

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246747	LPIO-10269	yes	The council should not even consider building on greenbelt land. This would preserve the Wirral's existing natural habitats.						
1245787	LPIO-10270	yes	I am broadly supportive of the Council's approach in acknowledging the rich natural biodiversity heritage and wealth of protected sites on and around Wirral. I support the development of a Recreation Mitigation Strategy although this alone is unlikely to solve the issues of visitor pressure or disturbance of some of the internationally important designated sites around our coast. The Council risks becoming powerless to influence the continuing decline in nature by allowing other policy priorities to take precedence over sustainability of healthy soils, rich biodiversity, and natural green spaces which bring health and wellbeing benefits to our communities. I would like to see 'recovery of nature' as a theme in the Local Plan and a comprehensive strategy developed (similar to the Climate Change Strategy) to support a partnership approach to making the very best of the exceptional natural assets on our doorstep while providing for their conservation.						
1245044	LPIO-10364	no	Gilroy Scrape, off Gilroy Road, West Kirby is not included in this list. It was home to 1000s of Black Tailed Godwits and needs to be returned to its previous state and protected						
1246559 (Wirral Wildlife Trust)	LPIO-10377	no	<p>Whilst we support this approach the wording is outdated as it reflects that in the 2012 NPPF and not the revised 2018 NPPF. Specifically we refer to the inclusion of the caveats 'where possible' and 'seek to' when describing biodiversity net gain and protecting the environment. These caveats do not appear in the 2018 version and should be removed. The new guidance refers to securing measurable gains for biodiversity in three sections of the NPPF:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Paragraph 174b) - identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity.</li> <li>• Paragraph 175 d) - development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity</li> <li>• Paragraph 170d) - minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures</li> </ul> <p>We suggest revised wording for Habitats and Biodiversity: The council will protect and enhance the natural Environmental Assets of the borough, including the designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites; priority habitats and species; ancient woodland; and ancient and veteran trees found outside ancient woodland; and provide net gains in biodiversity and establish coherent ecological networks.</p> <p>Of crucial importance to achieving the environmental objectives as set out in the NPPF 2018 is to have a Biodiversity Net Gain policy adopted as part of the Local Plan which sets out specific guidance and reflects the ten Biodiversity Net Gain - good practice principles for development (Ciria, CIEEM, IEMA 2016).</p> <p>Preferred Approach - Internationally Important Sites</p> <p>We welcome the approach to create a recreation mitigation policy to help protect internationally important sites and their supporting habitats.</p> <p>Preferred Approach - Wirral's Biodiversity</p> <p>A Biodiversity Net Gain approach is based upon:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Evidence based decisions (core sites - statutory and non-statutory, supporting habitat, priority habitat/species and ecological networks are mapped and incorporated into the strategy)</li> <li>• Mitigation hierarchy is followed (avoid, mitigate and only as a last resort compensate)</li> <li>• Measurable Biodiversity Net Gain is secured long term for all development (at least 10% uplift)</li> </ul> <p>First and foremost should be avoiding impacts to biodiversity assets which involves evidence based decisions, strategic mapping of assets, buffering sites from impacts such as disturbance and light/water pollution (this should be 50m for the most sensitive habitats). Ways to secure measurable Biodiversity Net Gain include increasing the total amount of wildlife habitat in the borough, restoring existing areas of high-value habitat, linking up areas of high-value habitat that may currently be fragmented.</p> <p>It is essential that losses and gains of natural assets are measured using a standard Biodiversity Net Gain calculation. As set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain good practice principles all Biodiversity Net Gain should be documented and transparent. All habitat creation should be managed in the long term by a competent offset provider.</p>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5668195">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5668195</a>					
1244412	LPIO-1058	no	Protect the greenbelt from development is main way to ensure continuing bio diversity - it should not be built on at any costs, if necessary use legal protection						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1241065	LPIO-10602	no	I doubt the council knows how best to maintain the areas biodiversity, there isn't even a species list for Birkenhead Park. There is a need for recording of species on a regular basis to ensure the biodiversity is properly addressed.						
1246724	LPIO-10605	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1241337	LPIO-10628	yes							
1246544	LPIO-10637	yes	..except that an allowance for development "if benefits outweigh the damage" could be used to justify almost anything. Destruction of wildlife sites cannot be "mitigated". All wildlife sites should be protected, whatever their designation, as well as linked sites (such as fields used by migratory waders when pushed off estuaries by high tides). Spraying poison on beaches is incompatible with protecting the environment and should be stopped forthwith. It does not in any case achieve its aim Public rights of way should be protected						
1246803	LPIO-10746	yes							
1246242	LPIO-11002		Biodiversity requires addressing at all times. The Council need to ensure all wild life habitats have legal protection and all Green Belt remains undeveloped.						
1247286	LPIO-11467		The Bird Conservation Targeting Project (BCTP) produces breeding distribution maps for rare and declining farmland and woodland birds. The following species are identified in the designated areas: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Tree sparrow</li> <li>• Redshank</li> <li>• Grey partridge</li> <li>• Lapwing</li> <li>• Corn bunting</li> <li>• Bats - a number of varieties</li> </ul>						
1243890	LPIO-1148	yes							
1247309	LPIO-11515		Most walks we see diverse range of bird life including birds of prey and we frequently hear owls in the woods at night. If you develop this land, these birds will lose their hunting grounds and therefore their habitats will be lost.						
1247196	LPIO-11624		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247359	LPIO-11653		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1241176	LPIO-1172	no	In addition to what has already been planned on behalf of Ditton Lane nature area community group I would suggest the following: Designate Ditton Lane Nature Area ( see the boundaries on the attached map ) as a Local Wildlife site (part of it currently appears as OS 238 on the local plan but another 2 important for the wildlife parts have been designated as residential area/housing ) . The area is very important from biodiversity point of view and has lots of endangered species ( e.g bats, newts, black poplars, etc ). The wildlife is thoroughly documented by many scientific surveys and the area is currently a subject of an application from Wirral Wildlife to Wirral Council to designate it as a protected Local Wildlife Site which our organisation Ditton Lane Nature area community group fully supports.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5613148">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5613148</a>					
1247015	LPIO-11868 1 of 2		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247015	LPIO-11868 2 of 2		Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247405	LPIO-12221		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247363	LPIO-12222		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247364	LPIO-12223		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247365	LPIO-12224		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247366	LPIO-12225		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247369	LPIO-12226		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247370	LPIO-12227		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247371	LPIO-12228		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247372	LPIO-12229		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247373	LPIO-12230		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247374	LPIO-12231		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247375	LPIO-12232		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247376	LPIO-12233		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247377	LPIO-12234		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247378	LPIO-12235		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247379	LPIO-12236		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247380	LPIO-12237		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247381	LPIO-12238		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247382	LPIO-12239		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247383	LPIO-12240		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247385	LPIO-12241		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247386	LPIO-12242		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247387	LPIO-12243		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247388	LPIO-12244		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247389	LPIO-12245		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247390	LPIO-12246		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247391	LPIO-12247		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247392	LPIO-12248		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247393	LPIO-12249		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247394	LPIO-12250		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247363	LPIO-12252		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1241910	LPIO-12451		I agree with Wirral Wildlife's report in which they state that the effect of loss of green belt on our wildlife has hardly been mentioned. The only mention I could find was the statement that SSI'S should of course be subject to continuing protections.						
1247214	LPIO-12457		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247492	LPIO-12559		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1240843	LPIO-12715		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247560	LPIO-12796		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247561	LPIO-12799		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247563	LPIO-12803		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247564	LPIO-12807		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247565	LPIO-12810		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247566	LPIO-12813		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247568	LPIO-12816		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedegrows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247570	LPIO-12819		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedgerows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247571	LPIO-12822		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedgerows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247572	LPIO-12825		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedgerows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247573	LPIO-12828		I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed off especially now with the environmental prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife birds of prey including owls + bats etc. is unthinkable. also the hedgerows that have been replanted in the last few years.						
1247578	LPIO-12914		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247510	LPIO-13039		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246335	LPIO-13177		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246853	LPIO-13430		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246852	LPIO-13556		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247746	LPIO-13711		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247228	LPIO-13742		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247747	LPIO-13755		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1238192	LPIO-13819		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247012	LPIO-13873		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247014	LPIO-13927		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1244681	LPIO-1394	yes	Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.).</li> <li>• Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive.</li> <li>• Public rights of way should be protected</li> </ul>						
1242183	LPIO-14028		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247218	LPIO-14123		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247219	LPIO-14226		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1244900	LPIO-1429	yes							
1247220	LPIO-14323		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247222	LPIO-14452		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247226	LPIO-14542		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247245	LPIO-14640		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247829	LPIO-14674 1 of 2		The Council is showing awareness, in this second Local Plan draft, of the importance of biodiversity in terms of habitats and species of animals and plants. It is also aware that good, suitable habitat is to be protected if biodiversity is to be maintained and enhanced. Yet the intent is not fully realised as some Green Belt parcels would inevitably incur reduced biodiversity, either directly or indirectly, if they were given over to development. Nor is awareness clearly demonstrated of the existence of a local level of protection: Local Wildlife Site (LWS), a widely used designation in Wirral and elsewhere after it replaced SBI designation (Site of Biological Importance). The latter term is listed and used in the current draft Plan, but not systematically, while LWS seems to be ignored altogether although it covers much Green Belt land. A lot of research went into the initial designation of sites as SBIs and is ongoing to ascertain that sites satisfy the LWS requirements. The SBI, now LWS designation, is an important reference to a site's biological importance and should be referred to in any discussion of wildlife presence. Consistent reference to LWS would, however, not change my opinion that there should be no release of Greenfield land for development, even in the few cases where the land in question is not in itself particularly important						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247829	LPIO-14674 2 of 2		<p>for animals and plants. I feel particularly strongly about (and have knowledge of) the potential release of the parcels discussed below. In fact I cannot understand how these could ever have been described as 'weak' contributors to the Green Belt! In fact this term is very unfortunate and misleading; it should not be used as a Green Belt descriptor in the revised Local Plan.</p> <p>Parcel 7.20 (SP065,66) Landican, infill of village. Besides having Heritage Value, the hamlet and its surroundings harbour several species of protected animals, especially at Old Hall Farm: foremost bats, badgers, brown hair and great-crested newts as well as generally wildlife-rich ponds.</p> <p>Parcel 6.11 North of Hilbre School, West Kirby. Nearby Hoylake Langfields area has served as supporting habitat for waders wintering on the Dee Estuary and Wirral Foreshore Ramsar / SPA sites. Detailed planning would be needed to ensure that the site would potentially remain useful for birds and that there would be no loss in biodiversity.</p> <p>Parcel 6.15 (SP013) West of and along Column Road, West Kirby, includes Caldly Hill LWS (heathland), Stapledon Wood LWS and high quality farmland, the latter containing ponds. There is a local badger population which uses the whole parcel; this is rich in bird and insect life, wild birds visiting the nearby wildfowl collection use the farmland, bats forage and breed on the site. Housing development on the farmland would destroy wildlife habitat and reduce the value of the LWSs as visitor (and dog) numbers would increase, causing trampling and thus damage to fauna and flora. Night light and noise would compound the disturbance at least to Stapledon Wood.</p> <p>Parcel 7.25 Sandy Lane by Irby Hill. Site located close to a part of Thurstaston Common SSSI which is damp heath, a rare habitat in Wirral (and Chester) with some rare plants. Nearby development might lower the water level and cause this special habitat to dry out and also suffer from increased trampling by people.</p> <p>Parcel 7.26 (SP009) Rear of Irby Hall, Backford Road Pond. Contains a fairly large pond with a substantial great-crested newt population which is a legally protected species that needs sufficient terrestrial habitat near the breeding pond to forage. Thus the farmland West of the pond must be protected and not developed, gardens around the houses would not suffice for maintaining the population. Numerous bird species visit the pond to feed, a pair of Coots has bred on it.</p> <p>Parcel 7.27 (SP060), South of Thingwall Road, Irby. Building houses on this farmland would, most likely, cause huge damage to the adjacent Ancient Woodland known as Harrock Wood. This is an LWS which is owned by the National Trust and has inalienable status, meaning that it must not be damaged in any way. While the land on which the wood stands would not be directly threatened by nearby housing, the ecology in terms of its rich plant and animal life would inevitably suffer as the visitor numbers, hence footfall by humans and dogs, would greatly increase. The farmland area which is accessible on public footpaths, would lose its Landscape Value as established hedgerows and also evidence of an ancient field pattern on the farmland would inevitably disappear. There is also a danger that the Arrowe Brook which flows through the field and Harrock Wood could become polluted, damaging the river and its banks, and therefore the integrity and biodiversity of the woodland.</p>						
1246827	LPIO-14758		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247016	LPIO-14863 1 of 2		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247016	LPIO-14863 2 of 2		While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land "[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247018	LPIO-14933		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land "[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247744	LPIO-14960		In my opinion, the Council are also missing an opportunity to enhance the attraction of the Wirral to local inhabitants and tourists. Instead of yet another golf course, why not join up with the RSPB, Cheshire County Council and Flintshire Council to promote a coastal Nature Reserve that follows the banks of the River Dee? The RSPB already has grant funding to pursue this aim, we have a number of SSI sites in Hoylake, West Kirby, Hilbre Island and Heswall that would lend themselves to such a development, linking up naturally to Parkgate marshes and Burtonmere Nature Reserve. It would provide a recreational and educational experience for the whole family, not just the golfers, from very young to mature people and offer our schools another educational experience. In the current climate of preserving and enhancing the natural world to help counteract global warming, I am sure there must be other environmental funding available to help develop this idea. There are an increasing number of schemes, mostly in the South of England, which are being developed into 'super reserves' to link varied natural habitats together to provide an overview of the local natural diversity. Wirral could be at the forefront of such a scheme, which I'm sure would attract tourists to such a pioneering area. Thank you for listening. I look forward to hearing that you have taken my comments into account before making your decision						
1247864	LPIO-15201		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247865	LPIO-15217		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247866	LPIO-15224		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1243700	LPIO-1523	yes	Liverpool City Region is not responsible for Wirral's habitat or biodiversity and their Local Plan should take note of our Councils strategy and not the other way round. The biodiversity and habitats of Wirral need some form of legal protection.						
1247867	LPIO-15246		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247868	LPIO-15260		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247873	LPIO-15275		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247869	LPIO-15299		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247246	LPIO-15378		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247870	LPIO-15404		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247871	LPIO-15440		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247872	LPIO-15492		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247248	LPIO-15508		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247251	LPIO-15600		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247252	LPIO-15687		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247274	LPIO-15791		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247275	LPIO-15945		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247936	LPIO-16059		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247287	LPIO-16253		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247344	LPIO-16341		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247349	LPIO-16428		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1241381	LPIO-165	yes	There is plenty of scientific evidence re: how to take care of our coastal areas, as well as input and regulatory control from government bodies. eg Natural England. The councillors and their officers should be aware of some very loud protestations about management of Hoylake beach... these appear to be nimbyism and lacking in knowledge of the historical care of the coast and of the science that could influence how to proceed in the present changing world.						
1247353	LPIO-16516		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247354	LPIO-16611		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247434	LPIO-16713		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247436	LPIO-16819		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247935	LPIO-16947		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247437	LPIO-17014		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247439	LPIO-17015		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247441	LPIO-17115		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247960	LPIO-17236		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247962	LPIO-17327		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247965	LPIO-17353		Biodiversity. The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF. This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1247966	LPIO-17436		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247967	LPIO-17454		Biodiversity. The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF. This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1244969	LPIO-1748	no	The approach is correct but is not broad or detailed enough. Green Belt sites have been proposed that support the feeding grounds of European Protected Bird Species despite WBC saying that they would not be brought forward. The importance of Farm land has not been considered during Winter storms when shore birds use it for shelter. There has been no consideration put forward to recognise important Farm Land bird species which breed and feed on our Agricultural Green belt land						
1247971	LPIO-17534		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1241726	LPIO-17634		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247979	LPIO-17801		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247980	LPIO-17803		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1245502	LPIO-17930		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247981	LPIO-17941		<p>CRITERION 2: ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There will not be protection of Agricultural Enterprise (AGR1) that reflects the importance of agriculture to the local community to maintain the character of Wirral's rural areas</li> <li>• Birds will not be conserved. The Bird Conservation Targeting project (BCTP) – rare and declining woodland birds breeding distribution identifies the following species in Area 2B: Tree Sparrows; Redshanks; Grey Partridges; Lapwings; Corn Buntings and a number of varieties of bats.</li> </ul> <p>CRITERION 3: BIODIVERSITY Ref: AGR1: The Protection of Agriculture Strategic Policy will be contravened as:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Data proves that agriculture is still of significant significance re the impact on the economy of Wirral</li> <li>• The national planning policy, which emphasizes sustaining the rural economy and protecting the countryside, will not be adhered to. All of Wirral's rural areas are within the Green Belt</li> <li>• Land classified by the Ministry of Agriculture and Fisheries that is of national importance and as such should be protected from development will not be protected from development. Over 50% of Wirral's agricultural land is within the category.</li> <li>• AGR1 seeks to protect land of poorer quality to protect parcels of land incapable of future development use due to fragmentation</li> <li>• Adjacent developments can have operational implications for cropping and livestock husbandry</li> <li>• Barnstondale is an ancient woodland with three sites of biological importance which should remain as such. It has been claimed that Barnstondale will not be affected but this is clearly nonsense as it will be an island in a sea of dwellings – not exactly conducive to accommodating and maintaining the badgers, bats and other wildlife there.</li> </ul>						
1247541	LPIO-18030		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1242537	LPIO-18105		I would like to see more wildflower meadows to be planted alongside railway tracks on motorway verges roundabouts in parks and on the Council's golf courses.						
1247539	LPIO-18137		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247983	LPIO-18167		The wildflowers near the dips in New Brighton are very precious; I would like to see more wildflower meadows to be planted alongside railway tracks on motorway verges roundabouts in parks and on the Council's golf courses.						
1238043	LPIO-1828	yes	But there is a link between promoting specific sites for the protection of wildlife and the general despoilation of the environment by continuing to think in terms such as weaker green belt. All geen belt helps bio-diversity to some extent mostly by merely being there.						
1247996	LPIO-18311		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1237857	LPIO-18352		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection. The biggest action that could be taken is to preserve the Greenbelt in order to maintain habitats particularly wildlife corridors .						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247021	LPIO-18414		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247022	LPIO-18468		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247023	LPIO-18523		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247024	LPIO-18578		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247025	LPIO-18672		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247038	LPIO-18673		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248022	LPIO-18722		I wonder if I might contribute to Wirral Council's Consultation with the following suggestions, which I have, with their permission, borrowed from the excellent group Save Newcastle's Wildlife. They are keen to have embedded into planning applications the following wildlife-friendly measures, which would, I am sure, also have a significantly beneficial effect for the flora and fauna of the Wirral, and for the pleasure of human residents. Here they are: - at least one native tree in every back garden - native hedgerow to delineate front gardens and adjacent to highways - swift bricks incorporated in every dwelling - provision of allotments and community orchards - bat boxes, especially in areas adjacent to open space - bird boxes in every garden - street trees incorporated on every street - hedgehog highways incorporated along every garden fence - climbing landscape plant species, including ivy, to be included in the landscape scheme, especially prominent gable ends and garages - interpretation panels to enable residents to understand the ecological value of wildlife species and neighbouring habitat - renewable energy and water efficiency, including swales and rain gardens - wildflower verges along roads and formal open spaces I am aware that the Council has already adopted some of these policies and intends to adopt more. Thank you for that, and I hope Councillors will respond positively to as many of these suggestions as possible.						
1247039	LPIO-18793		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247040	LPIO-18794 1 of 2		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247040	LPIO-18794 2 of 2		Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247041	LPIO-18866		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247042	LPIO-18933		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247060	LPIO-19036		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247061	LPIO-19037		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247063	LPIO-19109		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247064	LPIO-19163		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247071	LPIO-19274		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1245060	LPIO-1930		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247072	LPIO-19332		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247078	LPIO-19387		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247080	LPIO-19487		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247081	LPIO-19488		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1241669	LPIO-196	yes							
1247082	LPIO-19655		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247083	LPIO-19709		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247084	LPIO-19772		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247085	LPIO-19827		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247088	LPIO-19893		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247089	LPIO-19955		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247090	LPIO-20010		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247091	LPIO-20064		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247092	LPIO-20124		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247093	LPIO-20188		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247094	LPIO-20243		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247095	LPIO-20298		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247096	LPIO-20354		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247099	LPIO-20410		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247101	LPIO-20464		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247108	LPIO-20541		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247102	LPIO-20542		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247106	LPIO-20661		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247105	LPIO-20662		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247109	LPIO-20734		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247110	LPIO-20823		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247111	LPIO-20824		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247112	LPIO-20954		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247113	LPIO-21008		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247115	LPIO-21064		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247116	LPIO-21118		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1246851	LPIO-21210		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246918	LPIO-21445		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246924	LPIO-21446		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246928	LPIO-21447		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246920	LPIO-21633		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246926	LPIO-21634		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1247117	LPIO-21733		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247118	LPIO-21734		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247145	LPIO-21841		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247147	LPIO-21842		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1245112	LPIO-2194	yes							
1247148	LPIO-21949		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247150	LPIO-21950		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1244329	LPIO-22032		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247119	LPIO-22122		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1246678	LPIO-22123		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247151	LPIO-22230		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247152	LPIO-22231		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247153	LPIO-22344		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247155	LPIO-22345		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247156	LPIO-22453		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247158	LPIO-22454		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247159	LPIO-22559		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1247160	LPIO-22560		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1248150	LPIO-22585		More wildflower meadows to be planted alongside railway tracks on motorway verges roundabouts in parks and on the Council's golf courses.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247161	LPIO-22703		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247164	LPIO-22704		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247167	LPIO-22832		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247168	LPIO-22833		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1242519	LPIO-2290	no	Species and habitats can only be protected by not building on greenbelt.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247169	LPIO-22928		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247170	LPIO-22929		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBI) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247173	LPIO-23097		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247174	LPIO-23098		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247175	LPIO-23206		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247176	LPIO-23207		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247177	LPIO-23364		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						
1247178	LPIO-23365		<p>The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247179	LPIO-23366		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SIBIs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the ""best and most versatile agricultural land""[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1248380	LPIO-23456	no	This will also destroy FOREVER the green belt, the farming and the WILDLIFE HABITATS. PLEASE do not make the wrong decision for the WRONG reasons.						
1248546 (Wirral Wildlife)	LPIO-23466		Assessments: "5.3.1 Wirral is unique in comparison to other localities as it has significant biodiversity designations in both coastal and non – coastal environments. It is important to ensure development which happens on the land, does not adversely affect the surrounding coastal environments." We entirely agree with that statement, but it does not seem to have been adequately considered in the assessments. This report, and the Green Belt review and the MEAS RAG report, do not pay sufficient attention to Local Wildlife Sites. 5.3.10 says "However, the majority of identified parcels that could be involved do not overlap significantly with designated or biodiversity action plan habitats." We strongly disagree, as out of the 10 sites suggested at present for GB release, 3 have major wildlife objections and another 3-5 have wildlife concerns where at least some impacts would happen. As we found in the 2018 Green Belt review, there is little Green Belt in Wirral that does not have wildlife importance (out of its 54 parcels, 41 had serious wildlife implications and another 7 wildlife-related concerns). In the current review of "weekly-performing Greenbelt", out of 33 sites not currently designated for development, there are serious objections on wildlife grounds to 18, concerns about wildlife impacts for another 5. The 10 remaining are mostly small. Opportunities to "improve the remaining Green Belt" for wildlife and ecosystem services will be difficult to enforce, as so much is private land often owned by large estates and tenanted out. The Planning system cannot control this land. Little is intensive arable land, and some of the pasture is high-quality low-impact farming e.g. Oldfield Farm Heswall. The Green Infrastructure report, vital to considering wildlife networks and corridors, was only commissioned in February 2020, so has not informed the Regulation 18 work, and while its preliminary findings are likely to be available for Regulation 19, they will be available to the general public until that stage. That is simply too late. Decisions on possible Green Belt release must not be made until the GI study is complete and its findings suitably considered, or vital corridors may be cut. The Plan will not be "sound" if the GI work is not included 2) HABITATS REGULATIONS APPRAISAL (INTERIM) Wirral Wildlife recognise that a detailed study of the effects on Habitats sites has been done. All the recommendations in Chapter 6 must be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan if the Plan is to be "sound". We will be particularly checking that items in sections 6.6,6.11,6.13 and 6.17 are in appropriate policies and supporting text, and that design guidelines include the relevant precautions to safeguard important bird populations. It would be of great benefit (section 6.13) to developers and planners if more work is done before the plan is finished to identify better which areas act as Supporting Habitats, as has been done in Wales.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1241016	LPIO-235	yes	The wildlife on the Wirral is vitally important. The bird life in the coastal areas are internationally significant, and the sandbanks provide essential feeding grounds for many migrating birds. In the urban and semi-rural areas it is also important to protect the native wildlife.						
1248412	LPIO-23610		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>I support the preferred option in the Local Plan (Ref. Q 4.5) for development with urban intensification. One can observe plenty of brownfield sites around the borough, where a good standard of housing development would benefit and breathe new life into run-down areas, turning them into desirable residential spots. There would be ample room for development of high standard, quite intensive affordable housing along with regeneration of urban and brownfield sites, which would benefit rather than deplete the environment, and inject new community life into somewhat depressed sites.</li> <li>It is logical that sites that afford sustainable development should be used in preference to those sites with an historic or rich environmental value, and so I believe that the former should always be used in preference to the latter.</li> </ul>						
1246401	LPIO-23638		It offers habitat, shelter and forage opportunities for our wildlife and defines boundaries between our villages and a setting for our important low land heath, common and shoreline.						
1241770	LPIO-23654		New developments must not involve wanton destruction of mature trees, hedgerows and thus the area's biodiversity.						
1248422	LPIO-23673		In consideration of the benefits of maintaining our Green Belts, one cannot ignore the benefits nature provides. The Green Belts provide the only proper habitats for much of our local wildlife. By removing their natural habitat, not only do you risk a reduction in useful and unique wildlife, you risk the decimation of them altogether.						
1248428	LPIO-23726		I am shocked by the proposals to infill between established and separate communities and think of the unrelieved urban sprawl visible from the M6 in Birmingham. I do not want that here. As regards Lower Heswall it must not be forgotten that The Dee Estuary is a RAMSAR Site, Special Protection Area, Special Area of Conservation, SSSI and that the wildlife using it are also protected in the adjoining areas where they feed and roost.						
1242185	LPIO-23953		We agree with the Council that 'Biodiversity is one of Wirral's greatest assets'. The aims and objectives of the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan are laudable but can only be realised if the Local Plan contains robust policies that support it. Both incentives and deterrents are needed to encourage developers to bring forward proposals with a biodiversity net gain of +10% which is the Government's recommended figure. The Environment Bill is currently going through Parliament, but the Council could set its own local targets based on the uniqueness and value of Wirral's biodiversity. The State of Nature report 2019 showed the challenges facing our natural habitats and the Local Plan should contain policies that respond to this problem and effectively protects and enhances our natural environments across the peninsula. There should be no weasel words, such as "as far as is reasonably practical". The wording of policy needs to be clearer, such as: "the Council will protect and enhance the natural environmental assets by all means within its power" and the wording of the Local Plan policy should be strengthened to read "net biodiversity gain will be expected from all developments in accordance with the NPPF". For ecological networks the wording should be that "existing ecological networks will be protected, and developments expected to contribute to new networks where appropriate." Many groups are fearful that biodiversity off-setting would be specifically harmful to areas of local biodiversity value and would result in a degradation of biodiversity. Where proposals do not achieve stated biodiversity net gain targets on-site there should be policy to help officers to show grounds for refusal. There should be no ability of developers making a case they should not address this important issue. We are pleased to note that the Council has preferred approaches for both local and international important wildlife sites. We recommend that an approach similar to that carried out in North Wales is undertaken to identify areas that are functionally-linked acting as "Supporting Habitats to the European Sites", as identified in the Wetland Birds Survey (WeBS) counts, and in records of many knowledgeable ornithologists working in Wirral. A Local Plan map layer identifying main known areas would be helpful to planners when taking decisions. This would remove delay of planning application decisions, as surveys have to wait for the correct time of year, with costs involved. If Sites of Biological Importance were shown on the Local Plan, applicants may stop seeking permission in areas where development is significantly harmful. Protecting SBIs and supporting habitats to European Sites is beneficial to all in the future. There are economic and social benefits for protecting and enhancing Wirral's biodiversity.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006</a>			

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248496 (United Utilities)	LPIO-24215		Existing drainage systems in the borough are largely dominated by combined sewers, taking both foul and surface water. The design of the combined sewer network system includes combined sewer overflows points, to prevent network flooding by discharging into a nearby watercourse at times of high flow. There are numerous overflow discharges throughout the borough. A consistent approach to surface water management will significantly reduce the surface water entering the sewer network, decreasing the discharges from such overflow points. A holistic approach to drainage and water management linked to a wider strategy for environmental improvements as development is delivered can result in benefits to water quality and biodiversity improvements.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684806">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684806</a>					
1248557 (Environment Agency)	LPIO-24464		The EA encourages the enhancement of the natural environment, particularly for designated biodiversity locations, however it would be beneficial to see an expanded section here, with stronger language surrounding biodiversity net gain. At present there is no mention of restoration and development of new habitats, a key part of both EA policy and the Government's 25 Year Environment Plan, and having this present in the Local Plan will help ensure future developments result in a positive gain for the environment and ecology.						
1248566 (Natural England)	LPIO-24471		Natural England recently provided a separate letter to all Liverpool City Region (LCR) Local Authorities, including Wirral Council outlining our current position on recreational pressure on coastal designated sites. This letter further outlines our key recommendations for considering appropriate mitigation measures with respect to the Local Plan. We advise that you should ensure that you have considered the quantum of housing development as set out within the plan period and that this quantum will be mitigated for. You should consider the full quantum rather than using a threshold of a number of units to ensure that you have fully provided mitigation for development pressure on the internationally designated sites. For completeness in Annex C we have provided a copy of the advice letter that was also provided to you via email on 2 March 2020. [uploaded as separate attachment]	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5667741">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5667741</a>					
1248569 (Sefton Council)	LPIO-24535		In terms of biodiversity, Wirral's preferred approach to internationally Important sites and the references to the sub-regional recreation pressure mitigation strategy are noted. At the next, i.e. subsequent, stage of preparation of the Wirral Local Plan, Wirral's policy framework for assessing the impact of development (not just from recreational pressure) on internationally important sites and the integrity of such sites and networks should be explicit that it applies to all internationally important sites across the Liverpool City Region and beyond and should refer specifically to the sites on the Sefton Coast. Such policies may include those for port-related development or development on land closest to Sefton as well as those for nature and green infrastructure.						
1246559 (Wirral Wildlife Trust)	LPIO-24563 1 of 2		Whilst we support this approach the wording is outdated as it reflects that in the 2012 NPPF and not the revised 2018 NPPF. Specifically we refer to the inclusion of the caveats 'where possible' and 'seek to' when describing biodiversity net gain and protecting the environment. These caveats do not appear in the 2018 version and should be removed. The new guidance refers to securing measurable gains for biodiversity in three sections of the NPPF: Paragraph 174b) - identify and pursue opportunities for securing measurable net gains for biodiversity; Paragraph 175 d) - development whose primary objective is to conserve or enhance biodiversity should be supported; while opportunities to incorporate biodiversity improvements in and around developments should be encouraged, especially where this can secure measurable net gains for biodiversity. Paragraph 170d) - minimising impacts on and providing net gains for biodiversity, including by establishing coherent ecological networks that are more resilient to current and future pressures. We suggest revised wording for Habitats and Biodiversity: The council will seek to protect and enhance the natural Environmental Assets of the borough, including the designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites; priority habitats and species; ancient woodland; and ancient and veteran trees found outside ancient woodland; and wherever possible provide net gains in biodiversity and establish coherent ecological networks. Of crucial importance to achieving the environmental objectives as set out in the NPPF 2018 is to have a Biodiversity Net Gain policy adopted as part of the Local Plan which sets out specific guidance and reflects the ten Biodiversity Net Gain - good practice principles for development (Ciria, CIEEM, IEMA 2016). A Biodiversity Net Gain approach is based upon: Evidence based decisions (core sites - statutory and non-statutory, supporting habitat, priority habitat/species and ecological networks are mapped and incorporated into the strategy); Mitigation hierarchy is followed (avoid, mitigate and only as a last resort compensate); Measurable Biodiversity Net Gain is secured long term for all development (at least 10% uplift). First and foremost should be avoiding impacts to biodiversity assets which involves						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246559 (Wirral Wildlife Trust)	LPIO-24563 2 of 2		evidence based decisions, strategic mapping of assets, buffering sites from impacts such as disturbance and light/water pollution (this should be 50m for the most sensitive habitats). Ways to secure measurable Biodiversity Net Gain include increasing the total amount of wildlife habitat in the borough, restoring existing areas of high-value habitat, linking up areas of high-value habitat that may currently be fragmented. It is essential that losses and gains of natural assets are measured using a standard Biodiversity Net Gain calculation. As set out in the Biodiversity Net Gain good practice principles all Biodiversity Net Gain should be documented and transparent. All habitat creation should be managed in the long term by a competent offset provider. Preferred Approach - Internationally Important Sites. We welcome the approach to create a recreation mitigation policy to help protect internationally important sites and their supporting habitats.						
1244826	LPIO-2480	no	Biodiversity should be addressed at all times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1248749	LPIO-24905		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845</a>			
1248524	LPIO-24920		We wish to hold the Council to account on having proper regard for environmental impacts in the Local Plan, including the cumulative impacts of development. In our view, there are environmental issues that have not been adequately addressed. The Local Plan should ensure environmental harm is avoided, and properly mitigated and compensated to the appropriate level, reflecting the Government Guidance for in excess of +10% Biodiversity Net Gain targets for new development. The Local Plan needs effectively policy enshrined within the Local Plan and appropriate allocations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684261">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684261</a>					
1248769	LPIO-25024		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684956">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684956</a>	
1248823	LPIO-25128		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849</a>			
1248832	LPIO-25238		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562</a>				
1248833	LPIO-25342		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661125">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661125</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661100">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661100</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661124">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661124</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661129">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661129</a>		
1248956	LPIO-25431		We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677474">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677474</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684859">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684859</a>				
1248986	LPIO-25552		Agree with the general approach to adopt a City Region mitigation strategy. The suggested managed approach in the Habitats Regulations Assessment seems to be the most sensible approach, rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770</a>			
1249015	LPIO-25610		We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684897">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684897</a>					
1246458	LPIO-25828		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246459	LPIO-25830		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1249116	LPIO-25946		The Environment Bill 2020 includes a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity, with a 2-year transition period. As any future net gain requirement might be more onerous than mitigation for existing ecological interest within sites we would not support any policy requirement which would render developments unviable or undeliverable and reserve the right to comment when further detail is released at a later stage of the process.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674092">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674092</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684836">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684836</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674096">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674096</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674095">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674095</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674093">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674093</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684833">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684833</a>

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1249116	LPIO-26004 1 of 2		The Environment Bill 2020 includes a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity, with a 2-year transition period. As any future net gain requirement might be more onerous than mitigation for existing ecological interest within sites we would not support any policy requirement which would render developments unviable or undeliverable and reserve the right to comment when further detail is released at a later stage of the process.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675698">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675698</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675693">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675693</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675700">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675700</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675692">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675692</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675697">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675697</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675694">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675694</a>
1249116	LPIO-26004 2 of 2		The Environment Bill 2020 includes a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity, with a 2-year transition period. As any future net gain requirement might be more onerous than mitigation for existing ecological interest within sites we would not support any policy requirement which would render developments unviable or undeliverable and reserve the right to comment when further detail is released at a later stage of the process.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675696">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675696</a>					
1249100	LPIO-26011 1 of 3		We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677514">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677514</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677512">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677512</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684898">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684898</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677509">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677509</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684951">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684951</a>
1249100	LPIO-26011 2 of 3		We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677510">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677510</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684895">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684895</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677508">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677508</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677511">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677511</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684949">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684949</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516</a>
1249100	LPIO-26011 3 of 3		We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507</a>					
1249116	LPIO-26048		The Environment Bill 2020 includes a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity, with a 2-year transition period. As any future net gain requirement might be more onerous than mitigation for existing ecological interest within sites we would not support any policy requirement which would render developments unviable or undeliverable and reserve the right to comment when further detail is released at a later stage of the process.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684802">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684802</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684835">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684835</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677041">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677041</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677037">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677037</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684804">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684804</a>	
1249116	LPIO-26082		The Environment Bill 2020 includes a requirement for development to deliver a 10% net gain in biodiversity, with a 2-year transition period. As any future net gain requirement might be more onerous than mitigation for existing ecological interest within sites we would not support any policy requirement which would render developments unviable or undeliverable and reserve the right to comment when further detail is released at a later stage of the process.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674240">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674240</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684832">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684832</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674256">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674256</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684834">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684834</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684837">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684837</a>	
1237870	LPIO-2624	yes	The Council should take this matter very seriously. Local habitats should be protected by law if necessary.						
1249782	LPIO-26440		We are supportive of the flexible wording in relation to biodiversity, namely that wherever possible, net gains in biodiversity will be provided. Whilst we are fully supportive of the net gain approach to biodiversity, which is in line with the NPPF, flexibility needs to be available for instances where net gain may not possible due to individual site characteristics/ considerations. We agree with the general approach to adopt an LCR mitigation strategy when it comes to consider recreational issues and potential visitor and recreational demands on protected areas. The suggested managed approach in the HRA seems to be the most sensible approach rather than a SANGs based policy sometimes utilised in other locations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683892">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683892</a>					
1249219	LPIO-26489 1 of 2		The assessment of Wirral's important biodiversity is good, however further consideration of biodiversity is required. Most of Wirral's Green Belt has ecologically important sites in it, including Supporting Habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as hares, bats, which are more wide-ranging. This provides yet another reason why the Heswall Society opposes all Green Belt release. Local Wildlife Sites (=SBLs) have not been sufficiently taken into account in the Green Belt review and are consequently not properly considered in the choice of possible sites for Green Belt release. This is an essential analysis before any decisions on land release can be taken. We also need more information on wildlife corridors and ecosystem services. Proper definition of Supporting Habitat to the Special Protection Areas is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start, but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677529">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677529</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677528">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677528</a>				



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1249219	LPIO-26489 2 of 2		As indicated elsewhere, the Society objects to the single large release of Option 2B as it is damaging to wildlife and poorly sustainable in environmental terms. Details below for Parcels covering 7.15-7.18. Barnstondale LWS is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. The Prenton Brook flows across the parcel and through Barnstondale. The brook needs protection from pollution, and scour caused by sudden high flows when a rainstorm falls on a hard-surfaced urban area. There are reliable reports of bats in and around the woodland. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. Much of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170]. If development were allowed, then to achieve net biodiversity gain would be difficult. A range of measures would be needed to try to reduce harm to badgers and bats, including restrictions on fencing, properly managed dedicated foraging areas, and restrictions on lighting.						
1240932	LPIO-26633	yes	<p>We broadly support the Council's Preferred Approaches to Wirral's Biodiversity and Internationally Important Sites, however, we are concerned about the impact the Council's approach may have on the deliverability of the Local Plan. It is recognised that these Preferred Approaches broadly reflect national policy as outlined in the Framework and that the Council's ambitions as expressed through the emerging Local Plan align with our past record and future ambitions of delivering biodiversity enhancements across our landholding as set out in the attached Vision Document. The scale and interconnectedness of our landholding in Wirral will allow the impact of our biodiversity proposals to be more than the sum of their parts, for example through providing longer wildlife corridors.</p> <p>Under its Preferred Approach to Wirral's biodiversity the Council states that it will protect existing natural assets and wherever possible provide net gains in biodiversity. However, given its own recognition of NPPF policy (e.g. paragraph 170) and its NERC duty we would question why a stronger commitment has not been given, such that all new development on Wirral will have to provide a confirmed net gain to biodiversity. This would then fit with Government's future ambitions for biodiversity set out within the Environment Bill, such that all development must deliver a minimum 10% net gain to biodiversity and evidence this through Defra's biodiversity metric. Where compensation is not appropriate onsite, biodiversity offsets are an appropriate mechanic for delivery.</p> <p>We note that as part of the Council's Preferred Approach to Internationally Important Sites, the Council aims to include a policy setting out its approach to recreation mitigation in the Local Plan which is likely to require that mitigation will be required for recreation disturbance from new residential development within 5km of the coast. This will be through the funding of a strategy which will involve a mix of access management, habitat management and provision of alternative recreation space.</p> <p>Given that the location of many of Council's proposed allocations is within 5km of the coast, a significant area of alternative recreation space may need to be secured before planning permissions are granted. As many of these proposed allocations are urban brownfield redevelopment sites which may not be able to accommodate such recreation space, this appears likely to impact deliverability of housing across the Borough in an appropriate manner.</p> <p>We are willing to work with the Council to explore the provision of such alternative recreational space on our land in connection with development proposals affecting our land.</p> <p>We also note that, due to the Local Plan's timetable, this policy will be prepared in advance of the completion, approval and implementation of the Liverpool City Region Combined Authority's Regional Mitigation Strategy which will seek to address the implications of growth across the entire Liverpool City Region for the City Region's wildlife sites of international importance. Therefore, it is recommended that any draft Local Plan policy setting out the Council's approach to recreation mitigation is either worded with sufficient flexibility to ensure that the recommendations of the Regional Mitigation Strategy can be implemented in the determination of planning applications, or there is a commitment within the policy to incorporate the recommendations of the Regional Mitigation Strategy as part of a future Local Plan review.</p>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701</a>			

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248569 (Sefton Council)	LPIO-26655		General - locational aspects Sefton and Wirral are separated by the River Mersey (the geographic boundary between them is mid-river) and the most direct road or rail access is via Liverpool. This effective separation affects the number and scope of cross-boundary issues between Sefton and Wirral. Nature issues – protection of the internationally important nature sites on the Sefton Coast In terms of biodiversity, Wirral's preferred approach to internationally Important sites and the references to the sub-regional recreation pressure mitigation strategy are noted. At the next, i.e. subsequent, stage of preparation of the Wirral Local Plan, Wirral's policy framework for assessing the impact of development (not just from recreational pressure) on internationally important sites and the integrity of such sites and networks should be explicit that it applies to all internationally important sites across the Liverpool City Region and beyond and should refer specifically to the sites on the Sefton Coast. Such policies may include those for port-related development or development on land closest to Sefton as well as those for nature and green infrastructure.						
1248223	LPIO-26718		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248224	LPIO-26719		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248226	LPIO-26744		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248225	LPIO-26745		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248228	LPIO-26769		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248229	LPIO-26770		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248230	LPIO-26796		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248231	LPIO-26797		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250032	LPIO-26834		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248232	LPIO-26835		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250033	LPIO-26840		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250035	LPIO-26872		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250037	LPIO-26873		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248214	LPIO-26902		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248215	LPIO-26903		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250040	LPIO-26935		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248216	LPIO-26941		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248217	LPIO-26942		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250041	LPIO-26976		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248222	LPIO-26981		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248218	LPIO-26982		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248219	LPIO-27007		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248221	LPIO-27008		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248201	LPIO-27033		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248202	LPIO-27035		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1250043	LPIO-27048		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248203	LPIO-27073		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248204	LPIO-27074		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248206	LPIO-27105		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248205	LPIO-27107		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250044	LPIO-27114		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248210	LPIO-27137		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1237899	LPIO-27160		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248212	LPIO-27163		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248208	LPIO-27166		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248178	LPIO-27202		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248180	LPIO-27226		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250049	LPIO-27233		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250048	LPIO-27236		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248181	LPIO-27246		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250054	LPIO-27267		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1248213	LPIO-27273		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250059	LPIO-27306		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1250053	LPIO-27310		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250055	LPIO-27311		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250062	LPIO-27347		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250058	LPIO-27348		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250057	LPIO-27350		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250063	LPIO-27364		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250065	LPIO-27377		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1250067	LPIO-27390		The Local Plan shows Wirral Golf Course and Bidston Hill as sites of Biological Importance. It is unclear from the map if this also includes NF (OS140). This site is a continuity site for both the Golf Course and Bidston Hill, and if not already included as a site of biological importance, it should also be designated. This is especially important given its character as a part of a wildlife corridor. There is anecdotal evidence that the site is occupied by bats, either for roosting or as part of their feeding/flight paths, and the site is well used by birds, including owls and woodpeckers.						
1245180	LPIO-2790	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1245058	LPIO-2815		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery</li> <li>• All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.)</li> <li>• Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive.</li> <li>• Public rights of way should be protected</li> </ul>						
1245100	LPIO-2816	no	The council has not said HOW it will protect the local environment eg SSSIs, SMAs/SACs, once the EU Habitats Directives no longer apply. Strong policies will be needed to protect "green" and "blue" spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery. All wildlife sites, whatever their designation should be protected, as well as those linked to designated sites such as fields used as resting sites by waders pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides. Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aims and is destructive of local flora and fauna. Public Rights of Way and footpaths should be protected						
1248546 (Wirral Wildlife)	LPIO-2886	no	See attached document. Summary: "Biodiversity is one of Wirral's greatest assets" so it needs to be protected and enhanced as such. Stronger policies are needed on biodiversity protection, enhancement, net gain, Local Wildlife Sites must be given weight in decisions over land use, not sidelined as at present Supporting Habitats to SPAs must be properly identified Detailed policy points and technical notes are in the supporting document	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676765">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676765</a>					
1238379	LPIO-2913	no	The very fact that the Council is pursuing an unrealistic housing figure is putting Green Belt land and consequently innumerable wildlife species and habitats at unnecessary risk.						
1245159	LPIO-3094	yes	Does not include Carr Fields between Hoylake and West Kirby and areas threatened by Golf Resort. This is important as a nature area and it needs recognising and converting into a nature/bird reserve. The level of resources put to manage biodiversity and nature in Wirral does not meet statutory levels and resources should be increased. A selected farm that is struggling for viability should be selected for "wilding" to allow the farm to go wild and develop naturally with minimal human intervention. See the book "Wilding" by Isabella Tree. This will allow nature to re-colonise and provide habitat for flowers, shrubs, trees, mammals and birds some of which have been excluded by modern intensive farming methods.						
1238645	LPIO-3191	no	Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.). Where natural processes are changing an environment then, where practicable they should be left to happen, poisoning a beach just because people want it to be sandy is not acceptable. Public rights of way should be protected						
1241315	LPIO-3321	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1237944	LPIO-3466	yes							
1245451	LPIO-3593	yes	The level of resources put to manage biodiversity and nature in Wirral does not meet statutory levels and resources should be increased.						
1245462	LPIO-3647	yes	The level of resources put to manage biodiversity and nature in Wirral does not meet statutory levels and resources should be increased.						
1237827	LPIO-3833	yes	Need to specifically protect the coastal strip, west of the Wirral Way, from further development. This is a hugely important part of the Wirral, being functionally linked to the Dee Estuary SSI/Ramsar. There should be a specific statement within the Local Plan to protect this area, its habitat and its wildlife.						
1245288	LPIO-3902	yes							
1245498	LPIO-3984	no	by considering allowing building on greenbelt WBC is not ensuring bio diversity is properly addressed.						
1238835	LPIO-4044		Our areas of biodiversity and SSI's are under constant threat because of unscrupulous developers. This needs addressing urgently, to ensure that we can protect them for the longer term. Accordingly, all such biodiverse habitats for our fauna and flora need constant monitoring and legal protection. The wording used in this document, to describe Council's plans is unnecessarily cumbersome and complicated. Plain English will suffice wherever possible.						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1240939	LPIO-4182	yes							
1245346	LPIO-4265	yes	Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery. All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.). Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive. Public rights of way should be protected.						
1245638	LPIO-4321	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1237667	LPIO-4594	no	In general the approach is sensible but there should be no encroachment upon SSSIs or sites of international importance. These are too valuable to lose and are important in encouraging visitors to Wirral.						
1244720	LPIO-4772	yes	Provide further investment in wildlife protection by developing sites to provide habitat eg Hoylake wetland reserve. Discourage the "Friends" groups from interfering with natural and semi-natural habitats such as Bidston Hill, Flaybrick Cemetery and Grange Hill. These are fragile environments, already experiencing increased footfall from dog walkers and others. Litter picking and monitoring group to watch out for vandalism and firesetting is to be encouraged, but no more groundwork please as it is destroying the ecosystems of these natural areas. Agree with WBC plans to allow Hoylake foreshore to return to natural state and to generate natural flood defences: sandhills and dune system. Human interference such as weedkillers and raking should be stopped immediately.						
1245713	LPIO-5129		Biodiversity should be properly addressed and monitored constantly. Protect our habitats						
1245501	LPIO-5169	no	Biodiversity should be monitored and all 69 sites of biological importance in Wirral, designated as protected through the Unitary Development Plan (UDP) process under UDP Policy NC5 should have protection enshrined in law.						
1239571	LPIO-5285	yes	This is particularly important on the coastal fringe, including areas designated as weak contributors to the green belt.						
1246006	LPIO-5355		Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.). Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive. Public rights of way should be protected						
1240383	LPIO-5457	yes	Consideration is made for development around SSSI sites which could have detrimental implications for the protected species. The same consideration should be applied to SBI, Local wildlife sites where the same detrimental implications exist. The list of ancient woodland is deficient. Barnston dale ancient woodland is an important wildlife corridor 2km long, it is not listed.						
1246041	LPIO-5559	no	There is currently not sufficient protection of green belt land, which is essential for effective biodiversity.						
1242541	LPIO-5678	no	Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.).</li> <li>• Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive.</li> <li>• Public rights of way should be protected</li> </ul>						
1245984	LPIO-5772	yes	We agree with Council's preferred approach to biodiversity. However, policies for diversity need to be robust. Existing sites needs better protection: for example, the situation on Hilbre island when workmen polluted the shoreline. The Council seeks to encourage biodiversity, however green spaces are not properly managed currently and many of them are full of litter. We appreciate that the Council has a limited budget to deal with its street scene but it should not be left to volunteers to clean up green spaces so that biodiversity can be protected. Section 8.21 In order to protect biodiversity the habitat survey should surely have been done before the local plan was written. How else could the council ensure that diversity is protected from development without this survey? How will the Council plan to protect wildlife without these documents in place?						
1246310	LPIO-5979	no	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1238310	LPIO-6197	no	The draft final plan should be delayed. Detailed biodiversity, habitat and sustainability reports are required on specific sites before final selections are made Greenbelt options 2a and 2b have already been selected WBC is not following its stated approach in protecting biodiversity, species and habitats by selecting greenbelt options. WBC is not applying the recommendations and guidelines of the available sustainability and, habitat reports to the site selection process. Biodiversity, habitats and proximity of sites to SSSI and local nature reserves have not been a factor in greenbelt site selection. The sites selected for option 2a in appendix 4.7 table 6 contains sites with Biodiversity action plans. The AECOM habitats report states protected birds feed in some of greenbelt sites selected, yet the sites remains on the list for development. Greenbelt Site 7.25 is one example. It is an area of special landscape, has a biodiversity action plan, has protected birds feeding on it, is adjacent to an SSSI and a national trust owned local nature reserve yet remains on the list for housing development WBC approach appears to be to completely disregard the findings on Sustainability, habitats, biodiversity and landscape in its greenbelt site selection process for the plan.						
1244896	LPIO-6315	no	Aims and Objectives of Government's 25-Year Environment Plan are laudable, but can only be realised if the LP contains policies supporting it with incentives and deterrents, encouraging developers to submit proposals with 'biodiversity net gain' of 10+% (Government's recommended figure). The Environment Bill is currently going through Parliament. WBC has preferred approaches for both local and internationally important wildlife sites but there are errors and omissions in Reports, Policies, stated intentions and requirements. See the uploaded extract from (fellow WGSMA Member) Wirral Wildlife's Response, setting out much of this and ITPAS' concerns. Many issues directly affect Sites within our Area. We refer to these and more within Comments on Individual Site Assessments but highlight some here: The ITPAS Area has ecologically important sites, including 'Supporting Habitat' to the Dee Estuary SPA, or has value for protected species such as Great Crested Newts (Backford Road Pond and Site SP059E), hares, bats, owls, hedgehogs, foxes, etc., which are wide-ranging: another reason ITPAS opposes all GB release. Both roosting and foraging habitats need protection and quiet open space with dark skies. Insufficient account of Local Wildlife Sites has been taken in the Green Belt Review and undermines the choice of possible sites for GB release. Proper definition of 'Supporting Habitat' to the SPAs is essential. Using the WebS (Wetlands Birds Survey) count areas is a reasonable start but more data is needed to make sure all sites are known. 'Harrock Wood' is vulnerable Ancient Woodland, omitted from the List (like others) and thus given insufficient weight in site-selection. Its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance need recognition and protection. Arrowe and Greasby Brooks need protection from pollution and scour caused by sudden high flows when rainstorms fall on hard urban surfaces.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677118">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677118</a>					
1246402	LPIO-6486	yes	Biodiversity should be promoted at all times and habitats protected.						
1242751	LPIO-652		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1241661	LPIO-6840	yes	Strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.).</li> <li>• Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive.</li> <li>• Public rights of way should be protected and enhanced</li> </ul>						
1241868	LPIO-6870	no	There should be no development allowed anywhere near SBIs (Core Biodiversity Areas and Priority Habitat). New housing developments bring the problems of vandalism, litter, fly-tipping, increased fire risk, pollution, predatory pets, bored youths. SBIs should have statutory protection.						
1241723	LPIO-6943	no	Very strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature's restoration and recovery All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites (eg fields used as resting sites for waders when pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides.). Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith. It does not achieve its aim and is destructive to health and biodiversity. (Ecocide) All Public rights of way should be protected						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1245086	LPIO-6977	no	There are too many get out clauses in the NPPF guidelines which are outlined in point 8.90 above. The following examples should have planning permission refused in all cases: a."if significant harm to biodiversity resulting from a development cannot be avoided" b."development on land within or outside a Site of Special Scientific Interest, and which is likely to have an adverse effect on it" c."development resulting in the loss or deterioration of irreplaceable habitats" There should be no scenarios where development can be allowed in these cases otherwise developers will always be looking at ways of getting round the regulations. It is totally unacceptable to even consider development in these cases. Biodiversity should be taken account of in all cases & habitats should have legal protection with very severe penalties for non compliance.						
1237647	LPIO-718	yes							
1246488	LPIO-7307		Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246348	LPIO-7370	yes	If all these houses are built, plus roads, plus traffic, plus infrastructure you are going to have more and more people seeking fewer places to walk and explore. Certainly habitats should have legal protection but these vital places could be compromised if they are over exploited.						
1240932	LPIO-7633	yes	Yes, Leverhulme broadly supports the Preferred Approach to Wirral's Biodiversity and Internationally Important Sites outlined at paragraph 8.103 of the consultation document however is concerned about the impact the Council's approach may have on the deliverability of the Local Plan. Furthermore, given the Council's recognition of NPPF policy (e.g. paragraph 170) and its NERC duty we would question why a stronger commitment has not been given so that all new development on Wirral will have to provide a confirmed net gain to biodiversity. Leverhulme also notes the ambition to include a policy concerning internationally important wildlife sites which is likely to require that mitigation including a mix of access management, habitat management and provision of alternative recreation space will be required for recreation disturbance from new residential development within 5km of the coast. Given the location of many of the Council's proposed allocations, a significant area of alternative recreation space may need to be secured before planning permissions are granted. As many of these proposed allocations are urban brownfield redevelopment sites which may not be able to accommodate such space, this could severely impact deliverability. As the major landowner in Wirral seeking to partner with the Council on a comprehensive development strategy, Leverhulme is willing to explore the provision of such alternative recreational space on our land in connection with development proposals affecting Estate land. It is also recommended any draft Local Plan policy setting out the Council's approach to recreation mitigation is either worded with sufficient flexibility to ensure that the recommendations of the Regional Mitigation Strategy can be implemented or has a commitment within the policy to incorporate the recommendations of the Regional Mitigation Strategy as part of a future Local Plan review. Further detail can be found at paragraphs 9.20 to 9.25 of our representations.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701</a>			
1246592	LPIO-7846	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246594	LPIO-8010	no	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1240903	LPIO-8037	yes	Keeping greenbelts, open spaces, farms, beauty spots etc are essential to the biodiversity on the Wirral and globally. The council should do all in its power to promote the protection of such. IE do not build on greenbelt. Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1246605	LPIO-8205	no	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection. Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection.						
1241096	LPIO-8363	yes	WBC should prioritise addressing biodiversity on Wirral, not only is it important for local species and migrating birds, but also to encourage tourism and visitors to coastal areas in particular.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684262">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684262</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661944">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661944</a>				
1246612	LPIO-8404	yes							
1237882	LPIO-8471	no	Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection. Building on green belt such as Parcel 6.15 will impact on wildlife corridors and also impact on the habitats of those birds and animals currently living in Stapleton Woods. THIS IS NOT CONSIDERED IN THE EVALUATION OF GREEN BELT PARCELS! This means WBC are negligent in this and will have a significant negative impact on biodiversity and important species and habitats.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1243888	LPIO-8578	yes	This is one of the most important things Wirral council can do. Apart from the intrinsic value of biodiversity, this is also what makes Wirral an attractive place to live and work. it is a major tourism pull factor. Biodiversity must be protected by all possible means and not destroyed with financial compensation.						
1237832	LPIO-8628	no	Your approach is based on designation of a few specific areas. In fact, it is the totality of the land/coast area, urban, suburban and rural, which is needed for bio-diversity and flourishing wildlife. The rest of the Plan takes little or no account of this. To take a simple example, the agricultural fields off Pump Lane, Heron Road, Saughall Massie Road and Birkenhead Road form supporting habitat for wading birds, for example curlew in winter, particularly over high tide. These fields are "weakly performing" in the terms of the Green Belt review. But they are performing very strongly for the wildlife of the region. The same applies to many other areas, notably the Hoylake Langfelds area.						
1246523	LPIO-8653	yes							
1246598 (Hoylake Vision)	LPIO-8734	yes	If research leading to a new beach management plan at Hoylake, taken in the context of Natural England's recommendations, results in the emergence of a dune system, this should be considered in the context of the potential for a new Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre in the land behind Hoylake; which also involves the Ellerman Lines site being considered in the context of NDP policy CL1 potential for reconfiguration of Carr Lane residential and industrial areas with improved access to amenity green space; a series of holistically considered approaches that collectively make a significant contribution to improving the environment, net gains in biodiversity, combatting climate change and creating jobs.						
1240846	LPIO-8766	no	Harrock Wood is contained within land package 7.27. This is green belt land which is included in Option 2A for release. It belongs to the National Trust and comprises remnant Wych Elm woodland with other hardwoods such as oak, beech and ash standing alongside Arrove Brook. Harrock Wood helps to break up the urban environment and gives an open feeling to the area which is much appreciated by the community. It is a key walking amenity for residents and a habitat for much wildlife, some of it relatively rare such as tawny owls. Any development within land package 7.27 will clearly adversely impact upon this important amenity. I am aware that the National Trust objected in October 2018 to development of this land package. Have their concerns been listened to? In addition, this seems to have been totally ignored in putting forward Option 2A.						
1240653	LPIO-8789	no	The approach relies too heavily on an as yet undefined strategy and while responsibility for many aspects of protecting biodiversity lie with profit motivated organisations then the weak assurances in the plan are of little value.						
1241770	LPIO-8791	no	I do not feel that the protections in place are stringent enough. I want to see much more commitment to the environment in terms of planning scrutiny. This scrutiny also needs to be transparent to the public rather than being cloaked in jargon. Currently pieces of land are being sold and signed off by a single member of the cabinet or council officers with no evidence of environmental impact assessment. This is not acceptable and needs to be stopped if the council are to show any concern for the climate crisis. Mature trees must be protected, mature hedgerows must not be destroyed. This is not what we are currently seeing so I have no confidence that these few statements in the plan are going to improve these matters.						
1245472	LPIO-8963	yes	Strongly agree						
1246631	LPIO-8976	yes							
1240872	LPIO-9178	yes	Biodiversity maps must include increased buffers preventing development around them. 200metres minimum. Areas of biodiversity must not be cut off from open countryside. As an example trying to release SP043 would impact biodiversity and a SSSI site but would also cut off SSSI and biodiverse sites with ancient woodland from open countryside. This cannot be allowed to happen.						
1245034	LPIO-9220	no							
1239377	LPIO-9224	yes	Biodiversity should be addressed at all times and monitored and identified habitats should be given legal protection against development.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246651	LPIO-9264	no	Very strong policies will be needed to protect green and blue spaces and wildlife habitats and to support nature restoration and recovery : All wildlife sites, whatever their designation, should be protected, as well as those linked to designated protected sites, for example fields used as resting sites for waders when they are pushed off the estuaries by particularly high tides Spraying poison on beaches should be stopped forthwith - it does not achieve it's aim and it is destructive Public rights of way should be fully protected.						
1245289	LPIO-9381	yes	This approach must include full surveys of any green belt or farmland proposed for potential housing development to ensure that the implications of removing this land from the natural ecosystem is fully understood and plans put in place to completely offset this loss.						
1246678	LPIO-9395	no							
1241495	LPIO-9470	yes	Yes, my views are evident throughout my responses to this consultation. Biodiversity is one of Wirral's greatest assets. The Council must do everything it can to "protect and enhance the natural environmental assets". We cannot afford to lose any wildlife habitats or the species they support. Therefore these habitats should not be proposed for development. Development adjacent to wildlife sites could have a detrimental impact on those sites and would require substantial mitigation including buffer zones round trees and watercourses. Similarly ecological networks and corridors must be protected. The NPPF states that all development should "provide net gains for biodiversity" and this should be incorporated into the plan. I reiterate that too little or no account has been taken of Local Wildlife Sites. The Green Belt Review Appendix G Parcel Assessment Table includes national and international sites even TPO sites but does not include Local Wildlife Sites. Consequently inappropriate Green Belt sites have been selected for possible release. Given the importance of LWS to wildlife, they should have been listed in the Appendix G Parcel Assessment table. I object to their omission. The number of LWS is currently being reviewed and will need updating. There is more ancient woodland than is listed. The list given only includes sites over 2ha in size but there are others which are smaller, eg Harrock Wood, but none the less are important for wildlife. Some form corridors like in Dibbinsdale and Barnstondale. I have been interested in badgers for over 40 years. I have been an active member of the Wirral & Cheshire Badger Group since 1984. I have monitored the badger population on Wirral since 1987. I have been involved in all aspects of badger conservation dealing with illegal persecution, road casualties, injured badgers, sett protection, surveys, sett monitoring. I have been an expert witness for the prosecution in badger persecution cases. I also give talks & presentations on the subject. Throughout this involvement I have maintained close liaison with Merseyside Police, landowners, Cheshire Wildlife Trust, the RSPCA, the University of Liverpool's Department of Veterinary Science and Wirral Ranger Service. For over 30 years I have given advice to Wirral Borough Council Planning Department with regard to proposed development near badger setts. Although common elsewhere the badger is relatively uncommon on Wirral. The Wirral has had a history of badger persecution. As well as this Wirral is a small area and habitats are very limited due to the peninsula geography. It is to this end, that every badger sett on Wirral is automatically designated as a Local Wildlife Site, due to their rarity and need of extra protection. Badger populations on Wirral are constantly under threat being the object of illegal persecution and they face death on our busy roads. There have been three reported fatalities to date so far this year. Perhaps the major factor threatening the future of the badger in Wirral is development and habitat loss, increasingly so as Wirral Borough Council is under pressure to build more houses. It is currently looking to release Green Belt land for future development and so badger habitat is under increasing pressure. Wirral's badgers need to be protected not harmed. To my knowledge there are approximately 16 active setts within the Metropolitan Borough of Wirral. These setts are not all breeding setts. Setts are closely monitored by volunteers and typically appear to hold small numbers of badgers c.f the large family groups which are to be found in setts in more open countryside.						
1246624	LPIO-9488	yes	protection should be strictly adhered to and breaches brought to account						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.14 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring biodiversity is properly addressed within the Local Plan and that important species and habitats are protected?	Question 8.14a - If you answered No, what would you change and why? Do you have an alternative approach? If Yes, you can comment here.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1245833	LPIO-9613	yes	<p>The Trust fully supports the Council's preferred approach which seeks to protect and enhance the natural environmental assets of the Borough, including the designated biodiversity and geodiversity sites; priority habitats and species; ancient woodland; and ancient and veteran trees found outside ancient woodland; and wherever possible provide net gains in biodiversity and establish coherent ecological networks.</p> <p>In so doing we would suggest that the basic principles underpinning the Recreation Mitigation Strategy (RMS) are taken forward into emerging policies in so far as mitigation should be required for recreation disturbance resulting from new residential development within a defined radius of nationally important wildlife sites. The Trust has expressed concern in relation to individual site allocations close to our land at Harrock Wood and Thurstaston Common and the impact of additional residents upon important habitats. This approach would therefore facilitate a greater understanding of such impacts and ultimately minimise degradation of nationally important sites.</p>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656469">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656469</a>					
1242554	LPIO-9748	yes	We support the council's approach.						
1243448	LPIO-976	yes	In the main I agree. However, any development on green belt/field sites will inevitably negatively disrupt habitats of flora and fauna on these and adjacent special sites by decreasing the protective green margins around the special sites. Therefore, I object to any development on any green belt/field sites.						
1246693	LPIO-9907	yes	Again however this should not be used as an excuse - Biodiversity should be addressed at ALL times and monitored. Habitats should have legal protection. Habitats should be encouraged and expanded.						
1237724	LPIO-9913	no	This question is at odds with proposals to build on the greenbelt. This currently is the home to a very wide range of species, birds, mammals and insects.						