Person ID	ID	Question 6.9 - Do you agree with our preferred approach to defining a locally set threshold for retail impact assessments?	Question 6.9a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? If you answered Yes, you can comment here. Attachment 1 Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246724	LPIO-10530	yes					
1240223	LPIO-10667	no	Proposals for retail development located within defined centres should not need to have consideration of impact or the sequential approach. For clarification, we assume that these thresholds are actually applicable to proposals for out-of-centre developments which have catchments that include those centres. This must be confirmed and any resultant policy wording defined as such. For the purposes of setting applicable thresholds, we do note the reference to a benchmark store of a Tesco Express or similar and its potential to impact upon smaller centres. This threshold appears far too low, especially in the context of proposals for comparison retailing where the Tesco Express example would be irrelevant. An alternate higher threshold should be adopted for comparison retailing. In addition, it is hugely important that any resultant policy clarifies that any retail impact assessment should only need to be proportionate in scale and coverage to the proposal at hand.				
1246242	LPIO-10981		This must be a sensible moderated approach to ensure existing retail outlets are not jeopardised.				
1243890	LPIO-1127	yes					
1247196	LPIO-11603	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247214	LPIO-12431	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247492	LPIO-12531	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1240843	LPIO-12694	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1244681	LPIO-1274	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold				
1247578	LPIO-12892	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247510	LPIO-13016	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1246335	LPIO-13153	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1244681	LPIO-1316	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold				
1246853	LPIO-13408	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1246852	LPIO-13531	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247740	LPIO-13545		The Local Plan: Issues and Options makes reference to how the NPPF sets out that Local Planning Authorities can locally set retail impact assessment thresholds for the scale of edge-of-centre and out-of-centre development, and therefore proposes a locally-set impact threshold of 750 sq.m for Bromborough. The proposed new thresholds would apply to new floorspace, and proposed changes of use and variations of conditions to remove or amend restrictions on how existing units operate in edge-of-centre and out-of-centre locations. We note that this is significantly below the 2,500 sq.m. retail impact threshold set out in the NPPF. These updated threshold figures would impact any future proposed small uplift in retail floorspace, changes of use and variations of conditions at The Croft. Our Client understands that this is a requirement that is set by the Local Planning Authority and therefore would welcome the opportunity to discuss the appropriate thresholds in more detail with Wirral Council and encourage an open dialogue moving forwards to agree the best policy strategy and retail impact thresholds.				
1247746	LPIO-13687	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1242183	LPIO-14006	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247218	LPIO-14099	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247219	LPIO-14203	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247220	LPIO-14302	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247222	LPIO-14431	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1247226	LPIO-14521	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				
1243700	LPIO-1453	yes	The preferred approach must be logical and based on the local facts not models and statistics.				
1247245	LPIO-14616	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach				



Person ID	ID	Question 6.9 - Do you agree with our preferred approach to defining a locally set threshold for retail impact assessments?	Question 6.9a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? If you answered Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246827	LPIO-14737	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1241412	LPIO-149	yes							
1247246	LPIO-15356	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247248	LPIO-15483	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247251	LPIO-15579	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247252	LPIO-15666	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247274	LPIO-15767	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247275	LPIO-15907	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247936	LPIO-16036	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247287	LPIO-16232	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247344	LPIO-16320	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247349	LPIO-16407	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247353	LPIO-16495	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247354	LPIO-16589	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1244969	LPIO-1659	yes							
1247434	LPIO-16687	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247436	LPIO-16797	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247935	LPIO-16840		Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.						
1247437	LPIO-16970	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247439	LPIO-16971	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247441	LPIO-17094	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247960	LPIO-17215	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247962	LPIO-17302	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247966	LPIO-17409	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247971	LPIO-17512	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1241726	LPIO-17613	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247979	LPIO-17754	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247980	LPIO-17755	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1242966	LPIO-17823		I agree with the use of locally set thresholds for retail impact assessments. however I think you need to look harder at your evidence base in respect of the retail hierarchy, Birkenhead does not perform as a sub- regional centre. Most residents in Wirral shop in the local or District Centres or the numerous out of centre shopping areas and would the choose to go to Liverpool or Chester for comparison goods. a policy needs to be developed to strengthening the control of the out of centre retail areas. furthermore the core of these shopping areas need to be defined, there is too much retail space and the centres need to be diversified outside the cores, including the change of use to residential development.						
1245502	LPIO-17899	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247541	LPIO-18000	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247539	LPIO-18107	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						
1247996	LPIO-18274		Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach						



Person ID	ID	Question 6.9 - Do you agree with our preferred approach to defining a locally set threshold for retail impact assessments?	Question 6.9a - If you answered No, what would you change and why?
1237857	LPIO-18315		Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.
1245060	LPIO-1882	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.
1246851	LPIO-21189	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246918	LPIO-21379	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246924	LPIO-21380	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246928	LPIO-21381	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246920	LPIO-21591	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246926	LPIO-21592	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1245112	LPIO-2173	yes	
1242519	LPIO-2264	yes	
1245100	LPIO-2299	yes	Provided plans are consistent with The Climate Emergency, minimise t and public transport.
1242185	LPIO-23932	yes	Yes, we agree with the preferred option as it is a sensible approach.
1248542	LPIO-24401		The way that the proposed thresholds for impact assessments are exp Whilst a threshold of 1,500sqm for Birkenhead (as shown in table 6.4 c catch a lot of traditional retail floorspace it would not apply to the major regeneration in Birkenhead town centre is spearheaded by the master offer within the town centre, introduce more employment floorspace, these types of development are applied for elsewhere their impact up assessed. We are happy to work with the Council to assist in the devel regeneration initiatives committed in the masterplan area and other d impact assessments should be expressed using different levels for differ significant adverse impact upon the regeneration of Birkenhead town
1244826	LPIO-2449	yes	
1242697	LPIO-24705		West Kirby, Moreton and Heswall have a wide range of retail outlets, results style outlets already account for a large amount of floor a 54% in Heswall; and 74% in Woodchurch Rd (Prenton) (Table 6.4). Avaresult, the vitality of local smaller outlets, and customer choice is better only replacement like-for-like should be allowed. Lower thresholds manew outlets in these settlements. The percentages occupied by larger district & local centres. Birkenhead (29%) and Liscard (28%) which are in overall area, might attract new large outlets, as regeneration goes a 29% of floor space in these centres but given the larger area involved range of outlets to succeed. Such opportunities do not exist in the other.
1242950	LPIO-2578	yes	We agree that for sites outside the defined urban centre there should required.
1246458	LPIO-25786	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1246459	LPIO-25787	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach
1245180	LPIO-2745	yes	
1238835	LPIO-2936	yes	Yes. This approach seems reasonable.
1245159	LPIO-3058	yes	
1241315	LPIO-3300	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach

If you answered Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
raffic pollution and promote walking, cycling						
	<u>https://wirral-</u> <u>consult.objective.c</u> <u>o.uk/file/5659121</u>	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5657006			
ressed will not achieve their intended aim. of the Issues and Options document) would ority of A2/A3/A4 and A5 proposals. The plan, which is aiming to diversify the current cafes, restaurants and other leisure uses. If on the committed masterplan should be opment of policies which will safeguard the esignated retail centres. The thresholds for erent use classes to ensure that there can be no centre.	<u>https://wirral-</u> <u>consult.objective.c</u> <u>o.uk/file/5684894</u>					
nost of which are small. The few large space: 25% in Moreton; 46% in West Kirby; ailable land is limited or does not exist. As a r served by no more larger outlets. Perhaps, y help but should be sufficiently low to prevent outlets also cut across the hierarchy of town, already major shopping centres and are larger head. The larger outlets occupy just 28% or in these centres, there is opportunity for a er smaller towns/district/local centres in Table be a threshold where an impact assessment is	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5659118	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5659119	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5659120	https://wirral- consult.objective.c o.uk/file/5659121		



Person ID	ID	Question 6.9 - Do you agree with our preferred approach to defining a locally set threshold for retail impact assessments?	Question 6.9a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? If you answered Yes, you can comment here. Attachment 1 Attachment 2 Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1237944	LPIO-3410	yes				
1237827	LPIO-3811	yes				
1245288	LPIO-3881	yes				
1245346	LPIO-4131	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold.			
1240939	LPIO-4157	yes				
1245638	LPIO-4293	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1237667	LPIO-4577	yes				
1245416	LPIO-4643	yes				
1244629	LPIO-4784		Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1245713	LPIO-5106	yes				
1242372	LPIO-5335	yes				
1240383	LPIO-5438	yes				
1245954	LPIO-5519	yes				
1241661	LPIO-5663	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold			
1244896	LPIO-5827	yes	YES, as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1246310	LPIO-5958	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1245767	LPIO-6033	yes				
1242751	LPIO-631		I am agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1242541	LPIO-6336	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold.			
1246402	LPIO-6463	yes				
1241723	LPIO-6577	yes	The local community should be involved in defining a locally set threshold			
1246478	LPIO-6958	yes				
1237647	LPIO-696	yes	It isn't clear to me what action would be taken if the threshold were not met, nor why the threshold is s much lower than the actual values for current operations.			
1246482	LPIO-7054	yes				
1246488	LPIO-7238	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach			
1246348	LPIO-7296	yes	As long as it is well thought out.			
1241958	LPIO-751	yes				
1246592	LPIO-7783	yes				
1246594	LPIO-7866	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1240903	LPIO-7985	yes	This needs to be sensible and considered as retail need is reducing.			
1246605	LPIO-8175	yes	Agreeable to this approach as long as it is a sensible approach.			
1237882	LPIO-8438	yes				
1246598	LPIO-8711	no	Ditto, concern that data and evidence is not up to date and that Hoylake's re-emergence as a vibrant town centre is			
(Hoylake Vision)			not sufficiently recognised or supported in the emerging Local Plan			
1246631	LPIO-8912	yes				
1245034	LPIO-8959	yes				



Person ID	ID	Question 6.9 - Do you agree with our preferred approach to defining a locally set threshold for retail impact assessments?	Question 6.9a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? If you answered Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246651	LPIO-9153	yes	Local community must be involved in defining a locally set threshold.						
1239377	LPIO-9182	yes	As long as it is a sensible approach.						
1243448	LPIO-925		I can't comment on this as I have no idea what this means!						
1245289	LPIO-9306	yes							
1246678	LPIO-9368	no							
1246624	LPIO-9427	yes							
1242554	LPIO-9678	yes	We note that New Ferry has been designated as a 'local centre' and we support this designation.						

