements (Policy CS40, page 101); design, heritage and amenity (Policy CS43, page 107); phasing and infrastructure (Policy CS44, page 110); and developer contributions (Policy CS45, page 111). Policy CS42 also includes references to airport, utilities, pipelines and electrical instrumentation safeguarding; health and well being; and the protection of European Sites.

22.13 The sustainability appraisal shows that Policy CS42 is likely to have a wide range of long-term, permanent, positive effect, applied alongside the other policies it signposts in the Core Strategy, with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 369).

22.14 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS35, Policy CS36, Policy CS37 are likely to have wide ranging long-term, permanent, positive effects, with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 342, page 346 and page 350) but that Policy CS34, is likely to have a wide range of indirect and uncertain effects; and will need to be applied alongside Policy CS35 to ensure that sustainable drainage objectives are not compromised (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 338).

Better Design

22.15 Better design has also been a recurrent theme throughout the plan preparation process, particularly with regard to the impact on the protection of local character and distinctiveness.

Spatial Options

22.16 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) included three main options for providing for better design (page 181):

- Policy Option DE1 - Integrate requirements for improved design across all the other policies within the Core Strategy
- Policy Option DE2 - Include a separate Borough wide design policy in the Core Strategy
- Policy Option DE3 - Include provision for geographically specific design policies within the Core Strategy

22.17 The Council indicated that the preferred option was likely to be a mixed approach, using elements from every Policy Option, as the initial sustainability appraisal had suggested that all three Policy Options were likely to be equally sustainable (Spatial Options Report, page 185).

22.18 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that a hybrid approach should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 185).

22.19 Consultation showed wide support for a mixed approach. The general consensus appeared to be for an overarching design policy to be included, supported by lower level guidance, to ensure that new development matched the character and visual amenity of existing areas and secured elements of sustainable design (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 152).

Preferred Options

22.20 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010) suggested the provision of overarching design policy to promote the maintenance and enhancement of local distinctiveness and sustainable construction and design, supported by local assessments and guidance (Preferred Option 15 - Better Design, page 69). A summary of the likely implications were included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 118).

22.21 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 15 could support a wide range of measures to incorporate sustainable design into new development, while ensuring that development respected its setting and preventing any adverse impact on residential amenity. The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment showed that Preferred Option 15 was considered to have no potential effects on European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 69).

22.22 Policy Option DE3 was identified as the next best performing option but was not preferred because a partial, variable approach based on geographically specific areas was unlikely to be sufficient to deliver high design standards in the most consistent and effective way (Preferred Options Report, page 69).

22.23 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 15 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (Preferred Options Report, page 70).

22.24 Consultation responses indicated a wide level of agreement; provided this was applied equally across the whole of the area; and the policy was robust rather than vague or non-committal. Standards such as the British Research Establishment Environmental Assessment Method and the Code for Sustainable Homes were suggested to guide developers; supplemented by explicit references to the value of biodiversity and the historic environment (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 99).

Proposed Submission Draft

22.25 The Proposed Submission Draft now includes Policy CS43 - Design Heritage and Amenity (page 107), to be applied to all new development through Policy CS42 - Development Management (page 105), supported by local priorities in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (pages 26 to 44) and further references within the Spatial Vision (page 10); Strategic Objective 5 - Environmental Quality (page 15); Strategic Objective 7 - Sustainable Development (page 16); and Broad Spatial Strategy (Policy CS2, page 18).

22.26 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS43 is likely to have a wide range of long-term, permanent, positive effects, applied alongside other relevant policies in the Core Strategy, with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 377).

Transport

22.27 The Second Report of Initial Consultation recorded access to the national transport network as a strength of the area (page 6); traffic pollution as a weakness (page 7); the impact of traffic growth and over-loading of local infrastructure as a threat (page 8); and improving public transport and tackling the impact of car use and parking as both a need and an opportunity (page 7 and page 8). The physical accessibility of public transport including rail stations and terminals was also identified as a weakness by under-represented groups (page 11).

Spatial Options

22.28 Reducing the impact of traffic and congestion and improving the accessibility of employment, education and health were identified as key issues in the Spatial Options Report (page 17) and a brief assessment of the accessibility of each area was included in each of the Settlement Area portraits (pages 19 to 69). Co-ordinating transport and land use to increase the number and proportion of journeys undertaken

by public transport, walking and cycling was included in the Spatial Vision (Item O, page 81); included in Spatial Objective 6 - Transport Accessibility (page 92); and was a common aspect of each Broad Spatial Option (Spatial Options Report, page 99).

22.29 The Report of Consultation on Spatial Options indicated the need for further work to assess transport impacts and develop potential solutions (page 13); to reduce the need to travel (page 59); make best use of existing transport infrastructure and reflect reduced public funding; provide for additional transport infrastructure, to serve projects like Wirral Waters (page 70); and include an additional policy to address issues such as parking and public realm (page 166).

Preferred Options

22.30 The Preferred Options Report identified the need to promote sustainable travel choices as a driver for change (page 10); retained references to a more sustainable pattern of travel in the Spatial Vision (Preferred Option 3, page 15); and the need for accessibility was expressed through a number of Preferred Spatial Objectives (page 17) and the Broad Spatial Strategy (Preferred Option 4, page 28).

22.31 The impact on the capacity of local infrastructure and services, sustainable travel choices and transport, access and servicing were listed as issues to be addressed under Preferred Option 16 - Development Management (page 70); and as matter to be addressed under Preferred Option 17 - Developer Contributions (page 73).

22.32 Consultation indicated that a separate transport policy was required to promote sustainable accessibility; reduce congestion; encourage sustainable travel; and provide for the transport schemes that would be needed to secure the delivery the Strategy; and that transport modelling still needed to be undertaken (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 115).

22.33 Further information on congestion, traffic noise and the scope for further transport improvements was included in the consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies (January 2012). Responses indicated the need for local access audits; to address the impact of pedestrian and vehicular traffic on level crossings; provide for the comfort and safety of pedestrians and cyclists when maximising highway efficiency; clarify the requirement for traffic management measures to take account of impacts on the wider environment; and suggestions for additional transport schemes (Report of Consultation on Draft Settlement Area Policies, December 2012).

Proposed Submission Draft

22.34 The Proposed Submission Draft now, therefore, includes two additional policies: Policy CS40 - Transport Requirements (page 101), applied to all new development through Policy CS42 - Development Management (page 105); and Policy CS41 - Transport Schemes (page 104); supported by Policy CS44 - Phasing and Infrastructure (page 110); Policy CS45 - Developer Contributions (page 111);

the local priorities in Settlement Area Policies CS4 to CS11 (pages 26 to 44); the Assessment of Wirral Core Strategy Transport Impacts (August 2012); and the accompanying Proposed Submission Draft Delivery Framework and Proposed Submission Draft Infrastructure Delivery Plan (December 2012).

22.35 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS40 is likely to have a wide range of long-term, permanent, positive effects with no need for additional mitigation (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 361) but that Policy CS41 is likely to have a series of positive effects but must be applied alongside Policy CS40 and Policy CS42 - Development Management to avoid any potential negative impacts (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 365).

23 Developer Contributions

23.1 Concern has been expressed at each stage of the plan preparation process that developers should contribute towards addressing the problems likely to be caused by their developments.

Spatial Options

23.2 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) set out two main options for securing developer contributions (page 189):

- Policy Option DC1 - an enabling policy to support requirements through legal agreements and obligations
- Policy Option DC2 - an enabling policy to support requirements both through legal agreements and obligations and as part of a Community Infrastructure Levy Charging Schedule

23.3 The initial sustainability appraisal suggested that both Policy Options were likely to be equally sustainable. The Council, therefore, indicated that Policy Option DC2 was likely to be preferred, as it was likely to provide the most reliable future framework (Spatial Options Report, page 192).

23.4 A consultation question asked whether a fair assessment of the options had been presented, whether respondents agreed that Policy Option DC2 should be preferred and, if not, to give their reasons for the option that they preferred (Spatial Options Report, page 192).

23.5 Consultation showed strong support for Policy Option DC2, primarily on the basis of its greater flexibility but a few supporters of Policy Option DC1 still favoured site by site negotiation, believing it to be the easiest and cheapest to operate (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 158).

Preferred Options

23.6 The Preferred Options Report (November 2010), continued to follow an approach based on Policy Option DC2, listing the types of provision likely to be required to serve the development proposed or to mitigate its impact, and the full range of mechanisms that would be used to secure provision (Preferred Option 17 - Developer Contributions, page 73).

23.7 Regulations for the Community Infrastructure Levy came into force on 6 April 2010 and a preliminary list of potential infrastructure projects was included in an accompanying Preferred Options Draft Delivery Framework (November 2010).

23.8 A summary of the likely implications was included in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010, page 126).

23.9 The revised sustainability appraisal showed that Preferred Option 17 would have a positive impact on the local environment, assist in addressing local deficiencies and could help to secure a wide range of sustainability improvements (Preferred Options Report, page 74). The draft Habitats Regulations Assessment indicated that an additional commitment would be needed to prevent an adverse impact on European Sites (Preferred Options Report, page 75).

23.10 Policy Option DC1 was identified as the next best performing option but limits on the scope of planning obligations and uncertainty over public funding meant that only Policy Option DC2 would be capable of providing the infrastructure necessary to meet the Borough's ambitions (Policy Option DC1, page 75).

23.11 A consultation question asked whether respondents agreed with Preferred Option 17 and, if not, to give their reasons and explain how they would like to see it changed (page 75).

23.12 Consultation expressed concern at a previous over-concentration on highway improvements; indicated that priority should be given to public transport, walking and cycling before other physical transport improvements; and to enhancing and maintaining existing rather than just providing new or replacement facilities. Comments also suggested that a wide range of mechanisms should be retained to secure delivery; that New Homes Bonus should be taken into account; and sought more explicit reference to biodiversity; heritage; design; sport and leisure; support for local community groups; and a greater extent of community involvement in final decisions.

23.13 Three respondents still, however, indicated that each project should be considered on its merits rather than be subject to plan wide requirements (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 104).

Proposed Submission Draft

23.14 Although the Council has not yet resolved to become a charging authority, pending the outcome of the Core Strategy viability assessment, the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy provides for a mix of contributions to be sought,

through planning conditions; legal agreements; and the Community Infrastructure Levy, once a charging schedule has been adopted (Policy CS45 - Developer Contributions, page 111).

23.15 The sustainability appraisal indicates that Policy CS45 is likely to have a wide range of positive effects, with no further mitigation required (Proposed Submission Draft Sustainability Appraisal, page 388).

24 Delivery Framework

24.1 A framework for future delivery was first discussed in the Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009), which proposed a framework that would identify the principal implementation route for each policy; the organisations responsible; a timetable for implementation; the resource implications; and appropriate targets and indicators for measuring progress; and referred to some of the funding and delivery strategies then available (page 45).

24.2 The proposals drew a limited response but emphasised the importance of infrastructure and delivery planning; and the role of a number of other existing strategies and initiatives (Report of Consultation on Issues, Vision and Objectives, page 110).

24.3 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) included sections on the likely prospects for delivery as part of its overall evaluation of each of the options presented, which were retained and amended to include additional comments on the likely implications for additional infrastructure in the Preferred Options Assessment Report (November 2010). Short statements were also included on the potential methods for delivering each of the proposed Spatial Objectives (Spatial Options Report, page 83).

24.4 A Draft Delivery Framework was published for comment alongside the Preferred Options Report (November 2010).

24.5 The proposals again drew a limited response but indicated that the M53 Motorway was likely to reach capacity during the next ten years; that the impact of the Preferred Options on the M53 was still uncertain; and that the Framework needed to be further developed into a more detailed programme, as it was not clear whether delivery mechanisms were being proposed or whether the Framework was just intended to be a list of potential projects (Report of Consultation on Preferred Options, page 122).

24.6 The Proposed Submission Draft is now accompanied by a revised Delivery Framework, which sets out a series of potential implementation mechanisms, grouped by Strategic Objective, indicating the expected timescale, lead agency and source of funding; and a more detailed Infrastructure Delivery Plan, identifying individual items of infrastructure with their costs, funding sources, funding gaps and timeframes, which will be further developed in consultation with the relevant internal and external stakeholders, prior to the submission of the final Core Strategy to public examination.

25 Monitoring, Targets and Indicators

25.1 One group in the second session of each of the workshops held in November 2006 were asked to consider potential objectives, options and indicators for the Core Strategy. At both sessions, participants preferred to comment on the main priorities for an emerging strategy and identified only a limited number of indicators related to jobs, journeys to work, vacancy rates and energy efficiency (Second Report of Initial Consultation, page 9 and Appendix 17, page 37).

25.2 The Issues, Vision and Objectives Report (February 2009) set out some initial proposals for monitoring associated with the Local Development Framework Annual Monitoring Report (page 46) and Consultation Question 9 asked respondents to consider how success could be measured against each of the potential strategic policy objectives identified (page 44).

25.3 A wide range of indicators were suggested, including for contaminated land; the amount of development meeting the upper standards of the Code for Sustainable Homes; habitat loss and condition; Natural England standards for greenspace; open space and participation in sport; commuting distances; percentage of food grown locally; energy; water quality; the number of applications permitted against Environment Agency advice; number of properties at risk from flooding; the recycling and landfilling of waste; and the proportion of population within walking or cycling distance of various public services (Report of Consultation on Issues Vision and Objectives, page 109).

25.4 The Spatial Options Report (January 2010) also included some limited information on how progress against each of the Spatial Objectives could be monitored, including a number of suggested indicators (page 83 to 97). Responses were mainly focused on environmental issues and suggested the former National Indicator for local sites in active conservation management; monitoring information on Sites of Special Scientific Interest; Biodiversity Action Plan targets; the bi-annual review of demand data for playing pitches; and the Woodland Trust's Woodland Access Standard (Report of Consultation on Spatial Options, page 77).

25.5 Specific reference to targets and indicators was not included in the consultation on the Preferred Options Report (November 2010) but the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy is now accompanied by a Draft Monitoring Plan, which sets out what will be measured; the frequency of collection and analysis; the resources that will be required; and a series of potential triggers for review, which will be further developed in consultation with stakeholders prior to the submission of the Core Strategy to public examination.

25.6 The indicators to be applied are also set out in the Impact Matrix which accompanies each policy in the Proposed Submission Draft Policies and Written Statement.

26 Record of Compliance With Statement of Community Involvement

SCI Requirement	Initial Consultation	Issues, Vision and Objectives	Spatial Options	Preferred Options	Settlement Area Policies
Notification Letters	437 contacts	503 contacts	569 contacts	622 contacts	716 contacts
Public Notices	N/a	N/a	Yes	Yes	No
Press Release	N/a	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Council Website	N/a	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes
On-Line Consultation	N/a	N/a	Yes	Yes	Yes
Electronic Notification	N/a	N/a	Yes	Yes	Yes
Deposit of Documents	Libraries Technical Services	Libraries Technical Services	Libraries Technical Services 6 One-Stop Shops On-Line Portal	Libraries Technical Services 13 One-Stop Shops On-Line Portal	Libraries Technical Services 10 One-Stop Shops On-Line Portal
Summary Documents	N/a	N/a	Yes ⁽¹⁴⁾	Yes ⁽¹⁵⁾	N/a
Questionnaires	N/a	N/a ⁽¹⁶⁾	Yes	Yes	N/a
Focus Groups	2 x 2-hour workshops (50 people)	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a

15 A4 Key Diagram and 20-page Extract of the Preferred Options

14 8-page "taster booklet"

16 a series of consultation questions were, however, included in the main consultation document

SCI Requirement	Initial Consultation	Issues, Vision and Objectives	Spatial Options	Preferred Options	Settlement Area Policies
Public Meetings	N/a	N/a	Open Day - 22 January 2010 - 10.00am to 20.00pm (125 people attended) (17)	Open Day - 15 November 2010 - 10.00am to 20.00pm (65 people attended) (18)	N/a
Capacity Building (19)	See Focus Groups and Targeted Consultation	N/a	See Open Day and Targeted Consultation below	Wirral Council for Voluntary Services and Planning Aid - Workshop - 5 October 2010 - Drop in Session - 12 October 2010	N/a
Targeted Consultation	22 one-to-one meetings with "under-represented" groups	N/a	N/a	N/a	N/a
Local Strategic Partnership	Notification Letter	Documents	Notification Letter Taster Booklet Questionnaire Web links	Notification Letter Key Diagram PO Extracts Questionnaire	Notification e-mail and weblinks
Wirral Business Forum (20)	Notification Letter	Notification Letter	Notification Letter Taster Booklet Questionnaire Web links	Notification Letter Key Diagram PO Extracts Questionnaire	Notification e-mail and web links through on-line forum

- 18 public drop in sessions involving hourly presentations, document pick up, evidence base, with officers available to answer questions and provide additional information
- 17 public drop in sessions involving hourly presentations, document pick up, evidence base, with officers available to answer questions and provide additional information
- 19 also provided through Focus Groups, Open Days and targeted consultation
- 20 previously known as the Wirral Investment Network

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

SCI Requirement	Initial Consultation	Issues, Vision and Objectives	Spatial Options	Preferred Options	Settlement Area Policies
Area Forums	Notification Letter	Documents 10 Presentations	Notification Letter Taster Booklet Web links	Notification Letter Key Diagram PO Extracts Questionnaire	Notification e-mail and weblinks
Youth Parliament	N/a	Presentation - 3 March 2009	N/a	Teen Wirral Website "Have Your Say"	N/a
Older People's Parliament	N/a	N/a	Presentation - 5 March 2010, including public Q&A	Presentation - 3 December 2010, including public Q&A	N/a
Strategic Housing Partnership	Notification Letter to LSP RSL Representative	Notification Letters to RSL Providers	Notification Letters to RSL Providers	Presentation - 8 December 2010	Notification Letters to RSL Providers
MPs	Notification Letter	Documents	Documents	Documents	Documents
Councillors	Notification Letter	Documents	Documents	Documents	Documents
Council Departments	N/a	Documents	Notification Letter Taster Booklet Web links	PO Extracts and web-link "One Council" Newsletter (December 2010)	Documents
Specific Consultation Bodies	Notification Letter	Documents	Documents	Documents	Notification Letter

SCI Requirement	Initial Consultation	Issues, Vision and Objectives	Spatial Options	Preferred Options	Settlement Area Policies
Accompanying Evidence Base Documents	N/a	N/a	Employment Land and Premises Study 2009 Landscape Character Assessment 2009 Biodiversity Audit 2009 Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2009 Merseyside Minerals Study 2008 Town Centres, Retail and Commercial Leisure Study 2010 AMR 2009	SHLAA (July 2010) Open Space Assessment (November 2010) Birkenhead & Wirral Waters Integrated Regeneration Study 2010 Housing Market Assessment Update 2010 Affordable Housing Viability Assessment Update 2010 AMR 2010 (from 14 December 2010)	SHLAA Update (April 2011) from 22 February 2012 AMR 2011

Record of Responses Received	Initial Consultation	Issues, Vision and Objectives	Spatial Options	Preferred Options	Settlement Area Policies
Responses to Main Documents	N/a 105 respondents	543 responses 50 respondents	1,027 comments 108 respondents	789 comments 81 respondents	262 comments 56 respondents
Equality Impact Statement	N/a	1 comment	No comments	No comments	N/a
Sustainability Appraisal	N/a	Initial SA - 8 comments	Interim SA - 3 comments	SA Report - 3 comments	N/a
Habitats Regulations	N/a	N/a	Interim Screening Report - 3 comments	HRA Report - 3 comments	N/a

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

27 Specific Consultation Bodies Consulted

Key

IC = Initial Consultation (October 2005)

IV&O = Issues, Vision and Objectives (February 2009)

SO = Spatial Options (January 2010)

PO = Preferred Options (November 2010)

SA = Draft Settlement Area Policies (January 2012)

Specific Consultation Body	IC	IV&O	SO	PO	SA
Airwave MMO2		yes	yes	yes	yes
Bebington & West Wirral NHS Primary Care Trust	yes				
Birkenhead & Wallasey NHS Primary Care Trust	yes				
BT		yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire County Council (now CWaC)	yes	yes			
Cheshire West and Chester Council			yes	yes	yes
Coal Authority		yes	yes	yes	
Countryside Agency (now Natural England)	yes				
Countryside Council for Wales	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ellesmere Port and Neston Borough Council (now CWaC)	yes	yes			
English Heritage	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
English Nature (now Natural England)	yes				
English Partnerships (now HCA)	yes	yes			
Environment Agency	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Flintshire County Council	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Fusion Online Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Government Office for the North West	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Homes and Communities Agency			yes	yes	yes
Hutchinson 3G UK Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Liverpool City Council	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Marine Management Organisation					
Merseyside Police Authority		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mobile Operators Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
National Grid	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Natural England		yes	yes	yes	yes
Network Rail	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
North West Development Agency	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
North West Regional Assembly (4 NW)	yes	yes	yes	yes	
NTL		yes			yes
O2 UK Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Orange Pcs Ltd		yes			
Railtrack Property Division	yes				
Scottish Power		yes	yes	yes	yes
Secretary of State for Transport/Highways Agency	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sefton MBC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
SP Manweb		yes	yes	yes	yes
T Mobile (UK) Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
Transco (now National Grid)	yes				
United Utilities	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Vodafone Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral NHS Primary Care Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes

28 General Consultation Bodies Consulted

Key

IC = Initial Consultation (October 2005)

IV&O = Issues, Vision and Objectives (February 2009)

SO = Spatial Options (January 2010)

PO = Preferred Options (November 2010)

SA = Draft Settlement Area Policies (January 2012)

General Consultation Body	IC	IV&O	SO	PO	SA
Action Wirral Rivers	yes				
Age Concern Wirral		yes	yes	yes	yes
Allerton Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ancient Monuments Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Baptist Union of Great Britain	yes				
Barnston Conservation Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Barnston Womens Institute		yes	yes	yes	yes
Bebington Chamber of Trade	yes				
Bebington CVS		yes	yes		
Beechwood Community Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bell Ingram Pipelines Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bidston & N Birkenhead Environmental Action Group	yes				
Bidston Moss Steering Group				yes	yes
Bidston Preservation Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bidston Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Bidston Village CAAC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Birkenhead Market Tenants Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Birkenhead Town Centre Forum		yes	yes	yes	yes
Birkenhead YMCA		yes	yes	yes	yes
Brackenwood Committee	yes				
Bridgewater Meeting Room Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bromborough Conservation Area Committee	yes				
Bromborough Pool Village Society	yes				
Bromborough Society	yes		yes	yes	yes
Caldy CAAC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Carr Lane Residents Association	yes				
Central Liscard Area Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire & Merseyside Strategic Health Authority	yes				
Cheshire & Wirral Partnership NHS Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire Association of Local Councils		yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire Gardens Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire Jehovah's Witnesses	yes				
Cheshire RIGS Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Cheshire Wildlife Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Church Commissioners	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Civic Trust	yes				
Claire House Children's Hospice		yes	yes	yes	yes
Clatterbridge Centre for Oncology		yes	yes	yes	yes
Claughton Community Group		yes	yes	yes	yes
Clifton Park Residents Group				yes	yes
Council for British Archaeology	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Country Land & Business Association		yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Cycling Project	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dee Estuary Conservation Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Denbighshire County Council	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Devonshire Park Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Diocese of Chester	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Diocese of Shrewsbury		yes	yes	yes	yes
Disabled Motorists Federation		yes	yes	yes	yes
Eastham Village Preservation Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Eastham Village Residents Association	yes				
Eleanor Road Residents Association	yes	yes	yes		yes
Energy Projects Plus	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
English Churches			yes	yes	yes
Environlink Northwest			yes	yes	yes
Fender Valley Tenants Association	yes				
Forestry Commission	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Frankby CAAC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Arno & Oxtan Fields		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Arrowe Country Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Ashton Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Bidston Hill		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Birkenhead Park	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Central Park	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Coronation Gardens		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Dibbinsdale		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Eastham Country Park	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Flaybrick		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Gilroy Nature Conservation Society		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Grange Community Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Harrison Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Heswall Open Spaces					yes
Friends of Heswall Shore		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Higher Bebington Park				yes	yes
Friends of Hilbre Nature Reserve		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Hoylake & Meols Gardens		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Hoylake & Meols in Bloom					yes
Friends of Leasowe Lighthouse		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Meols Park				yes	yes
Friends of Ness Gardens		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of North Wirral Coastal Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Rock Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Storeton Woods	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Tam O'Shanter Urban Farm Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Tower Grounds		yes			
Friends of Vale Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Friends of Victoria Gardens				yes	yes
Friends of Warwick Park				yes	yes
Friends of Wirral Country Park		yes	yes	yes	yes
Garden History Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
General Aviation Awareness Council	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
General Synod of the Church of England	yes				
Georgian Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Greasby Outdoor Activity & Leisure		yes	yes	yes	yes
Groundwork Merseyside		yes	yes		

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Groundwork Wirral	yes				
Halton UA	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Health & Safety Executive	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Helsby Parish Council		yes	yes	yes	yes
Heswall & District Business Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Heswall Jehovah's Witnesses		yes	yes	yes	yes
Heswall Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
HM Coastguard	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Home Builders Federation	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hooton Park Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes
Hoylake Civic Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hoylake Conservation Areas Advisory Committee				yes	yes
Hoylake CVS		yes	yes		
Hoylake Village Life				yes	yes
Ince Parish Council		yes	yes	yes	yes
Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority					yes
Irby, Thurstaston & Pensby Amenity Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Irish Community Care Merseyside					yes
Joint Committee of the National Amenity Societies	yes				
Kings Gap CAAC (now Hoylake CAAC)	yes	yes	yes		
Kings Lane Supporters Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Knowsley MBC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Lairdside Communities Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes
Lawn Tennis Association			yes	yes	yes
Leasowe Community Centre		yes	yes	yes	yes
Liscard and Egremont Partnership				yes	yes
Manor Egremont Mast Action Group		yes	yes	yes	yes
Meols Drive Residents Association	yes	yes	yes		
Mersey Basin Campaign	yes	yes	yes		
Mersey Estuary Conservation Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mersey Estuary Development Co-ordinator	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mersey Forest				yes	yes
Merseyside & West Cheshire Ramblers	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside & West Lancs Bat Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Archeological Service (NML)	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Civic Society		yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Cycling Campaign	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Environmental Trust		yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Fire & Rescue Service	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Police	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseyside Policy Unit	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Merseyside Renewable Energy Initiative		yes			
Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Merseytravel	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Methodist Church Property Division	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mineral Products Association				yes	yes
Multiple Sclerosis Society		yes	yes	yes	yes
National Farmers Union	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
National Federation of Gypsy Liaison Groups					yes
National Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Brighton BRAVO	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Brighton Community Association		yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

New Brighton Community Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Brighton Environmentalists		yes	yes	yes	yes
New Ferry & Rock Ferry Conservation Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Ferry Business Association	yes				
New Ferry Regeneration Action Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Norman Street & Area Residents and Tenants Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
North Birkenhead Neighbourhood Forum	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
North West Association of Sea Angling Clubs	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
North West Strategic Health Authority		yes	yes	yes	yes
North Western Baptist Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
North Western Confederation of Passenger Transport		yes	yes	yes	yes
NW & North Wales Sea Fisheries Committee	yes	yes	yes		
Overchurch Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Oxton Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Partnership for Racial Equality		yes	yes	yes	yes
Port Sunlight Village Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Poulton & District Residents Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Poulton Protection Group	yes				
Puddington & District Parish Council		yes	yes	yes	yes
Pulford Road Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ramblers Association (Wirral Group)		yes	yes	yes	yes
RC Bishop's Conference for England & Wales	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Reclaim Our Quarry		yes	yes	yes	
Rock Ferry Community Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Rock Park CAAC					yes
Rock Park Estate Management Committee	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Royal National Lifeboat Institute	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
RSPB	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Rural Development Service	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Salvation Army		yes	yes	yes	yes
Saughall Massie CAAC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Seacombe Community Partnership				yes	yes
Seacombe Local Area Partnership	yes	yes	yes		
Seven Waves Community Radio		yes	yes	yes	yes
Shell UK Pipelines	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Showmans Guild of Great Britain	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Society for the Protection of Ancient Buildings	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sport England	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
St Helens MBC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
St James Area Regeneration Action Team					yes
Stanton Estate Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Sure Start (Birkenhead Central)		yes	yes	yes	yes
Sustrans	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
The Mersey Partnership (TMP)	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Theatres Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Thornton Hough Community Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tower Action Group		yes	yes	yes	yes
Towns , Needham & Co (for United Reformed Church)	yes				
Townswomen Wirral 101-25		yes	yes	yes	yes
Tranmere Alliance	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tranmere Parks		yes	yes	yes	yes
Tranmere Together		yes	yes	yes	yes
Transition Town West Kirby			yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Twentieth Century Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Union Street Day Resource Centre		yes	yes	yes	yes
VCA Wirral				yes	yes
VCAW Bebington		yes	yes	yes	yes
VCAW Heswall		yes	yes	yes	yes
VCAW Wallasey		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wallasey Civic Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wallasey Village Community Partnership		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wellington Road CAAC		yes	yes	yes	yes
West Kirby Village CAAC	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Westwood Road Residents Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Willaston Parish Council		yes	yes	yes	
WIRED	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral & Cheshire Badger Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Association for Disability		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Autistic Society		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Barn Owl Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Black & Racial Minority Partnership		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Business Forum (formerly Investment Network)	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Chamber of Commerce	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Change				yes	yes
Wirral CVS		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Disabled Peoples Partnership		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Environmental Network			yes	yes	yes
Wirral Federation of Tenants & Residents Associations	yes	yes	yes		
Wirral Fire Safety Command		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Footpaths and Open Spaces Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Friends of the Earth		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Green Belt Council	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Green Party	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Jehovah's Witnesses		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral LA21 Forum	yes	yes			
Wirral Local Strategic Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Magistrates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Multicultural Organisation		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral NHS Hospital Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Society	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Transport Users Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Urban Farm Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Victim Support		yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Voluntary and Community Services Network	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Waste Action Group				yes	
Wirral Wildlife	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Woodchurch Neighbourhood Management		yes	yes	yes	yes
Woodland Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

29 Other Consultees

Key

IC = Initial Consultation (October 2005)

IV&O = Issues, Vision and Objectives (February 2009)

SO = Spatial Options (January 2010)

PO = Preferred Options (November 2010)

SA = Draft Settlement Area Policies (January 2012)

Other Consultee	IC	IV&O	SO	PO	SA
A Power			yes	yes	yes
A2 Architects			yes	yes	yes
Abacus Organics				yes	yes
Adams Holmes Associates	yes				
Alisdair Macdonald	yes				
Ainsley Gommon Architects	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Airbus Operations Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Alinbrook Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
Alpha Homes			yes	yes	yes
Alyn Nicholls & Associates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Anchor Trust			yes	yes	yes
Appleton Group	yes				
Anna May Couture					yes
Arena Housing			yes	yes	yes
Arriva North West Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Arrowcroft North West Ltd	yes				
Athertons	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Atisreal Limited		yes	yes	yes	
Axis Planning Environment & Design	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Avantgarde					yes
B Wagstaff				yes	yes
Bargain Booze					yes
Babtie Group	yes				
Barratt Chester	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Barton Willmore	yes			yes	yes
BE Group		yes	yes	yes	yes
Beechwood & Ballantyne EMB Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bell Developments Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
Bellway Homes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bett Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Biffa Waste Services	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Birkenhead Building & Roofing Supplies					yes
Black Macadam	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bloomfields Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Blue Sky Planning Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bluemantle Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
BNP Paribas Real Estate			yes	yes	yes
Bovis Homes Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Brady Chartered Surveyors					yes
Braithwaite Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bremners Solicitors			yes	yes	yes
Bride Hall Holdings Ltd				yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Bridscape			yes	yes	yes
Bristol-Myers Squibb Pharmaceutial Research	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
British Aerospace	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Broadway Malyan Planning		yes	yes	yes	yes
Brock Plc		yes	yes	yes	yes
Brockway Dunn Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Brodies Solicitors	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Bruce Nowell Business Services	yes				
Building Design Partnership	yes	yes			
Bullivant Jones & Company	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Business Environments Planning	yes				
Burton Property				yes	yes
C A Planning			yes	yes	yes
C D Hughes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Campaign for Real Ale	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Carey Jones Architects	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Carpenter Bidwells Planning	yes				
Carr Gomm			yes	yes	
Cass Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CB Richard Ellis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CDP Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
CDS Housing			yes	yes	yes
CgMs Consulting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Charlesworth Group Ltd	yes				
Chelford Properties	yes	yes	yes		
Cart Plan 2004 Ltd					yes
Cherish the Bride					yes
Cheshire Office Park Limited	yes				
Chesterton Planning & Economics	yes				
China Plate Farm				yes	yes
Chris Thomas Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Cliff Walsingham & Company	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Clive Watkin Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
CLM Services	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Colin Buchanan & Partners	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Colliers CRE		yes	yes	yes	yes
Consilium Planning	yes				
Compendium Group (Riverside)					yes
Contour Homes			yes	yes	yes
Corporate Property Solutions	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Cosmopolitan Housing			yes	yes	yes
Countryside Properties	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Crosby Homes NW Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Crown Estate		yes	yes	yes	yes
Cuff Roberts Solicitors	yes	yes	yes	yes	
CUH2A Architecture & Planning	yes				
Cunnane Town Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
D Bamber			yes	yes	yes
D J Cooke & Company Ltd			yes	yes	yes
D Morgan Plc	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
D S & E J Webster				yes	yes
D2 Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dalton Warner Davies		yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Daly International		yes	yes	yes	yes
David McLean Homes Limited	yes	yes	yes		
David Wilson Homes	yes	yes	yes		
Dawn Ralph			yes	yes	yes
De Pol Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Denis Wilson Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Denton Clark & Co.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Design Planning Development	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Development Planning & Design Services	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dickinson Dees	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dickman Associates Ltd				yes	yes
Dimensions UK Limited (New Era)			yes		
Dixon Webb	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Doyle Developments		yes	yes	yes	yes
DPP	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr I Neilson					yes
Dr K Singh	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr M A Turpin		yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr M Baker-Schommer	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr M Day	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr Macbeath		yes	yes	yes	yes
Dr N M Jedynekiewicz					yes
Dr R Dockrell			yes		yes
Drivers Jonas LLP	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
DTZ Piedad Consulting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
E M Enterprises	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
EDAW Plc	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Edmund Kirby	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Elite Homes (North) Limited	yes	yes	yes		
Emerson Group	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Emery Planning Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Entec UK Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Environmental Resources Management	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Eqfund (IPS) Limited					yes
Environs Partnership	yes				
Fairclough Homes Limited (NW Division)	yes				
Family Housing Association			yes	yes	yes
FFT Planning					yes
Feilden & Mawson	yes				
Fisher German		yes	yes	yes	yes
Forster and Company		yes	yes	yes	yes
Fort Perch Rock	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Forthview Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Forum Housing Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Fuller Peiser	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
FWT		yes	yes	yes	yes
G Jones				yes	
G S Puddy	yes				
Garry Usherwood Associates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Gary Strother Builders					yes
Gauchwin Group				yes	yes
George Wimpey North West Limited	yes	yes	yes		
Gerald Eve	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Gilling Dod Architects		yes	yes	yes	yes
Gilmore Developments Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
GL Hearn		yes	yes	yes	yes
Gladman Developments				yes	yes
Goodwin Planning Services		yes	yes	yes	yes
Gough Planning Services	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Gregor Shore		yes	yes	yes	
Grosscurth & Co		yes	yes	yes	yes
GroundSure Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Guardian Retirement Housing			yes	yes	yes
GVA Grimley	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
H D Gee Consultants	yes				
H M Jones			yes	yes	
Halcrow Consulting Business Group				yes	yes
Halcyon Properties	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hallam Land Management Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Halliwell's LLP	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Harlor Homes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Haston Reynolds Partnership	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hawarden Airport (Airbus)		yes	yes	yes	yes
Heatons Stationery Ltd				yes	
Henry Boot Developments Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hepher Dixon	yes	yes	yes		
Hickling Gray Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Higham & Co.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hornby Homes			yes	yes	yes
Hourigan Connolly			yes	yes	yes
Housing 21			yes	yes	yes
HOW Planning LLP	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Hylgar Properties	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Indigo Planning Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Inglewood Properties	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Insignia Richard Ellis	yes				
Irvin Consultants			yes	yes	yes
J Barnard			yes	yes	yes
J Bowen			yes	yes	yes
J Smith			yes	yes	yes
J10 Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
JASP Planning Consultancy					yes
JMP Consultants Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
James Barr Consultants	yes				
Job Centre Plus	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
John Millar (UK) Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Jones Lang LaSalle	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
JWPC Limited				yes	yes
Kemp & Kemp	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Kersh Commercial	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
King Sturge	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Knight Frank LLP	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
L Masterman			yes	yes	yes
Lambert Smith Hampton		yes	yes	yes	yes
Lamont			yes	yes	yes
Land Planning Group		yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Land Projects UK Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Landmark Information Group Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Lattitude					yes
Leasowe Community Homes		yes	yes	yes	yes
Lees & Partners					yes
Leith Planning Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Leverhulme Estates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Liverpool Housing Trust			yes	yes	yes
LRM Development Consultants	yes				
M Graham				yes	yes
MacIntosh Communications Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Malcolm E Lloyd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Malcolm Judd and Partners	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Malcolm Scott Consultants					yes
Maritime (Regenda Group)			yes	yes	
Manor Kingdom Central					yes
Marine Lake Training Ltd					yes
Maritime Housing Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mason Owen Property Consultants	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Matthews & Goodman	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
McCormick Architecture	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
McDyre & Co.	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
McInerney Homes		yes	yes		
MCP Planning & Development	yes				
Mersey Docks and Harbour Company	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Mersey Waste Holdings Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Metropolitan Resources Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Michael Cunningham Architects			yes	yes	yes
Miller Homes (North West) Ltd	yes				
Miller Town Planning		yes	yes	yes	yes
Miss J Marguerie		yes	yes	yes	yes
Miss S Poole				yes	yes
Mitsubishi Electrical Europe B.V.		yes	yes	yes	yes
Moneycorp Limited	yes				
Mono Consultants Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
Morecrofts Solicitors			yes	yes	yes
Morris Homes (North) Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mouchel Parkman		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr R Neale		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs A & Y Salisbury				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs A Pasterfield	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Anderson				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Arnold				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs B & R Walsh				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs C T Hanman	yes				
Mr & Mrs D Gleave	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Dunne		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs E & B Bushell				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Edwards				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs G Archibald			yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs G Bowler	yes				
Mr & Mrs J & C Thomas					yes
Mr & Mrs J & C Thomas				yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Mr & Mrs J & H Wesencraft				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Jacques		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs L & B Bell		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs L & S Hurst				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs M & A Hudson				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs M & N Davies				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs M Cook				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs N & M G Dyson				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Neeson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs PM & UR Weston	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr & Mrs Povoas					yes
Mr & Mrs S & B Irving				yes	yes
Mr & Mrs T Sullivan					yes
Mr & Mrs Woods				yes	yes
Mr A Kennaugh	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr A Love				yes	yes
Mr A Nuttall		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr A P McArdle	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr A T Hurst	yes				
Mr A Royle				yes	yes
Mr Ashman					yes
Mr B Legan Dip TP DMS	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Badenoch		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Brown		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C Airey	yes	yes			
Mr C M Brand	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C P Arrowsmith	yes				
Mr C P Hales		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C R Hutchinson	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C S Thompson	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C Simpson				yes	yes
Mr C T Moore	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C W Dent BA Dip TP RIBA MRTPI	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr C Wellstead				yes	yes
Mr Cambell			yes	yes	yes
Mr Casement		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Allan				yes	yes
Mr D Birkett	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Clamp	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Cross	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Hollett				yes	yes
Mr D McKaigue	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Nooman		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr D Taylor		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Davies		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr E Fewtrell				yes	yes
Mr E J Norton		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr F Burgana BA MCD MRTPI	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr F Howell	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr F Hyde		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr F J Bloore				yes	yes
Mr G Bryan		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr G D Evans	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Mr G Ellison			yes	yes	yes
Mr G Jones					yes
Mr G Hunter	yes				
Mr G McGaffney					yes
Mr G Noble		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr G S Nagra			yes	yes	yes
Mr Gorman			yes	yes	yes
Mr Grey		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr H Grimshaw					yes
Mr H S Cameron				yes	yes
Mr H Turnbull	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Hale					yes
Mr Hogg		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Hussenbux	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr I Coulthard	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr I Wyche	yes				
Mr J A Wright BA (Hons) MRTPI	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr J Baird				yes	yes
Mr J Barrington			yes	yes	yes
Mr J Davies				yes	yes
Mr J M Corfe		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr J Morris					yes
Mr J Noble		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr J O'Neil	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr J Thompson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Johnson			yes	yes	yes
Mr K Collins	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr K C Pullman	yes				
Mr L Burman		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr L Parker-Davies	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Lynchy			yes	yes	yes
Mr Lyon			yes		
Mr M Curtis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr M Dewhirst				yes	yes
Mr M F Lewis	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr M G Laurenson	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr M Kivlehan					yes
Mr M Harrision		yes	yes		
Mr M Meredith Jones	yes				
Mr M Muller		yes	yes		
Mr M Rattenshaw		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr M Studley				yes	yes
Mr M Webster				yes	yes
Mr Mahoney	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Martin		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr McCormick			yes	yes	yes
Mr Mighall		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr N Ferguson				yes	yes
Mr N Poole				yes	yes
Mr N Whittingham	yes				
Mr P Barton MCD BA (hons)		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr P Berry			yes	yes	yes
Mr P Douglas				yes	

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Mr P Burgess					yes
Mr P Cutts					yes
Mr P Fitzgerald				yes	yes
Mr P Haywood		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr P Jackson	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr P McCann		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr P Pendleton		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr P Surrige					yes
Mr P Swift				yes	yes
Mr P Whearty	yes				
Mr Prandle		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Quaile			yes	yes	yes
Mr R Braithwaite				yes	yes
Mr R E Dockrell	yes				
Mr R Hardman				yes	yes
Mr R Hobbins	yes				
Mr R J Wood	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr R L Shelbourne	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr R Miles			yes	yes	yes
Mr R Taylor	yes				
Mr R Watson				yes	yes
Mr Reade		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Rowland		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr S Davies				yes	yes
Mr S Dyke				yes	yes
Mr S Palin				yes	yes
Mr Spencer					yes
Mr T Clark		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr T Denton					yes
Mr T Edgar	yes				
Mr T Kirkham				yes	yes
Mr T Roberts				yes	yes
Mr T Rock			yes	yes	yes
Mr T Tarr	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr T Wolf					yes
Mr Van Ingen			yes	yes	yes
Mr W Cates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr W Conroy					yes
Mr W Cushion				yes	yes
Mr W Eastwood				yes	yes
Mr W Mitchel		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr W O'Dowd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mr Watts			yes	yes	yes
Mr Wilkinson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs B Murthwaite	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs Clarke		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs D M Bentley				yes	yes
Mrs Duncan		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs E M Hale	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs G Nicholas		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs G Wollers	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs J Andrews		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs J M Smith	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Mrs J McIlhatton				yes	yes
Mrs J Wood	yes				
Mrs Johnson				yes	yes
Mrs K M Ives	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs Lewis		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs M Dockrell		yes			
Mrs M Callaghan				yes	yes
Mrs N L Ratcliff		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs R M Fraser	yes	yes			
Mrs S Charlesworth	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs S Shaw	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs T Chadwick	yes				
Mrs Testo				yes	yes
Mrs V Doodson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Mrs Weston		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms A Gillett				yes	yes
Ms A Holcroft				yes	yes
Ms C Radford		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms C Smyth					yes
Ms D Toony		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms E Davey	yes				
Ms E McVey (now MP)			yes		
Ms Foster		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms Gordon				yes	yes
Ms H Butler				yes	yes
Ms H M Jones					yes
Ms J Benfield				yes	yes
Ms J M McIlhatton	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Ms J M Stafford				yes	yes
Ms K Robinson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms K Truman				yes	yes
Ms L Rutter				yes	yes
Ms L Woodhead	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms M Bintley					yes
Ms M Bowman				yes	yes
Ms M Johnson		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms P F Elcock					yes
Ms S Colquhoun	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms S J Wall		yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms S Magee	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Ms S Sweeney	yes	yes	yes		
Ms S Noyce				yes	yes
Ms Seager		yes	yes	yes	
Ms V A Ferris				yes	yes
Ms V P James				yes	yes
Muir Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Myles Parry Estates					yes
N Power Renewables		yes	yes	yes	yes
Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
National Wind Power Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
New Brighton Football Club	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
NJL Consulting	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Norland		yes	yes	yes	yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

North Country Homes Group Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Northern Trust	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
P H Property Holdings Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
P Wilson & Company		yes	yes		
Paddock Johnson Associates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Paisleys Emporium Ltd					yes
Palms Fine Foods					yes
Pareto Retail Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Party Paraphernalia					yes
Patrick Farfan Associates Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Paul Butler Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Paul Dickinson Associates	yes	yes	yes		
Peacock & Smith	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Peel Holdings Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Peel Ports					yes
Persimmon Homes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Peter Brett Associates					yes
Phil Major Waste Disposal Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Phoenix House Residential Rehabilitation		yes	yes	yes	yes
PHP Developments Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Pierhead Housing			yes	yes	yes
Pine Court Housing			yes	yes	yes
Planning and Environmental Services Ltd	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Planning Bureau Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Planning Potential Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Port Sunlight Village Trust	yes				
Precious Moments					yes
Premier Brands UK Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Prime Maintenance and Development					yes
PTS Property		yes	yes		
R G Drake	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Reddington Developments Limited		yes	yes	yes	
Redrow Homes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
RES Northern Europe				yes	yes
Rev Father Ostaszewski		yes	yes	yes	yes
RGB			yes	yes	yes
Riverside Housing			yes	yes	
Robinson & Neal		yes	yes	yes	yes
Robinson Architects	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Rodney Housing Association		yes	yes	yes	yes
Roger Tym & Partners	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Royal Estates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Royal Liverpool Golf Club	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
RPS Planning Transport & Environment	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Safety Layne (Investments) Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Salisbury Developments	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Sanderson Weatherall LLP				yes	yes
Savell Bird and Axon	yes				
Savills	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Second Site Property	yes				
Seddon Homes Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Servite Houses			yes		
Shire Consulting					yes

Core Strategy for Wirral - Proposed Submission Draft Consultation Statement

Signet Planning		yes	yes	yes	yes
SLR Consulting Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Smith & Sons	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Smiths Gore	yes	yes			
Sommerville Primary School		yes	yes	yes	yes
Spawforths		yes	yes	yes	yes
St Mary's Catholic College		yes	yes	yes	yes
Stanton Land & Marine Development Limited	yes				
Steer Davies Gleave	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Steven Abbott Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Stewart Ross Associates		yes	yes	yes	yes
Storey Sons & Parker	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Stranraer		yes			
Street Design Partnership		yes	yes	yes	yes
Strutt & Parker	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Suburban Studios					yes
Survey & Design Associates	yes	yes	yes		
Taylor Wimpey UK Limited		yes	yes	yes	yes
Taylor Woodrow Developments	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Taylor Young	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
The Front Room					yes
Terrence O Rourke	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tetlow King Planning	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Thermal Ceramics UK Ltd			yes	yes	yes
Thomas Estates Limited	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tribal MJP		yes	yes	yes	
Tulip Limited	yes	yes			
Turley Associates	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Tweedale		yes	yes	yes	yes
Unichema Chemicals	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Unilever Research Port Sunlight	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Unilever UK Home and Personal Care	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Unilever UK Property	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
United Co-operatives Ltd		yes	yes	yes	yes
V David				yes	yes
Venture Housing Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Villa Medical Centre	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wainhomes	yes	yes	yes	yes	
Wardell Armstrong	yes				
Welcome Home Developments		yes	yes	yes	yes
West Cheshire Cleaning Services				yes	yes
Westbury Homes	yes				
White Young Green	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Williams Estate Management			yes	yes	
Wirral Development Corporation Ltd	yes				
Wirral Methodist Housing Association	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Metropolitan College	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Partnership Homes	yes	yes	yes	yes	yes
Wirral Planning Advice & Appeals Service	yes				yes
Woodford Group	yes	yes			