

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1238147	LPIO-10313	no	Again not enough detail. I would like to see in Heswall more protection for sandstone walls in the Conservation areas and better protection for buildings not listed but making a special contribution to the Conservation Area.						
1246724	LPIO-10613	no	More can be done to protect our heritage sites.						
1241065	LPIO-10635	yes							
1241337	LPIO-10703	no	See responses to 8.17						
1246544	LPIO-10718	yes	But more could be done to conserve and re-use interesting old buildings which are not necessarily designated under any heritage description						
1246242	LPIO-11007		The Council must ensure it does all it can to protect our heritage.						
1243890	LPIO-1152	yes							
1247196	LPIO-11628		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247015	LPIO-11875		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247214	LPIO-12461		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247492	LPIO-12563		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1240843	LPIO-12719		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247578	LPIO-12918		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247578	LPIO-12920		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247510	LPIO-13043		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246335	LPIO-13181		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246578	LPIO-13345		The council has not given sufficient weight to the increasing evidence that the Battle of Brunanburh was fought on the Wirral. The battle was believed to be the largest battle ever fought on English soil. The indications are that the battle was held on a battlefield that may have run from Clatterbridge to Prenton. We are extremely fortunate that much of this area is largely unbuilt. If and when the historic and scientific worlds accept that Wirral is the battle site this will be an enormous boost for the peninsula. To have built modern housing estates on the site in the meantime would be a travesty.						
1246853	LPIO-13434		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246852	LPIO-13560		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247746	LPIO-13715		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1238192	LPIO-13823		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247012	LPIO-13877		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247014	LPIO-13931		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1242183	LPIO-14033		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247218	LPIO-14127		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247219	LPIO-14232		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1244900	LPIO-1432	yes							
1247220	LPIO-14328		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247222	LPIO-14456		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247226	LPIO-14546		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247245	LPIO-14644		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247829	LPIO-14675		On the whole, I agree but believe that ancient field systems where they are still identifiable, longstanding hedgerows and old, notable trees should be included.						
1246827	LPIO-14762		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247016	LPIO-14867		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247018	LPIO-14937		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1245343	LPIO-1516	yes							
1243700	LPIO-1535	yes							
1241412	LPIO-155	yes	Partially. Please just ensure that planning applications are really scrutinised for demolition or building. We have lost too many old buildings since 1950's and do not want to lose any more.						
1247248	LPIO-15512		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247251	LPIO-15604		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247252	LPIO-15691		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1244901	LPIO-1574	yes							
1247274	LPIO-15795		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247275	LPIO-15949		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247936	LPIO-16063		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247287	LPIO-16257		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247344	LPIO-16345		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247349	LPIO-16432		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247353	LPIO-16521		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247354	LPIO-16615		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247434	LPIO-16718		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247436	LPIO-16823		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247935	LPIO-16956		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247437	LPIO-17022		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247439	LPIO-17023		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247441	LPIO-17119		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247960	LPIO-17240		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247962	LPIO-17331		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247965	LPIO-17383		Heritage. Whilst conservation areas can be designated outside of the plan making process, it would be useful if the current Local Plan included future, planned conservation areas. I am aware that boundaries and a character analysis was prepared for a new conservation area called Noctorum Ridge, in 2007. This did not progress due to financial implications for preparing the relevant documentation, rather than for any issues on the merits of the proposed conservation area. Local planning authorities are under a positive legal duty to assess their area and review it from time to time, to consider whether areas are suitable for designation, or to remain designated (S.69 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990), and the Local Plan would provide added weight to the intention. I request that the previously proposed Noctorum Ridge conservation area, which did not progress, should be re-visited as part of the Local Plan process, and designation supported. I would be grateful if you would provide me with updates on the issues raised in the above comments.						
1247966	LPIO-17442		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247967	LPIO-17456		Heritage. Whilst conservation areas can be designated outside of the plan making process, it would be useful if the current Local Plan included future, planned conservation areas. I am aware that boundaries and a character analysis was prepared for a new conservation area called Noctorum Ridge, in 2007. This did not progress due to financial implications for preparing the relevant documentation, rather than for any issues on the merits of the proposed conservation area. Local planning authorities are under a positive legal duty to assess their area and review it from time to time, to consider whether areas are suitable for designation, or to remain designated (S.69 Planning (Listed Buildings and Conservation Areas) Act, 1990), and the Local Plan would provide added weight to the intention. I request that the previously proposed Noctorum Ridge conservation area, which did not progress, should be re-visited as part of the Local Plan process, and designation supported. I would be grateful if you would provide me with updates on the issues raised in the above comments.						
1247971	LPIO-17538		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1244969	LPIO-1754	no	As previously explained WBC are simply not adopting the approach which they say they wish to. Heritage has an increasingly important part to play in Tourism. Evidence that the most important battle in national history which determined the formation of England as an independent nation existed on Wirral is a revelation which WBC should exploit and adopt as a worthy funding stream. Careful consideration should be made regarding release of Green Belt since much of the Battle site its approaches and retreats are still in Wirral's open countryside						
1241726	LPIO-17638		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247979	LPIO-17813		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247980	LPIO-17814		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1245502	LPIO-17922		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247541	LPIO-18035		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247539	LPIO-18141		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247996	LPIO-18319		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1237857	LPIO-18356		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage. Funding for Heritage protection should not be an excuse to build houses.						
1247021	LPIO-18418		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247022	LPIO-18472		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247023	LPIO-18527		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247024	LPIO-18582		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247025	LPIO-18681		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247038	LPIO-18682		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247039	LPIO-18801		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247040	LPIO-18802		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247041	LPIO-18870		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247042	LPIO-18937		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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-19044		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247061	LPIO-19045		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247063	LPIO-19113		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247064	LPIO-19167		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247068	LPIO-19221		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247071	LPIO-19278		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247072	LPIO-19336		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1245060	LPIO-1936		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247078	LPIO-19391		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247080	LPIO-19495		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247081	LPIO-19496		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1248113	LPIO-19548		<p>A. Non-listed buildings can often make an important contribution to the character of a Conservation Area and to the setting of Listed Buildings within them. This is especially the case where they relate well in style, scale, age, materials and layout to other buildings of importance within the Area and where they help form part of characteristic views into or out of the designated Area.</p> <p>B. Demolition will only be acceptable where the premises or structures involved have little or no merit in terms of their contribution to the history, character or appearance of the Conservation Area concerned. The Local Planning Authority will, however, normally encourage proposals to develop or replace buildings or areas which are out of harmony with the wider character of the Area, providing those proposals are carefully designed in order to enhance the overall appearance of the Conservation Area. Demolition required under these circumstances will normally be approved.</p> <p>C. Policy CS42c specifically guards against the premature loss of a building by ensuring that demolition is only permitted where directly related to plans for redevelopment or site treatment which are acceptable to the wider objectives of Conservation Area control</p> <p>Notes / Comments</p> <p>(i) Referring to para.1, sub-section</p> <p>(ii) Such development need not necessarily involve new buildings but could be landscape enhancement.</p> <p>POLICY CS42f – BIRKENHEAD PARK CONSERVATION AREA</p> <p>1. In relation to Birkenhead Park Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <p>(i) preserve the character and appearance of an extensive Victorian public park;</p> <p>(ii) ensure that all development, including alterations to existing buildings, is sympathetic to the character of the Area and in line with the original specification;</p> <p>(iii) preserve unifying features of design, such as gate piers, boundary fences and stone walls, and the nature and extent of landscaping throughout the Area;</p> <p>(iv) restrict the non-residential use of existing buildings within the Area, unless a primarily domestic setting would be retained;</p> <p>(v) restrict all new development on private gardens between the Park's carriage drive and the rear of existing properties fronting Ashville Road, Cavendish Road, Park Road North, Park Road West, Park Road East, and Park Road South, as well as ensuring the enhancement and maintenance of appropriate boundary treatments with the Park on such land;</p> <p>(vi) ensure that all development is consistent with the restrictive covenants affecting private land around the periphery of the Park; and</p> <p>(vii) ensure that all development is in accordance with the updated Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan (2020) as a Supplementary Planning Document.</p> <p>2. Priority will be given to preserving uninterrupted, tree-lined, open vistas within the "inner park" as delineated by the route of Park Drive.</p> <p>3. Any planning application for new development, extensions to existing buildings, changes of use or hardstanding must be accompanied by a detailed landscape proposal.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1248113	LPIO-19549		<p>A. Birkenhead Park Conservation Area was designated in June 1977 and the historic park and garden is also designated at Grade I in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England.</p> <p>B. Opened in 1847 and designed by Sir Joseph Paxton, one of the most important landscape designers of the day, Birkenhead Park is universally acknowledged to be the first publicly funded park in Britain and provided the inspiration for the design of Central Park, New York. It also gave impetus to the Victorian "Public Parks Movement", which had a lasting influence throughout Britain and beyond.</p> <p>C. Wirral Council is seeking to submit an application for inscription of Birkenhead Park as a World Heritage Site and is preparing a nomination dossier and management plan. The Council's existing Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan is being updated and is intended to be adopted as a Supplementary Planning Document with additional and more detailed planning policies and guidance.</p> <p>D. The character and appearance of the Area principally derives from its wide and varied collection of period buildings and structures set within and around a mature parkland setting, unified by common features of design such as gate piers, boundary railings and substantial landscaping. Policy CS42f, therefore, provides for these features to be retained and restricts new uses which would by their nature or design prejudice the landscaped appearance of the area or detract from the primarily domestic character of period buildings. Policy CS42f also restricts new development falling within the area of open land bounded by Park Drive in order to preserve the open landscaped setting of the central parkland area</p> <p>Policy CS42ze – THE PRESERVATION OF HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS</p> <p>1. The Local Planning Authority will pay special regard to sites included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest and will only permit development within, adjacent to, or otherwise likely to affect the setting of such a site, where the proposals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) would not involve the loss of features considered to form an integral part of the special character or appearance of the park or garden; and</li> <li>(ii) would not otherwise detract from the enjoyment, layout, design, character, appearance, or setting of the park or garden.</li> </ul> <p>2. Special consideration will be given to matters of design, including landscaping and visual impact, in order to preserve the character and setting of the designated area.</p> <p>A. Historic England has an established national Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. Within this Register, parks and gardens are graded with regard to the extent of interest they possess.</p> <p>B. National planning policy guidance indicates that local planning authorities should protect registered parks and gardens, both when preparing development plans and in determining planning applications. This extends not only to the integrity of the park itself but also to its wider setting. Policy CS42zb, therefore, seeks to ensure that the special character of such sites, together with their setting, is protected from inappropriate development</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1248113	LPIO-19550		<p>Policy CS42zf – HISTORIC PARKS AND GARDENS</p> <p>1. The following historic parks and gardens, shown on the Proposals Map, will be protected from inappropriate development subject to Policy CS42zb:</p> <p>1A. Birkenhead Park, Claughton  2A. Thornton Manor Gardens, Thornton Hough  3A. The Dell, The Diamond &amp; The Causeway, Port Sunlight  4A. Flaybrick Memorial Gardens, Bidston</p> <p>A. Wirral currently has four parks and gardens listed in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England. The boundaries to these designations are shown on the Local Plan Proposals Map.</p> <p>B. Birkenhead Park, opened in 1847, was the first public park to be established at public expense in the United Kingdom and was influential on the design of public parks both nationally and internationally. It was designed by Joseph Paxton and incorporates a number of innovative features. It is considered an outstanding example of Paxton's work and a landmark in the history of public parks. The Park is registered Grade I.</p> <p>C. Thornton Manor Gardens falls within the exceptionally high category of historic interest required to merit Grade II* status in the Register. The Gardens were designed by Thomas Hayton Mawson in collaboration with the industrialist and philanthropist William Hesketh Lever, later first Viscount Leverhulme and were the first in a series of three major private gardens produced by Mawson for Lord Leverhulme.</p> <p>D. The principal public open spaces in Port Sunlight comprise part of a garden village laid out to the plans of William Hesketh Lever with the formal open spaces at The Diamond and The Causeway based on a 1910 competition design by Ernest Prestwich. The open spaces at The Dell, The Diamond and The Causeway are registered Grade II.</p> <p>E. Flaybrick Memorial Gardens, registered Grade II, is a public cemetery opened in 1864 and extended in the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. It was the first municipal public cemetery in Wirral. The layout was designed by Edward Kemp and the buildings by Lucy &amp; Littler. The cemetery contains a number of graves of architectural and historic interest including the family vault of the Laird family and the imposing canopied stone tomb of Sir William Jackson</p> <p>Notes / Comments</p> <p>(i) Referring to para.1: - Presumably reference to 'Policy CS42zb' should be amended to read 'Policies CS42 and CS42ze'.</p> <p>(ii) Policies CS42ze and CS42zf: - It may be helpful to combine these policies into one.</p>						
1247082	LPIO-19659		<p>We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).</p>						
1247083	LPIO-19713		<p>We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).</p>						
1247084	LPIO-19777		<p>We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).</p>						
1247085	LPIO-19831		<p>We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).</p>						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247088	LPIO-19897		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1241669	LPIO-199	yes							
1247089	LPIO-19959		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247090	LPIO-20014		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247091	LPIO-20068		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247092	LPIO-20128		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247093	LPIO-20192		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247094	LPIO-20247		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247095	LPIO-20302		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247096	LPIO-20358		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247099	LPIO-20414		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247101	LPIO-20468		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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-20549		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247102	LPIO-20550		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247106	LPIO-20669		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247105	LPIO-20670		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247109	LPIO-20738		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247110	LPIO-20831		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247111	LPIO-20832		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247112	LPIO-20958		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247113	LPIO-21012		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247115	LPIO-21068		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247116	LPIO-21122		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1246851	LPIO-21214		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246918	LPIO-21457		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1246924	LPIO-21458		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246928	LPIO-21459		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246920	LPIO-21641		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246926	LPIO-21642		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1247117	LPIO-21741		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247118	LPIO-21742		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247145	LPIO-21849		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247147	LPIO-21850		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247148	LPIO-21957		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247150	LPIO-21958		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1245112	LPIO-2199	yes							
1244329	LPIO-22036		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247119	LPIO-22130		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1246678	LPIO-22131		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247151	LPIO-22238		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247152	LPIO-22239		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247153	LPIO-22352		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247155	LPIO-22353		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247156	LPIO-22462		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247158	LPIO-22463		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247159	LPIO-22568		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247160	LPIO-22569		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247161	LPIO-22711		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247164	LPIO-22712		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247167	LPIO-22840		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247168	LPIO-22841		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247169	LPIO-22936		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1247170	LPIO-22937		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247173	LPIO-23105		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247174	LPIO-23106		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247175	LPIO-23217		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247176	LPIO-23218		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247177	LPIO-23376		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247178	LPIO-23377		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1247179	LPIO-23378		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).						
1248391	LPIO-23480		I support a sequential approach to development to ensure sustainable sites are developed before those with a heritage value.						
1242185	LPIO-23957	yes	Yes, broadly we are content with the Council's approach. We note more studies need to be completed to inform the policy and hope there will be more comprehensive policy text to guide what is acceptable and unacceptable from a decision takers point of view, in order to encourage developments in the right locations, and correctly designed to suit the receiving environment. We believe it is paramount for the Council to have complete, and full, heritage assessments in front of it to consider as part of site appraisals, in advance of proposing Green Belt sites in the Options.	<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 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1248567	LPIO-24527		<p>Local Plans should include strategic policies to conserve and enhance the historic environment of the area and to guide how the presumption in favour of sustainable development should be applied locally. It is vital to include strategic policies for the historic environment in the local plan as the plan will be the starting point for decisions on planning applications and any Neighbourhood Plans that come forward are required to be in general conformity with the strategic policies of the Local Plan. The strategic policies for the historic environment will derive from the overall strategy to deliver conservation and enjoyment of the area's heritage assets for generations to come. A strategic policy must be locally specific and set out what it is that makes the Wirral special. These may be within policies that concern themselves specifically with the development of types of heritage asset. But delivery of the NPPF objective may also require strategic policies on use, design of new development, transport layout and so on. Indeed every aspect of planning conceivably can make a contribution to conservation. Plan policies in all topics should be assessed for their impact on the strategic conservation objective. Conservation is not a standalone exercise satisfied by standalone policies that repeat the NPPF objectives. The Local Plan should also consider the role which the historic environment can play in delivering other planning objectives:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building a strong, competitive economy;</li> <li>• Ensuring the vitality of town centres;</li> <li>• Supporting a prosperous rural economy;</li> <li>• Promoting sustainable transport;</li> <li>• Supporting high quality communication infrastructure;</li> <li>• Requiring good design;</li> <li>• Protecting green belt land;</li> <li>• Meeting the challenge of climate change, flooding and coastal change;</li> <li>• Conserving and enhancing the natural environment;</li> <li>• Facilitating the sustainable use of minerals.</li> </ul> <p>In formulating the strategy it is advisable and often necessary to consider the following factors:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• How the historic environment can assist in the delivery of the vision and the economic, social and environmental objectives for the plan area;</li> <li>• How the Plan will address particular issues identified during the development of the evidence base including heritage at risk;</li> <li>• The interrelationship between the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment and the other Plans policies and objectives;</li> <li>• The means by which new development in conservation areas and within the setting of heritage assets might enhance or better reveal their significance;</li> <li>• How local lists might assist in identifying and managing the conservation on non-designated heritage assets;</li> <li>• How the archaeology of the Plan area might be managed;</li> <li>• How CIL funding might contribute towards ensuring a sustainable future for individual assets or specific historic places and whether or not certain heritage assets might need to be identified;</li> <li>• Whether masterplans or design briefs need to be prepared for significant sites where major change is proposed;</li> <li>• What implementation partners need to be identified in order to deliver the positive strategy;</li> <li>• What indicators should be used to monitor the effectiveness of the strategy.</li> </ul>						
1244826	LPIO-2486	yes	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1248524	LPIO-24924		We think there is more work to be done to ensure the Local Plan properly plans for development in the context of the area's heritage assets, especially development that although not directly within, is located next to conservation areas.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684261">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684261</a>					
1246458	LPIO-25837		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1246459	LPIO-25839		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1249116	LPIO-25949 1 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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>	
1249116	LPIO-25949 2 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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/5684833">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684833</a>					
1249116	LPIO-26009 1 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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-26009 2 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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>					
1249116	LPIO-26051 1 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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>			
1249116	LPIO-26051 2 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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/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-26085 1 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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>		
1249116	LPIO-26085 2 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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/5684837">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684837</a>					
1249203	LPIO-26106	yes	GREASBY VILLAGE Dating from some 8,500 BC, Greasby has been found to be the earliest known settlement in Western Britain and possibly in the entire country. To commemorate this, I designed and raised funds for the installation of five place name signs sited on the boundaries of the township. In the 1960's the former Hoylake Urban District Council abandoned a previously proposed highway link between Pump Lane and Mill Lane. This necessitated road widening schemes within the historic core of the village itself, involving demolition of Teapot Row, a terrace of red sandstone cottages and the Blacksmith's, a landmark building also of characteristic local stone, as well as the saddlery adjacent the Coach and Horses Public House. The result of these works was annihilation of the historic character of the centre of the village. An ugly blue engineering brick retaining wall was constructed opposite the Greaves Dunning Public House, permanently exposing to view extensions at the rear of the Coach and Horses. The works also created a dangerous junction between Mill Lane and Greasby Road and involved the truncation of the section of Old Greasby Road, causing isolation of the row of shops and chaotic car parking and vehicular access problems. I am strongly of the opinion that the damaged urban fabric of the village could be dramatically repaired as the plan below indicates. The scheme would greatly enhance this nationally significant historic village, whilst supporting the Council's aims to reduce unnecessary traffic through the shopping centre by a reduction in the width of Greasby Road to accommodate two-way bus movement. I respectfully request that this strategy be incorporated into the local plan. Further information and my detailed designs are available and strong support has been forthcoming from local developers and traders.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677223">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677223</a>					
1243721	LPIO-2623	no	We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (eg Heswall Police Station).						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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-26263 1 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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>		
1249116	LPIO-26263 2 of 2		In principle, we have no objections to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced but 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/5684837">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684837</a>					
1249219	LPIO-26493		We do not consider that the Council's approach to heritage is adequate. In particular, we do not consider that there is sufficient protection for buildings classed A and B in Heswall's Conservation Areas Management and Appraisal Plans nor for sandstone walls and trees within the conservation areas. We strongly advocate a Local Listing for non-designated heritage assets (e.g. Heswall Police Station).	<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>				
1240932	LPIO-26637	no	No, we disagree with the Council's approach and wish to make some recommendations. Notwithstanding the apparent current lack of evidence base support for the Council's approach to how heritage is dealt with in the Local Plan, we note that the Council's Preferred Approach is to set a positive strategy for the "conservation and enjoyment" of the Borough's heritage assets through inter alia the "protection" of heritage assets and conservation areas (our emphasis). The Preferred Approach mentions 'conservation' and 'protection', however makes no mention of the desirability of enhancing heritage assets, as outlined in national policy and guidance. In particular, this reflects the requirements of the Framework at paragraph 185 that Local Plans should take into account "the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation". We also wish to highlight how the Local Plan policies should be worded to allow the requirements of section 16 of the Framework, in particular, paragraphs 192 and 196, to be discharged in the determination of planning applications: "192. In determining applications, local planning authorities should take account of: a) the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation; b) the positive contribution that conservation of heritage assets can make to sustainable communities including their economic vitality; and c) the desirability of new development making a positive contribution to local character and distinctiveness; 196. Where a development proposal will lead to less than substantial harm to the significance of a designated heritage asset, this harm should be weighed against the public benefits of the proposal including, where appropriate, securing its optimum viable use." As such, we recommend that draft Local Plan policies for both the Council's overarching heritage strategy and development management will need to be flexible to allow for new uses sympathetic to the assets' heritage characteristics and value as well as securing their long term survival in line with the requirements of national policy and guidance.	<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>			
1248113	LPIO-26664		The heritage section of the Local Plan should give greater focus to identifying conservation areas of national, even international, importance, which should include: Birkenhead Park (the text within Proposed Policy CS42f, considered by the Planning Sub Committee on sets out the national and international case); Hamilton Square (Proposed Policy CS42e explains its importance in that it is the largest square outside London composed of Grade I listed buildings); and Port Sunlight (the case for the international reputation is made in Proposed Policy CS42i). These three conservation areas should be identified as particularly significant and should be placed at the beginning of the list of conservation areas with a general statement as to why they are so important.						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26670		<p>Policy CS42e - Hamilton Square Conservation Area as amended by CAW</p> <p>The principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) preserve the historic character, formal setting and sense of enclosure within the central square;</li> <li>(ii) retain the unity of design and elevational treatment of buildings overlooking the central gardens;</li> <li>(iii) preserve the wider visual setting of the Square by controlling the design and scale of new buildings located outside but visible to and from the central square;</li> <li>(iv) preserve the period property beyond the immediate square; and</li> <li>(v) secure renewed economic, residential and leisure activity within the Conservation Area. Priority will be given to retaining the historic and formal character of the central garden area.</li> </ul> <p>Hamilton Square Conservation Area was designated in July 1977 and extended in June 1994. The Square itself is the largest, Grade 1 Listed, Victorian square outside London and has major significance for the historical development of Wirral.</p> <p>Designed by James Gillespie Graham it represents one of the first residential areas for businessmen and the professional classes to be built in the newly formed town of Birkenhead, following the introduction of steam ferries across the River Mersey. The Area was until recently the primary focus for the commercial office centre of Birkenhead and has the potential to be a focus for urban tourism together with other nearby heritage attractions, including Birkenhead Priory and St Mary's Tower.</p> <p>The principal character of the Area derives from the grand scale of the architecture, the sense of enclosure and the The objective of Policy CS42e is, therefore, to preserve these elements in the design and appearance of the Square and to retain the open aspect and formal arrangement of the central garden area.</p> <p>The boundary of the Conservation Area has been extended to include period property along Argyle Street, Hamilton Street and Market Street and the west side of Chester Street to its junction with Ivy Street. These streets provide an important and complementary "visual envelope" to the main Square. However, this boundary does not include all the buildings or land which have the potential to detract from its wider visual setting.</p> <p>Policy CS42e, therefore, requires all new development located outside but visible from the central Square or visible when looking into the Square, to be of a scale and design appropriate to maintaining the Area's historic character.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26671		<p>Policy CS42h Rock Park Conservation Area comment from Rock Park group</p> <p>WBC should fund the maintenance of the esplanade. Continued public access to the esplanade is not in the interest, at least not directly, of local residents so that such access should be paid for by the public, i.e. from the taxes paid by the community</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26672		<p>Policy CS42k Caldry Conservation Area comments from the Caldry Society</p> <p>One point of concern is the final paragraph of the WBC statement, which seems to imply that the terms of the original Caldry Manor Estate no longer apply vis a vis planning and that the WBC now use their own criteria. Does this mean they will now ignore the Covenants which cover the Conservation area? We also note that policy CS42 refers to preservation or enhancing of conservation areas but then goes on to the "need for new development" which is no doubt a higher priority for WBC.</p> <p>Policy CS42k refers to Caldry and the need to retain the character of the area. It refers to policy CH11 but there is no information on CH11.</p> <p>As I noted, WBC recognises density controls, but no information is given on detail. Overall, we find the plan long on aspiration and nebulous platitudes and short on specifics or detail. It is full of wriggle room to allow WBC to do as it pleases.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26673		<p>Policy CS42l - Frankby Village Conservation Area comments from the Franky Group</p> <p>Add the following two policy elements:</p> <p>v) retain unifying features, such as tree groups, hedges, boundary walls, red sandstone walls and the triangular cap stones; and</p> <p>(vi) preserve the wider visual setting of the Frankby area by retaining the openness of the fields which surround the whole conservation area.</p> <p>This is because we feel the current draft statement omits the landscape features in the area and concentrates on the Green as opposed to the whole of the conservation area and does not represent the wider visual aspect of</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26674		<p>Policy CS42m - Gayton Conservation Area</p> <p>No comments on the WBC statement.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26675		<p>Policy CS42o Thornton Hough Conservation Area comments from Thornton Hough Group</p> <p>The extract CS42 is a direct extract from Policy CH15 and all points made remain in place and major considerations. One thing to be mindful of also is that Thornton Hough is designated an Area of Special Landscape Value, not that Policy LA1 has provided Thornton Hough with much protection concerning some recent planning applications and subsequent approvals.</p> <p>The old Policy LA1 provides for the protection of the character and visual appearance of Areas of Special Landscape Value. Thornton Hough is one of only 4 areas in Wirral to have this status; this designation is used sparingly by the Local Planning Authority and is applied only to landscapes of outstanding value within a Borough wide context. The Dee Coast including Heswall Dales, Thurstaston Common &amp; Royden Park; Clay Hill including Stapledon Wood and Thornton Hough were originally designated as heritage landscapes within the Merseyside Structural Plan which was approved in November 1980. They were considered to represent outstanding landscapes of country-wide significance which merited special protection in order to minimise the potential for damage from new development. It is vital that this designation remains in place alongside Conservation Area status. As mentioned previously the LPA have severely let Thornton Hough down regarding this Policy.</p> <p>A 10-year Management Plan exists 2011-2021, updated in 2019, for the development and improvement of the Village Green.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26676 1 of 2		<p>Policy CS46p - West Kirby Old Village Conservation Area as amended by CAW</p> <p>In relation to West Kirby Old Village Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <p>(i) preserve the remaining semi-rural, low density character of a former medieval hamlet in a woodland setting;</p> <p>(ii) preserve the open aspect of the remnant fields and pasture which originally surrounded the Village;</p> <p>(iii) retain the scale and massing of buildings at the Village core, between 4-32, Village Road, and the open setting of The Ring O'Bells, The Old Rectory and St. Bridget's Church; and trees such as boundary treatment, including st</p> <p>(iv) retain unifying features, such as woodlands, tree groups, stone walls, and the character of narrow unmade paths. Priority will be given to retaining the open setting of land and woodland to the east and west of Echo Lane and of open land to the east of Church Walk.</p> <p>In considering proposals for new development within the old village special attention will be paid to the retention and, if necessary, the enhancement of its listed and other historic buildings, and of their retaining walls and the preservation of the area's open spaces and woodland.</p> <p>The 'old village' area of West Kirby was designated as a Conservation Area in September 1973. It incorporates the nucleus of the old medieval hamlet and includes the oldest buildings in West Kirby. The character of the area is primarily derived from its historic associations but is significantly enhanced by the design and setting of its major buildings, such as St. Bridget's Church and Old Rectory and The Ring o' Bells, the survival of historic farm buildings, unifying features such as red sandstone walls, woodland areas, narrow unmade paths and lanes, and by the open aspect of St Bridget's school playing field and the remnant fields which originally surrounded the Village.</p> <p>Policy CS42p, therefore seeks to ensure that these distinctive features are preserved and that aspects of the area which serve to indicate the original character of the Village, including the open spaces, are enhanced and retained.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26676 2 of 2		<p>2. Date and rationale of designation and boundaries: Designated 1973.</p> <p>3. Adoption of the Character Appraisal and Management Plan with dates: Character Appraisal-2009; Management Plan - 2009</p> <p>4. Description of the character/sub zones of the area: Three distinct character zones can be identified: i. The churchyard ii. Village Road iii. The open fields and woodland</p> <p>5. Description of the buildings</p> <p>5.i - Listed Building: • St Bridget's Church, (Grade II listed) • West Kirby War Memorial, •St Bridget's Churchyard, (Grade II listed) • The Nook and Nook Cottage, 34 and 36 Village Road (Grade II listed)</p> <p>5.ii - Heritage buildings and structures not listed: • Former St Bridget's School • West Kirby Museum (formerly the Charles Dawson Brown Museum); • The Ring o' Bells Public House, Village Road (1810); • Manor Farm, Village Road (1655) • Sycamore Cottage, Village Road (1746); • The White House, Village Road (1699); • Terraced Cottages, Village Road (1839); • Old Rectory, Rectory Road; • Former barn and stables, Rectory Road</p> <p>5.iii - Buildings making a positive contribution to the conservation area: • 32 Village Road • Medhurst, Village Road; • 4 Village Road</p> <p>6. Buildings in different categories: Listed buildings - 3; Non listed heritage buildings/structures - 9; Buildings making a positive contribution - 3</p> <p>7. Links to other policies:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UDP - Policies CH2, CH3</li> <li>• Core Strategy - Policy - CS43 – Design, Heritage and Amenity</li> <li>• Character Appraisal – 2009 · Management Plan - 2009</li> <li>• Supplementary Guidance Note SPG 33</li> </ul>						
1237574	LPIO-26677		<p>Policy CS42r Wellington Road Conservation Area comments from Wellington Road Group</p> <p>In relation to Wellington Road Conservation Area the principal planning objectives should be as follows:</p> <p>(i) Preserve the character of a series of Victorian Villas and terraced gardens with an open coastal aspect.</p> <p>(ii) Retain common aspects of villa design such as gabled roofs, barge-boarding, stuccoed elevations, decorated friezes and cast-iron balconies overlooking the coastal promenade. Ensuring that the view from and to the promenade sea wall, as it borders Kings Parade between the buildings at Marine Point to the east and Harrison Drive to the west, remains unobstructed.</p> <p>(iii) Conserve all the green open leisure space and green urban space contained within the boundaries of the conservation area. In particular: the greens, currently used for golfing, to the west of the lower part of Portland Street, the triangular depression to the east of lower Portland Street and the north of Pilots Way, including the small triangular strip, by the continuation of Pilots Way, at the boundary wall of 42 Wellington Road.</p> <p>(iv) Preserve the historic character of Marine Park for formal public recreation retaining its primary use as a green open space.</p> <p>(v) Only residential uses will be permitted along Wellington Road.</p> <p>(vi) Priority shall be given to retaining the open aspect of the north facing boundary of the conservation area and its heritage buildings, as viewed facing south from the promenade sea-side wall. This shall be maintained by retaining all the green open space, and land designated as Urban Greenspace to the north, west and east of the onservation Area together with the hard covered and paved open spaces.</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26678		<p>Policy CS42s - Thurstaston Conservation Area comments from Thornton Hough Group</p> <p>I have trawled through the various documents pertaining to the Thurstaston Conservation Area and note the wording of Policy CS42s is a duplicate of the previous Policy CH19 which to a great extent covers all aspects of the village character and setting.</p> <p>The description is basically a distillation of the wider detail contained in the Thurstaston Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan 2009.</p> <p>The Appraisal states The character of the Area primarily derives from its topographical setting, the surrounding landscape including a number of important tree groups..</p> <p>A great deal of the surrounding landscape, or topographical setting, so important to the character of the village, falls outside the designated Conservation Area, specifically the fields beyond the conservation boundary either side of Station Road, running to the Wirral Way and towards Oldfield Farm and to Caldy Golf Club and headland beyond.</p> <p>Although the fields are designated a Site of Special Scientific Interest and subject to Special Landscape Value and Article 4. Directives. ITPAS is aware that any future removal of Green Belt status and potential to develop the fields surrounding the conservation area would ultimately cause significant and irreversible damage to the inherent character and setting of the village.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26679		<p>Policy CS42t - Bromborough Village Conservation Area comments of CAW</p> <p>Supplementary Historic Information Bromborough is now confirmed as the site of the defining Battle of Brunanburh in 937. This is one of the most significant battles in English History. Although the battle site doesn't impinge on the Conservation Area it will have a major effect on the area. Recent digs in the Rectory Garden have discovered Roman shards – evidence of Roman occupation rather than a transitory presence.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26680		<p>Policy CS42u Barnston Conservation Area comments of Barnston Group</p> <p>The Barnston notes make reference to the wooded corridor to the North of the village being of significant importance and indeed are recorded in part as being of National importance by Defra. However, the Barnston Conservation Area is surrounded to the South, East and West by Town Fields and a network of Medieval and Post Medieval field systems (Referenced in Barnston Conservation Area Appraisal) which are of historical importance and which provide a wildlife environment to support the wooded corridor to the North. In addition, this land is integral to the success of our four working farms and Wirral's Rural Economy.</p>						
1237574	LPIO-26681 1 of 2		<p>Policy CS42v - Bromborough Pool Conservation Area as amended by CAW</p> <p>In relation to Bromborough Pool Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) retain the uniform, planned form of the historic, industrial workers' village;</li> <li>(ii) preserve the open aspect of the land which provides an important separation function from surrounding modern industrial and residential uses;</li> <li>(iii) retain unifying features of design, including the grid-iron pattern of streets, terraces of four dwellings, and their materials, scale, elevational treatment and garden areas; and</li> <li>(iv) retain the high wall bounding the Village along Dock Road South. Only primarily residential uses will be permitted within the Area and priority will be given to retaining the primarily open aspect of land used as playing fields at The Green and fronting South View.</li> </ul> <p>Bromborough Pool Village Conservation Area was designated in October 1986. It was developed as a model village in 1854 to provide homes for workers in the nearby Price's Candle Factory. Development of the Village continued throughout the rest of the century to incorporate a school, hospital, village hall and Church, all of which remained in the ownership of the factor, all of which still survive except the hospital. The Village, therefore, represents one of the earliest examples of English private company philanthropy.</p> <p>Policy C42v provides for essential elements in the planned form of the Village to continue to be preserved, including the uniformity of layout and the setting and detailed design of individual buildings. It also provides for the Village to remain a Primarily Residential Area and to remain essentially separate from its modern industrial surroundings, by restricting new development on open land which serves as an essential buffer between the Village</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26681 2 of 2		and the modern housing estate and factory premises nearby. An Article 4 Direction, for the built-up parts of Bromborough Pool Conservation Area, is in force, which limits permitted development rights for properties within the Village.						
1237574	LPIO-26682		<p>Policy CS42x – Kings Gap Hoylake Conservation Area as amended by CAW</p> <p>In relation to Kings Gap Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) preserve the character and appearance of a Victorian and Edwardian seaside resort and commuter settlement;</li> <li>(ii) preserve particular aspects of historic building design such as barge boards and blind boxes, gate piers, setts and cast iron railings;</li> <li>(iii) retain unifying features such as the gridiron pattern of roads, grass verges, street trees, granite kerb stones, sandstone and other boundary walls and gate piers, mature hedges and trees, and close boarded timber fences; and</li> <li>(iv) retain and enhance the open views across the Royal Liverpool Golf Course, the Dee Estuary and Liverpool Bay.</li> </ul> <p>In considering proposals for new development within the Area, special attention will be paid to the style, scale, massing and setting of the property, the type and quality of building materials, and the details of design, landscaping and boundary treatment. Kings Gap Hoylake Conservation Area was designated in April 2000. It represents an area of 19th and early 20th Century housing development in generously sized plots sandwiched between the sea and the Royal Liverpool Golf Course and contains some important public buildings currently unlisted. The character and appearance of the Area primarily derives from the style and pattern of building associated with the development of the area during the Victorian and Edwardian periods. The Conservation Area shows the progress of design and development across these periods following the construction of the railway in 1866 and demonstrates the changes in the taste, wealth and status of the incoming inhabitants.</p> <p>Policy CS42x seeks to retain the character and appearance of a Victorian and Edwardian seaside resort and to control the design of new buildings to ensure that they will not conflict with the design traditions established within the historic design traditions of the Area.</p> <p>2. Date and rationale of designation and boundaries: Designated 2000</p> <p>3. Adoption of the Character Appraisal and Management Plan with dates: Character Appraisal 2000; No Management Plan</p> <p>4. Description of the character/sub zones of the area: Three distinct character zones can be identified: Stanley Road/Barton Road and subsidiary residential roads; King's Gap and subsidiary residential roads; North Parade</p> <p>5. Description of the buildings</p> <p>5.i - Listed Building: Church of St Hildeburgh (1897-9, Grade II listed); Lighthouse and Keepers Cottage, Valentia Road. (1865, Grade II listed)</p> <p>5.ii - Heritage buildings and structures not listed: War Memorial, St Hildeburgh's churchyard</p> <p>5.iii - Buildings making a positive contribution to the Conservation Area: Green Lodge Hotel, Stanley Road; 4 Stanley Road; 28 – 30 Stanley Road; Dormy 32/32A Stanley Road; 40 Stanley Road; Red Rocks Nursing Home, Stanley Road; The Motor House, Barton Road; 2, 4 and 6 Beach Road; Relict sand dune, Courtney Road; Former Lifeboat House, North Parade (1899)</p> <p>6. Buildings in different categories: Listed buildings (2); Non listed heritage buildings/structures (1); Buildings making a positive contribution (12)</p> <p>7. Links to other policies</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• UDP – Policies CH2, CH3</li> <li>• Core Strategy Policy - CS43 – Design, Heritage and Amenity</li> <li>• Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan The King's Gap Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2000</li> </ul>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26683 1 of 2		<p>Policy CS42y – Meols Drive Conservation Area as amended by CAW</p> <p>In relation to Meols Drive Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) preserve the historic character and appearance of a wealthy late Victorian and Edwardian commuter suburb and the setting, landscape and skyline of the Royal Liverpool Golf Course;</li> <li>(ii) retain the consistency of scale, massing and separation between neighbouring buildings;</li> <li>(iii) preserve the variety of buildings, materials and design linked by a common design approach, including highly decorative details and roofscapes.</li> <li>(iv) retain unifying features such as building lines, generous landscaping and boundary treatment, including sandstone and red brick walls along public frontages; and</li> <li>(v) promote a more unified treatment along the boundary with the Royal Liverpool Golf Course.</li> </ul> <p>In considering proposals for new development within the Area, special attention will be paid to the style, scale, massing and setting of the property, the type and quality of building materials, and the details of design, landscaping and boundary treatment.</p> <p>Meols Drive Conservation Area was designated in April 2004 in order to preserve the local distinctiveness and historic setting of the area associated with the Royal Liverpool Golf Course. The character and appearance of the Area is defined by the spacious, landscaped setting of Meols Drive, the scale and character of individually designed buildings, the quality and variety of materials, and the distinctive detailing associated with the 'Arts and Craft' movement at the turn of the 20th Century.</p> <p>Policy CS42y seeks to ensure that the character and appearance of the Area will not be harmed through the introduction of higher density development, out of keeping with the historic design traditions of the Area. Policy CS42y, in particular, seeks to preserve the consistency of scale, massing and separation between buildings and the individual but common design approach to materials, variety and detailing.</p> <p>2. Date and rationale of designation and boundaries: Designated 2004</p> <p>3. Adoption of the Character Appraisal and Management Plan with dates: Character Appraisal 2004 No Management Plan</p> <p>4. Description of the character/sub zones of the area Five distinct character zones can be identified: · Meols Drive and subsidiary residential roads; Hoylake Gateway; West Kirby Gateway; Stanley Road; Golf Course</p> <p>5 Description of the buildings</p> <p>5.i - Listed Building: Hope Church – former Congregational Church,1906 (Grade II listed); Hoylake Railway Station 1938, (Grade II listed); St Andrew's Church, Meols Drive 1889 -1891 (Grade II listed)</p> <p>5.ii - Heritage buildings and structures not listed: *Royal Liverpool Golf Club, Meols Drive (1895); Former Post Office – now Royal Mail Delivery Centre; Hoylake Quadrant; Former Hoylake UDC District Offices, Hoylake Quadrant; URC Church, Meols Drive (1890)</p> <p>5.iii - Buildings making a positive contribution to the conservation area: No 51 Meols Drive</p> <p>6. Buildings in different categories</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i. Listed buildings (3): West Kirby Girl's Grammar School, Graham Road – (core building - 1912-13); Nos 3 and 5 Graham Road; Former HSBC Bank, Hoylake Quadrant (opened 1897)</li> <li>ii. Non listed heritage buildings/structures: (4)</li> <li>iii. Buildings making a positive contribution: (11)</li> </ul> <p>7. Links to other policies UDP:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Policies CH2, CH3 Core Strategy</li> <li>• Policy - CS43 – Design, Heritage and Amenity Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan</li> <li>• Meols Drive Conservation Area Character Appraisal 2004</li> </ul> <p>8. Unlisted buildings of particular merit (15):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• URC Church, Meols Drive (1890)</li> <li>• No 51 Meols Drive · No 53 Meols Drive</li> <li>• No 75 Meols Drive · No 79 Meols Drive</li> <li>• Nos 85/87 Meols Drive</li> </ul>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26683 2 of 2		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Royal Liverpool Golf Club, Meols Drive (1895)</li> <li>• West Kirby School, Meols Drive – formerly the Children’s Convalescent Home (1899)</li> <li>• West Kirby Girl’s Grammar School, Graham Road – (core building - 1912-13)</li> <li>• Nos 3 and 5 Graham Road. · Former Post Office – now Royal Mail Delivery Centre, Hoylake Quadrant.</li> <li>• Former Hoylake UDC District Offices, Hoylake Quadrant (opened 1898)</li> <li>• Former HSBC Bank, Hoylake Quadrant (opened 1897) F503</li> <li>• No 53 Meols Drive · No 75 Meols Drive · No 79 Meols Drive</li> <li>• Nos 85/87 Meols Drive</li> <li>• West Kirby School, Meols Drive – formerly the Children’s Convalescent Home (18996)</li> </ul>						
1237574	LPIO-26684 1 of 2		<p>Policy CS42z – Clifton Park Conservation Area amended by CAW</p> <p>1. Planning objectives</p> <p>In relation to Clifton Park Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>i) preserve the historic character and appearance of a Victorian suburb and its landscaped setting;</li> <li>ii) retain the consistency of scale, massing and separation between neighbouring buildings;</li> <li>iii) preserve the variety of buildings, materials and design linked by a common design approach, including highly decorative details and roofscapes; and</li> <li>iv) retain, create and improve unifying features such as boundary treatment, including stone walls and railings</li> </ul> <p>and</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>attractive landscaping within public vantage points as well as protecting the significant treescape within the Park area.</li> <li>v) principal planning objectives should also aim to halt the incremental loss of character, even to many of the listed buildings, due to a lack of planning control and the social problems besetting the area due to multi occupancy and drug related issues. Applying a strict conservation regime in this area will come to nought without a complementary approach to its other problems.</li> </ul> <p>In considering proposals for new development affecting the Area, special attention will be paid to the style, scale, massing and setting of the property, the type and quality of building materials and the details of design, landscaping and boundary treatment.</p> <p>laid out by developer Captain William Sharp to a design by the architect Walter Scott circa 1840, who is also reputed to have designed most of the early houses. The area was intended as an opulent suburb for the wealthy of Birkenhead and Liverpool and housed some notable residents in its time including Walter Scott, the Park’s architect and F E Smith, the Lord Chancellor, Lord Birkenhead, whose family lived at No 42, Clifton Road, having supposedly bought the house which had been originally built for Captain Sharp. The smaller brickbuilt properties surrounding the earlier developments also have significant architectural features and many were supplied to accommodate the staff working in the big houses as well as in the newly expanding town of Birkenhead. Clifton Park complemented Birkenhead Park which provided a more spacious residential environment compared to Hamilton Square and the earlier terraces. These terraces and villas of Hamilton Square and around Birkenhead Park and Clifton Park are important surviving examples from the formative period of the town’s development. The Victorian Society commented: “All the early houses are of high architectural quality, some of them of quite exceptional excellence. .. A variety of styles are presented, with version of Italianate, Gothic or Elizabethan. ... Detailing is of a very high order, with many elements which may be recognised as characteristically Scott’s own. The Park was also mentioned by Mortimer in The Hundred of Wirral, 1845.</p> <p>Within the last few years this has been converted from a large plot of waste land into a favourite place of residence and is now studded with villas, generally of handsome and attractive elevations. The park has been laid out by Mr Walter Scott, of Birkenhead from whose designs most of the houses in it have been built. They exhibit a most studied diversity of character, the whole forming a splendid ornament to the neighbourhood.</p> <p>The Conservation Area Boundary: The proposed Conservation Area boundary runs along the back of the houses on the east side of Clifton Road, along the rear of The Woodlands as far as number 45 and then</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237574	LPIO-26684 2 of 2		<p>along the road as to Fearnley Road. Turning at right angles the boundary then runs for a short distance up the centreline of Fearnley Road and then skirts around the rest of the western terrace. At Lowwood Road, it crosses over, and again goes down the rear of the properties to include the houses on Circular Road, eventually coming out near the junction of Hollybank and Clifton Roads. It then travels towards and then over Whetstone Lane and includes numbers 140, 142, 144, 146 and 148.</p> <p>3. Character Appraisal and Management Plan: Clifton Park's Character Appraisal was done in 2004. There is currently no Management Plan.</p> <p>4. Character/sub zones of the area: Clifton Road was principally laid out in the 1840's with large detached or semi-detached houses within spacious plots. Although there has been some infilling, Clifton Park's overall character remains dominated by the grand scale of the villas that are set back from the road or partly screened by trees. The architectural design with robust cornice and eaves details produce the effect that the houses have a strong presence on the street scene. In Circular Road the buildings are predominantly of brick. A few earlier villas form the centre point of this area with rows of terraced housing in surrounding streets. The unusual form of Circular Road immediately gives a unique and special feel to the area. Brooklands Road and the Woodlands generally retain sufficient properties which are relatively unaltered for a strong authentic character to still exist although this will be an issue of concern in the future. Whetstone Lane has many buildings worthy of protection.</p> <p>5. Listed Buildings and others making a positive contribution</p> <p>i) According to the Clifton Park Appraisal document, there are 28 listed buildings and 1 unlisted building that are of particular interest and/or give value to the area eg landmark buildings. Grade II listed buildings: Clifton Road (East Side) Nos, 21, 23/25, 27 (Masonic Temple), 31/33, 47/49; Clifton Road (West Side) Nos 10, 24, 30/32, 34/36, 40, 42, 44; Whetstone Lane Nos 140/142, 144; Hollybank Former Chamber of Commerce building; Lowwood Road No 12; Lowwood Grove No 8; Woodlands (South side) No 42; Woodlands (North side) Nos 53/55, 57/59</p> <p>ii) 49 buildings are listed as "making a positive contribution to the area".</p> <p>6. Current Policies</p> <p>6.1 Policy CS42z seeks to ensure that the character and appearance of the Area will not be harmed through the introduction of higher density development which is out of keeping with the historic design traditions of the Area. Policy CS42z, in particular, seeks to preserve the consistency of scale, massing and separation between buildings, individual design approach and to promote improved unifying boundary in the public realm. Policy CS42z also aims to prevent over-development and ensure that the density, height, scale, massing, siting and visual impact of any buildings or structures and the provision of landscaping and private amenity open space will be appropriate to the character, grain and layout of the surrounding area. Policy CS42z also aims to preserve important views into and out of the area. Policy CS42z also aims to provide visually attractive buildings with appropriate architectural detailing, materials, external colour scheme and elevational treatment with the main entrances aligned to create active frontages in the public realm.</p> <p>6.2 Policy CS1c in particular should be applied to give special attention to the significant treescape within the Park area which acts as a "buffer" protecting the setting and amenity of adjacent property. Removal of the trees would harm the character of the Conservation Area.</p> <p>6.3 Policy CS1B in particular should be applied to: protect and provide high quality unifying features of design such as gates, piers, landscaping, walls, boundary fences, taking account of the nature, quality and type of materials.</p>						
1245180	LPIO-2795	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1245100	LPIO-2821	no	Any new applications for fossil fuel exploration and extraction must demonstrate that the activity will not be adding greenhouse gases to the atmosphere thereby increasing the risks from climate change.						
1237870	LPIO-2846	yes	Again - it is vitally important that our heritage assets are preserved.						



Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1241925	LPIO-288	no	8.117 acknowledges the importance of heritage assets such as non-listed buildings of local interest. A reference should be added to include one of the most significant elements of Birkenhead's townscape: The Edwardian new town extension (c1903) between Park Road North and Beckwith Street. The Council should designate this area as an area of local interest.						
1238379	LPIO-2917	no	See previous comments re unrealistic housing targets and the threat to Green Belt heritage sites. More Could and should be done to protect these sites.						
1242093	LPIO-293	yes	Yes, but see my answer to 8.17. But nice to see the importance of the Battle of Brunanburgh acknowledged. It is one of the most important battle's in England's history. Who are the archaeologists working on it? And are historians also going to be involved as well?						
1245159	LPIO-3103	yes	But you must put the resources, financial, enforcement and project management there to do it properly.						
1241315	LPIO-3325	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1237944	LPIO-3475	yes							
1245451	LPIO-3604	yes	But you must put the resources, financial, enforcement and project management there to do it properly.						
1237827	LPIO-3837	yes							
1245288	LPIO-3906	yes							
1238835	LPIO-4050	yes	This issue is of significant importance not only for Wirral, but the nation as a whole. We need to ensure that they are preserved, and not buried under a sea of concrete , just to satisfy a selfish developer.						
1240939	LPIO-4186	yes							
1245638	LPIO-4326	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1237667	LPIO-4596	no	See answer to Question 8.17 above.						
1237696	LPIO-4743	yes	The oldest area for Wirral's heritage is Birkenhead Priory and Monk's Ferry. This area must be preserved form industrial and commercial intrusion and developed as a heritage bonus. Again, a current area so much overlooked.						
1244720	LPIO-4776	yes	Not clear what the detail of this would be Principle of protecting heritage is sound. There may be sites of historical importance which are not yet identified.						
1245794	LPIO-4932	no	See 8.17						
1244629	LPIO-4988	no	More can be done to protect our heritage sites.						
1237923	LPIO-5108		more needs to be done to protect heritage						
1245713	LPIO-5135	yes							
1239571	LPIO-5287	yes							
1240383	LPIO-5461	no	WBC could do more. Simply implementing a plan or appraisal is worthless if it is not referenced						
1245954	LPIO-5534	yes							
1246159	LPIO-5609	yes							
1246310	LPIO-5983	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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-6201	no	I do not agree. The plan is not reflecting the approach or its heritage policy The greenbelt is part of our natural Heritage and the local plan intends to destroy it. Options 2a and 2b contain beautiful landscape that is part of Wirral's natural Heritage. Appendix 4.7 table 6 lists proposed greenbelt development sites with archaeological interest and areas of special landscape yet they remain on the list. If greenbelt is used for development it will be lost forever to our children and grandchildren. I must refer again to WBC heritage policy 2014. Please adopt it The importance of conserving our natural heritage and biological diversity is becoming increasingly recognised. The natural world is an integral part of our cultural heritage and identity. It is important in defining local character and distinctiveness. It affects the quality of life of the people of Wirral, contributing to our health and wellbeing. A good quality natural environment has a positive impact on house prices and makes high density housing more livable. Our green infrastructure as a whole also provides 'ecosystem services' such as carbon sequestration, flood prevention, maintenance of water quality, micro-climate control and even pollination for our crops In Wirral, the importance of heritage as a driver for regeneration was demonstrated in the Single Regeneration Budget initiatives of the 1990s.						
1246402	LPIO-6491	yes	More should be done						
1242751	LPIO-656		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1244896	LPIO-6585	no	NO. Comments are as per Q8.17: ITPAS (like other Groups) considers there is much more work to be done to ensure the Local Plan properly considers any possible development in the context of NPPF Section 16: 'Conserving and enhancing the historic environment'. See the uploaded file for Report on Heritage failings and opportunities. It is noted from the detailed policy list in Appendix 9.1 that there will be 32 policies relating to Heritage, so we will interrogate those policies in due course at the Regulation 19 stage when more information is forthcoming (if not published before then). Please note that Heritage should also include such human-natural heritage as pre-Enclosure field systems (as cover 25% of Site 7.27 (SP060)), important hedges (Hedgerow Regulations 1997) and "notable" trees which are of cultural or nature conservation importance to the local community. An example of this is the ancient tree between Irby Hall and the Anchor PH, which features in the iconic view out from the Village across countryside to the Welsh Hills but which one Council Consultant appears to consider it acceptable to fell for an access road (although another comment is that this could create an even busier and more dangerous junction). This is not joined-up thinking.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677066">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677066</a>					
1241868	LPIO-6854	no	Non-designated heritage assets should be given the same statutory protection as designated assets and should be treated as though they are designated.						
1245086	LPIO-6987	no	As stated in my previous answer more needs to be done.						
1237647	LPIO-722	yes							
1246488	LPIO-7314		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1241025	LPIO-7367	yes							
1246348	LPIO-7376	no	Was not impressed with the Storeton Hall outcome. It's made one man rich and no benefit to the people of Wirral, except the loss of green belt. Thin end of the wedge I reckon. WBC put up no defense. Of course Wirral's heritage should protected. People enjoy the feeling of continuity and it brings people in from outside the area.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1240932	LPIO-7639	no	No, Our Client disagrees with the Council's approach and wishes to make some recommendations. Notwithstanding the apparent current lack of evidence base support for the Council's approach to how heritage is dealt with in the Local Plan outlined in our response to Q8.17, Our Client notes that the Council's Preferred Approach is to set a positive strategy for the "conservation and enjoyment" of the Borough's heritage assets through inter alia the "protection" of heritage assets and conservation areas. The Preferred Approach mentions 'conservation' and 'protection', however makes no mention of the desirability of enhancing heritage assets, as outlined in national policy and guidance. In particular, this reflects the requirements of the Framework at paragraph 185 that Local Plans should take into account "the desirability of sustaining and enhancing the significance of heritage assets, and putting them to viable uses consistent with their conservation". Our Client also wishes to highlight how the Local Plan policies should be worded to allow the requirements of section 16 of the Framework to be discharged in the determination of planning applications, in particular described the balanced approach to decision-making outlined at paragraphs 192 and 196. As such, Our Client recommends that draft Local Plan policies for both the Council's overarching heritage strategy and development management will need to be flexible to allow for new uses sympathetic to the assets' heritage characteristics and value as well as securing their long term survival in line with the requirements of national policy and guidance. Please refer to paragraphs 9.34 to 9.36 of our full representations for our more detailed response to this question.	<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-7851	yes							
1246594	LPIO-8016		Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1240903	LPIO-8043	no	More can be done to protect our heritage sites.						
1246431	LPIO-8088	yes	welcome the implied commitment to update and reinvigorate the Conservation Area management plans, such as Frankby.						
1246596	LPIO-8095	no	Not enough protection.						
1246605	LPIO-8210	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect heritage.						
1237882	LPIO-8477	no	Absolutely not! Recent building decisions in conversation are conservations areas by WBC demonstrate the absolute lack of interest in preserving or enhancing heritage assets. Locals have no confidence in WBC making decisions other than those that benefit the profits of property developers and in planning meeting often seem to be enjoy seeing certain heritage assets undermined. Even planning consultants believe that WBC are notorious for not protecting their heritage assets and certain decisions passed that would not be passed in other borough councils. WBC decisions such as to include variations to NPPF guidelines such as making distinctions between 'essential' and 'less essential' gaps between settlements and 'connectivity to countryside' in evaluating parcels of green belt sites seems to reflect the planning consultants and local people's options. Liverpool has ensured that heritage assets have been preserved and have benefited (residents and tourists) from being proud of their past..Wirral doesn't seem to care.						
1239410	LPIO-849	yes	I agree with the approach, however, I feel that non-designated but locally significant historic features such as sandstone walling or victorian, red-brick walling should be preserved. I feel that if a historic wall is to be removed, the application should reinstate or replace with the same or similar materials or should provide a justification should as structural survey to demonstrate why a wall may need to be removed or replaced with alternative materials.						
1246598 (Hoylake Vision)	LPIO-8738	yes							
1246631	LPIO-8982	yes							
1245472	LPIO-8986	yes	The Councils Heritage Policy has not, in recent times, been given the priority and profile it needs. Our heritage contributes to our well being, our sense of place and history and puts value on the character of our built environment. This also impacts on tourism and the appeal of the Wirral peninsula. There should be a mandatory requirement to include a Heritage Assessment in all planning applications within or adjacent to Conservation Areas and designated landscape.						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1246667	LPIO-9110	yes							
1239377	LPIO-9232	no	Again, more could and should be done to preserve & protect Wirral's heritage sites.						
1245034	LPIO-9240	yes							
1246202	LPIO-9257	yes							
1245289	LPIO-9331	yes							
1246678	LPIO-9399	yes							
1241495	LPIO-9475	yes	Yes, I would support this approach. In addition heritage should also include natural heritage eg landscape, trees, hedges, rivers, ponds which are also of wildlife importance.						
1246624	LPIO-9493		see previous answer						
1245833	LPIO-9618	yes							
1242554	LPIO-9756 1 of 2	yes	<p>We agree with the overall aims to preserve and enhance heritage assets, but does not feel Wirral Council has presented proactive, strategic policies to achieve these aims for Port Sunlight or the other 25 conservation areas. See proposed policy amendment and new policies submitted in previous question (8.17).</p> <p>Additionally, we are considering a bid to the tentative list for World Heritage Site inscription. The local plan should acknowledge the exceptional significance and value of the Port Sunlight conservation area and establish strategies to protect and enhance its heritage value, setting and character.</p> <p>Policy CS42i - Port Sunlight Conservation Area</p> <p>In relation to Port Sunlight Conservation Area the principal planning objectives for the area will be to:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) preserve the planned layout of the village and its unifying features, such as the scale, massing, and design of buildings, including the use of superblocks, together with their landscape setting;</li> <li>(ii) retain primarily residential uses within the village but allow for adaptive use of existing buildings and sites where they are complementary, address deficiencies, enhance the heritage character and ensure long term sustainability of the conservation area;</li> <li>(iii) preserve and enhance the character and layout of the Registered landscapes: The Dell and The Diamond and The Causeway;</li> <li>(iv) preserve the historic factory frontage overlooking the village from Wood Street;</li> <li>(v) reserve and enhance the visual setting of the village and its buildings, including all designed views and vistas, monuments, public art and landscaped areas;</li> <li>(vi) preserve and enhance the quality and nature of the key approaches and entrances to the village;</li> <li>(viii) ensure complementary uses within the Unilever factory site; and</li> <li>(ix) enhance the public realm and accessibility for the conservation area.</li> </ul> <p>Port Sunlight was designated a Conservation Area in March 1978 and its greatest value is that for the first time it offered a vision of a workers' settlement based on a combination of social welfare and picturesque principles. The Village was conceived by William Lever to house the workers of his nearby soap factory. It is an international reputation, demonstrating Lever's philosophy of 'prosperity sharing which, combined with a concern for sanitary living conditions, a beautiful Arts and Crats build environment, extensive green spaces and community facilities, had the aim of improving the well-being, productivity and education and of his workforce and their families, as well as the advancement of his business. The Dell and The Diamond and The Causeway were included in the Historic England Register of Parks and Gardens of Special Historic Interest in England in 2002. All the building and monuments within the conservation area (that pre-date the Second World War) are listed as Grade II, with the exception of the War Memorial (Grade I) and Christ Church (Grade II*). The village retains unprecedented integrity and authenticity and it is an outstanding example of a philanthropic worker settlement from the turn of the 20th century, which both inspired and reflects the Garden City movement</p>						

Person ID	ID	Question 8.18 - Do you agree with the Council's approach to ensuring heritage assets are preserved or enhanced?	Question 8.18a - 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
1237807	LPIO-9757	yes	But again deeds not words. How and when will the heritage policy be updated? How will it be actioned? Article 4 directions must be implemented soon in order to achieve the necessary greater protection for Conservation Areas.						
1243448	LPIO-983	yes	Yes. As much as possible should be done to identify, preserve, conserve, protect and promote awareness of our heritage and heritage sites in Wirral for the benefit of residents and vistors.						