

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246747	LPIO-10022	no	Economic viability should not be such an influential factor in this consultation/study. Markets go down as well as up. We are potentially on the edge of a large recession (resulting from the Coronavirus outbreak), and - should the greenbelt land in Zones 3 and 4 be released and destroyed for housing developments - there is no guarantee that developers would be in a position to build there, or that families/individuals would be able to buy/rent the properties built. In Liverpool City Centre, there are examples of sites which have been cleared for development, and then have not been built upon (or - worse - building projects have run out of money and projects have been only half completed). If 'viability' is cited as the reason for releasing greenbelt land, this is a gamble. Construction / development are a gamble anyway in the current climate, so why risk the greenbelt for something which may not (in economic terms) deliver what it promises?						
1246760	LPIO-10086	no	Clearly developers and land owners are always going to angle for the higher zone numbers because there is more money to be made. This illustrates perfectly why it is vital that the release of Green Belt is removed from the plan. If a developer gets any hint of a possibility that Green Belt land might become available then they are going to hold off developing brownfield land and wait until Green Belt is released. This will result in delays to any development taking place, and put the Council even further off track with regards to historic under-delivery, as well as thwarting the Councils efforts to regenerate the East side of the Wirral where everyone acknowledges the development is most needed.						
1244412	LPIO-1009	no	Developers are about profit not what is best for the area or greater good. They will not want to build on zones 1 and 2. This study of viability is not independent and is from the perspective of a developer. I reject the findings of the EVBU. Developer should foot the cost of remediation and / or the council/government agencies should be engaged in providing grants/incentives to encourage developers redevop brownfield sites						
1246792	LPIO-10116	no	Brexit						
1241065	LPIO-10144	yes							
1240223	LPIO-10193	yes	We feel that it is hugely important to reflect upon paragraphs 2.80 and 2.81 as extracted below. "2.80 The results for the viability testing for the office and industrial uses suggest that employment development is not currently viable on a speculative basis. The study found that existing planning policy obligations do not place such a burden on new employment development so as to prejudice its future delivery. Issues in relation to viability arise because rents and capital values for employment uses are still currently at a relatively low level and in comparison, there is a 'gap' with build costs. Traditionally in recent years this gap has been met by public sector funding support or in the case of mixed-use schemes cross-subsidised by other more viable forms of development. 2.81 Notwithstanding the above, the study advises that it is likely that office and industrial development will come forward in Wirral in the future motivated by specific circumstances such as an owner occupier wishing to expand or alternatively with the benefit of public sector funding support. The results of the viability testing for retail development show that development of both convenience and comparison retail is generally viable at the present. " That being the case, the Council should be much more pragmatic in terms of taking blanket approaches to allocating very large tracts as Primarily Industrial Areas where their own evidence shows that this is not deliverable. Opportunities should be taken to introduce more flexibility to allow other commercial uses which generate employment to be accommodated, subject to showing that this will not impede the residual parcels that genuinely can (continue) to support B1/B2/B8 uses. That was best addressed through the proposed Flexible Commercial Use zoning identified in the previous consultation and this approach should have been retained and its utilisation extended.						
1246772	LPIO-10275	no	This will destroy the very nature of Wirral. Build on brown field rather than gobbling up more of the countryside, parks and green belt						
1238582	LPIO-10622	yes							
1248825	LPIO-10648	no	The Economic Viability Baseline Update is historic, dating from November 2018, and does not comply with Planning Practice Guidance: Viability (PPGV) or NPPF requirements. Both documents reference the need for LPAs to use 'up-to-date policies' and NPPF paragraph 57 states that the weight to be given to an application stage viability assessment must have regard to "...whether the plan and the viability evidence underpinning it is up to date". Both PPGV and NPPF have been updated since the Economic Viability Baseline Update was produced and a further updated viability assessment for Wirral is required.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684264					
1243890	LPIO-1081	no	Because I've never heard of it and am sick of becoming bogged down in such a user-unfriendly consultation as this one.						
1247015	LPIO-11425		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247196	LPIO-11558	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1240731	LPIO-1177	no	The whole system is geared to building on Green Belt. Developers will be employing expensive,"experts" to ensure that they have access to the Green Belt sites where they can make the most profits. Houses built in the urban areas on brownfield sites cost more to build because the ground is not "spade ready" therefore costs are involved for remediation. Also houses in these areas cannot command the high prices that houses by the countryside can.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1241412	LPIO-121	yes							
1247214	LPIO-12385	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247492	LPIO-12480	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1240843	LPIO-12648	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247578	LPIO-12846	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247510	LPIO-12970	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1243700	LPIO-1306	no	Developers will want to develop in any area that gives the best profit. The Wirral suffers from a lack of first time buyers, social and affordable housing in all zones but does not lack what could be termed as luxury housing. Zones 3 & 4 fit the luxury housing market where developers will want to develop, developments in these two zones will be un-affordable for the people in need of housing. Developers should bear the cost of land remediation in zones 1 and 2. The Council's priority must be to regenerate the East of the borough to reduce standards of living between the east and west of the Borough.						
1246335	LPIO-13093	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246853	LPIO-13362	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246852	LPIO-13484	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247746	LPIO-13638	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1244629	LPIO-1375		This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation. Surely the Council can see what is stopping the developers and step in themselves with Government funding, and in so doing improve the prospects of Birkenhead for a start. The report seems to suggest that this process has started but has it?						
1238192	LPIO-13832		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247012	LPIO-13886		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247014	LPIO-13940		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1242183	LPIO-13955	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247218	LPIO-14051	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247219	LPIO-14156	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247220	LPIO-14254	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247222	LPIO-14385	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247226	LPIO-14473	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247245	LPIO-14563	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246827	LPIO-14692	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1239377	LPIO-1486	no	This final summary to this point is particularly loaded in favour of demonstrating how unattractive zones 1 & 2 are for developers compared to zones 2 & 3. It is well known that it is easier to build on undeveloped land than go through the process of making good pre-industrial land for habitation. But it is not impossible. A Council with optimistic visions of urban regeneration surely cannot wish to send a message to developers of how hard it is to build housing on reclaimed urban land? Developers are wealthy bodies who should be encouraged to change their habits away from going for the easy option. If they want to build, then let them build on where the housing is needed! This Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is weighted to point developers in the direction of Wirral's green belt for high-value luxury housing.						
1247016	LPIO-14877		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1238043	LPIO-1489	yes	This is a problem which needs to be addressed if proper regeneration is to be achieved. Wirral should press for the maximum infrastructure support to enable development to be viable. Conversely the practice of allowing developers to seek to change the amount of "affordable housing" after planning permission has been granted, by means of a fresh viability assessment should be banned.						
1247018	LPIO-14946		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247246	LPIO-15312	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247248	LPIO-15412	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247251	LPIO-15529	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247252	LPIO-15621	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1242519	LPIO-1568	no	Developers must build on brownfield land only .						
1247274	LPIO-15713	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247275	LPIO-15821	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247935	LPIO-15923		This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247936	LPIO-15967	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1244969	LPIO-1599	no	The residents of Wirral want to see regeneration in the North and East of the borough including redevelopment of the waterfront for all to use. The responsibility to deliver this lies within the remit of WBC. National funding streams and private investment must be brought forward to make projects more attractive to developers now. If not, when will it ever be delivered ?						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247287	LPIO-16187	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1244898	LPIO-1623	no	Viability Studies have a biased basis with misunderstanding, and favour Developers. Wirral doesn't need 12,000 dwellings adding to existing Stock. It has a surplus and huge untapped potential in terms of development sites. Wirral's overriding need is for improvements not additions. Additions for population growth (there is none), inward migration (negligible, ruled out by policy according to Officers and Cabinet), and suppressed demand (low) – so, max 1,000/1,500 requirement overall. Regeneration would not add to Stock through existing, substandard dwellings either replaced with new or upgraded. Were substandard dwellings have occupants moved to a new-build home and the former home is upgraded for new owner/occupiers, then the overall Stock goes up and the number is accounted against the Housing Delivery. Example: assume 3,000 substandard houses were 1,000 need to be demolished, 1,500 can be upgraded, and 500 converted into two smaller units each. Building just 500 new houses would sort out the full 3,000 substandard houses (possibly of 3,000 Families on the Housing List – with many more having their housing needs sorted by 'Churn' and normal changes/exchange). For that scale of 'regeneration', we would need just 500 out of the nonsense 12,000 figure AND Demolitions are accounted for. What is needed in Wirral's unique, acute and 'exceptional' case is Regeneration and some urban intensification in existing housing areas BUT NIL development in Green Belt which would only deter/delay Regeneration. House-builders have been doing well enough without our Council providing financial windfalls. If they wish to build on Wirral, their choices should be limited and targeted, with issues of Viability shared between the Public and Private sectors. 'Homes England' have a major role here but it's up to the Council to sell the 'Vision', do the job expected and come up with the Funding.						
1247349	LPIO-16362	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247353	LPIO-16449	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247354	LPIO-16538	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247434	LPIO-16635	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247436	LPIO-16748	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247437	LPIO-16858	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247439	LPIO-16860	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247441	LPIO-17049	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247960	LPIO-17170	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247962	LPIO-17257	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247966	LPIO-17362	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247971	LPIO-17464	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1241726	LPIO-17557	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247979	LPIO-17662	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247980	LPIO-17663	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245502	LPIO-17849	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247541	LPIO-17951	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245060	LPIO-1801	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245069	LPIO-1803	no	It is obvious that developers will only seek to build on more profitable areas, albeit to include some, normally a low percentage, of affordable housing. The council should seek to do what is right for Wirral, develop brown field sites and non profitable sites and not simply curtail to the profits of developers/land owners. A good example of the potential effect of build houses in more profitable areas can be witnessed now. In Heswall the is relatively large development, perhaps 50 or so dwellings, many of which are now standing empty. The demand is not there.						
1247539	LPIO-18053	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1237857	LPIO-18154		This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247996	LPIO-18210	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247022	LPIO-18481		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247023	LPIO-18536		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247024	LPIO-18591		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1241669	LPIO-187	yes							
1247025	LPIO-18706		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247038	LPIO-18708		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247039	LPIO-18819		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247040	LPIO-18820		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247041	LPIO-18883		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247042	LPIO-18949		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247060	LPIO-19062		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247061	LPIO-19063		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247063	LPIO-19122		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247064	LPIO-19176		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1238379	LPIO-1919	no	Developers will not want to build in zones 1 or 2 but will want zones 3 and 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I totally reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses then they should bear the cost of remediation.						
1247068	LPIO-19230		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247071	LPIO-19287		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247072	LPIO-19345		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247080	LPIO-19521		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247081	LPIO-19522		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247082	LPIO-19668		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247083	LPIO-19722		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1237833	LPIO-19752		Table 3.17 sets out the implications of Local Plan policies and other documents on the viability of development. The HBF have concerns that the Viability Assessment only allows for a contribution of £600 per dwelling to S106 agreements. Given the significant potential in terms of infrastructure requirements within the Plan, this appears to be a significant under-estimation of the potential costs. The HBF is also concerned that the costs associated with a number of other policies are not included within this assessment, for example the inclusion of the National Described Space Standards (NDSS) requirements, the M4(2) and M4(3) requirements, electric vehicle charging points, the requirements for improvements in water efficiency, the costs associated with green and blue infrastructure provision.						
1247084	LPIO-19786		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247085	LPIO-19843		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247088	LPIO-19907		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247089	LPIO-19968		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247090	LPIO-20023		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247091	LPIO-20078		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247092	LPIO-20138		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1245083	LPIO-2015	no	If developers want to build houses then they should foot the cost of remediation						
1247093	LPIO-20201		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247094	LPIO-20257		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247095	LPIO-20311		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247096	LPIO-20368		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247099	LPIO-20423		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247101	LPIO-20477		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247108	LPIO-20499		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247102	LPIO-20500		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247106	LPIO-20687		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247105	LPIO-20688		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247109	LPIO-20747		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247110	LPIO-20849		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247111	LPIO-20850		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1238835	LPIO-2090	no	In view of your suggestions, it is quite clear that developers would prefer to target zones 3 and 4, in preference to zones 1 or 2. I consider the "Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment" study to be flawed and biased, as it favours the developer massively. It casts doubt on the main aim of this project, which is the regeneration of Birkenhead town centre. Consequently, I would strongly reject it. Not only is it non-sensical to irreparably damage our environment, I also have major concerns about the willingness or capability of developers to foot any remediation bill.						
1247112	LPIO-20967		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247113	LPIO-21021		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247115	LPIO-21077		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247116	LPIO-21131		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1246851	LPIO-21144	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246918	LPIO-21242	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246924	LPIO-21243	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246928	LPIO-21244	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245112	LPIO-2131	yes							
1246920	LPIO-21501	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246926	LPIO-21502	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1247117	LPIO-21759		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247118	LPIO-21760		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247145	LPIO-21867		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247147	LPIO-21868		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247148	LPIO-21978		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247150	LPIO-21979		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1244329	LPIO-22045		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247119	LPIO-22148		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1246678	LPIO-22149		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247151	LPIO-22256		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1247174	LPIO-23124		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1245146	LPIO-2318	no	Developers will prefer, if given the choice, to build in areas where they can make the most profit such as Zones 3 and 4 rather than in Zones 1 and 2 which are less attractive.						
1247175	LPIO-23241		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247176	LPIO-23242		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247177	LPIO-23403		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247178	LPIO-23404		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1247179	LPIO-23405		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1248389 (Highways England)	LPIO-23751		The Wirral Local Plan Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018 undertook a high-level assessment of development viability and identified this viability based on a range of typologies varied into four geographical zones. Overall, the findings of the study concluded that market housing development on brownfield land in the lowest value areas (Zone 1) around Birkenhead is generally not viable without adjustments to the level of developers profit or land price or both. Viability in Zone 2 improves dependent on density and whether the site is brownfield or greenfield, whilst in Zones 3 and 4 Market Housing is generally viable. Highways England wish to highlight that all Zones with the exception of Zone 1 around Birkenhead interact directly with the M53. Consolidation of future development into a single Zone may therefore cause increased pressures on the motorway and local networks, therefore a viability testing approach is welcomed and should also include transport related criteria, as congestion around sites will directly impact deliverability.						
1248438	LPIO-23758		It is not considered that the Viability Study (base date: April 2018) provides a robust and up-to-date evidence base upon which to inform future plan-making decisions. The Council should prepare an updated Viability Study to inform the policies of its emerging Local Plan. This will be essential in order to make a judgment on whether the Council's proposed housing allocations are deliverable and can satisfy the emerging Local Plan policy requirements. Wirral is not in a position, given the historic shortfall in delivery, whereby it can afford to advance a new Local Plan which still holds uncertainty regarding the delivery of individual sites on viability grounds and which in turn could result in lengthy negotiations and delays around the viability of individual sites which could instead have been considered during the plan-making process.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684850	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657890				
1244826	LPIO-2381	no	Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation and regeneration of the areas.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1242185	LPIO-23884	yes	Yes, broadly but Wirral's Local Plan should yield a good standard of infrastructure, as when community facilities are operating at over-capacity it can seriously erode the quality of life of local communities. Developer contributions should be appropriate to the quantum of development outlined in applications. The Figure 2.1 legend only shows four colours, whereas the map shows seven. We would question whether Zone 1 should be entirely free of developer contributions. This is as Wirral Waters has been designated both an Employment Zone up to 2037, with Enhanced Capital Allowances; and also a Housing Zone and has been awarded over £6 million of Housing Investment Fund (HIF) to support the abnormal costs of remediating the Northbank East and West areas. As significant public investment has effectively removed the abnormal costs of development, we consider there should be developer contributions for important social infrastructure, such as affordable housing. Public benefit must be realised from the significant public investment. NPPF Paragraphs 34, 57 and 62 states that Councils should ensure all new development is sustainable in the long term by guaranteeing an adequate level of developer contribution. This relies on the Council setting out the minimum requirements for infrastructure and planning contributions expected from developers when applications are submitted. Off-site provision is not the normal position. The normal position is on-site and this point needs to be highlighted and reiterated in the Local Plan. As the NPPF is focused on developer viability, it is therefore very important that Local Plan policies clarify the position and tighten up the wording on what is expected as a minimum contribution. Developers are required to deliver housing types and tenures specified in Local Development Plans. The legal judgment in [2018] EWHC 991 (Admin) established that land value must be informed by policy, and consequently, it is not acceptable for the Council to grant permission for an application that is deficient in developer contribution. Therefore the Local Plan policy must be correctly worded, otherwise places may be deficient in amenities ruining the quality of life for Wirral communities.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006			
1248490	LPIO-24107		For high density Brownfield sites the allowances per dwelling for S106 costs, infrastructure, opening up and abnormal costs are low and do not reflect those recommended in the Harman Guidance. They do not reflect the likely level of investment required to support the concentration of new development proposed in an area which requires significant investment in physical and social infrastructure.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1247798	LPIO-24230		It is not considered that the Viability Study (base date: April 2018) provides a robust and up-to-date evidence base upon which to inform future plan-making decisions. Our Client would strongly advise the Council to prepare an updated Viability Study to inform the policies of its emerging Local Plan. This will be essential in order to make a judgement on whether the Council's proposed housing allocations are deliverable and can satisfy the emerging Local Plan policy requirements. Wirral is not in a position, given the historic shortfall in delivery, whereby it can afford to advance a new Local Plan which still holds uncertainty regarding the delivery of individual sites on viability grounds and which in turn could result in lengthy negotiations and delays around the viability of individual sites which could instead have been considered during the plan-making process.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684846					
1248542	LPIO-24351		Support the Council undertaking an updated viability assessment as part of the evidence base that informs the emerging Local Plan. The high-level findings appear accurate as the work demonstrates that different housing markets exist across the Borough, with homes in the west/south west demanding a much higher value than those in the east/north east. We will provide supplementary site-specific viability evidence where appropriate.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684894					
1242697	LPIO-24648		The zoning is artificial and sites within zones may vary in land price and work needed for viability. For example, permissions are ready for factory sites in Moreton & Saughall Massie. But other parts of Zone 2 in Birkenhead may require a higher level of work and public funding before becoming viable. Para 2.79 says "The study findings indicate that it may be appropriate to consider introducing differing levels of affordable housing requirements within each geographical zone, to reflect the range of development values and hence viability in each area of the Borough. The study also suggests a test of viability is introduced into the Local Plan's policy to ensure that development on brownfield sites is not prejudiced due to potential contamination and other abnormal development costs." The latter point is right in that this is a brownfield first plan. But "differing levels of affordable housing requirements" means what? Housing in Settlement Areas 1-3 is generally of lower price, needs refurbishment and then is argued to be more affordable than in other SAs. A good market viability in Zone 4 simply says that developers can build on greenfield and Green Belt for minimal cost and maximum profit. That is contrary to the "brownfield" first policy in the Plan. The Study is wrong in the sense that it emphasises the green areas as viable while pointing out problems in other areas. Its proper purpose is to develop ways and projects to make Zones 1 and 2 to become viable and provide evidence for the Council's EOI for new Development Corporation Competition.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659118	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659119	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659120	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121		
1248749	LPIO-24813		The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845			
1248769	LPIO-24935		The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684956	
1248823	LPIO-25038		The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849			

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248832	LPIO-25142		The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562				
1248833	LPIO-25252	no	The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661125	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661100	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661124	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661129		
1248956	LPIO-25353		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684859	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677475				
1248546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-2537	no	Wirral Wildlife consider that the Local Plan should not be based on the presumption that land prices will remain high. Land prices will have to be allowed to fall nationally. Where owners have allowed contamination to happen, they are responsible to clean up. Where governments and society have allowed contamination and it is no longer possible to make the polluter pay, then society through national government needs to find money to pay for clean-ups. Over the last 40 years of dealing with this issue, one of us (HJA) has seen that brownfield land is only efficiently recycled when there is monetary help from wider society to do so. This is particularly true in disadvantaged and run-down areas. National government needs to be told this repeatedly and lobbied to provide funds. "Zero carbon in use" buildings are, with the rapid fall in technology costs, now little more expensive to build than old-fashioned wasteful buildings, and vastly cheaper to run. (Centre for Alternative Technology; Zero Carbon Britain). Houses with low running costs become affordable to people who can borrow capital but struggle with revenue, and will prevent fuel poverty for the poorest. Similarly for industrial buildings and enterprises, especially SME firms, where running costs are an important issue. To meet our climate emergency obligations, all new buildings should be as low carbon as possible in construction, and zero-carbon in use.						
1242950	LPIO-2543	no	No, it is our experience that such broad viability assessments are seldom realistic. The authors of such reports never speak to landowners, developers etc and so their findings and recommendations have little bearing on the actual land market.						
1248986	LPIO-25448		The Baseline Update assumes an affordable housing requirement of 40% however the Issues and Options report indicates up 30% affordability is the preferred approach. An assessment at 40% should not therefore be included.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770			
1249002	LPIO-25522		Within all economic viability calculations for developments, Merseytravel would wish to request that Wirral Council includes appropriate consideration, and support for public transport, active travel modes and the Mersey Tunnels, as part of these calculations.						
1249015	LPIO-25564		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684897					
1249070	LPIO-25634		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684896	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5679650				
1244896	LPIO-2566	no	Viability Studies have a biased basis with misunderstanding, and favour Developers. Wirral doesn't need 12,000 dwellings adding to existing Stock. It has a surplus and huge untapped potential in terms of development sites. Wirral's overriding need is for improvements not additions. Additions for population growth (there is none), inward migration (negligible, ruled out by policy according to Officers and Cabinet), and suppressed demand (low) – so, max 1,000/1,500 requirement overall. Regeneration would not add to Stock through existing, substandard dwellings either replaced with new or upgraded. Where substandard dwellings have occupants moved to a new-build home and the former home is upgraded for new owner/occupiers, then the overall Stock goes up and the number is accounted against the Housing Delivery. Example: assume 3,000 substandard houses where 1,000 need to be demolished, 1,500 can be upgraded, and 500 converted into two smaller units each. Building just 500 new houses would sort out the full 3,000 substandard houses (possibly of 3,000 Families on the Housing List – with many more having their housing needs sorted by 'Churn' and normal changes/exchange). For that scale of 'regeneration', we would need just 500 out of the nonsense 12,000 figure AND Demolitions are accounted for. What is needed in Wirral's unique, acute and 'exceptional' case is Regeneration and some urban intensification in existing housing areas BUT NIL development in Green Belt which would only deter/delay Regeneration. House-builders have been doing well enough without our Council providing financial windfalls. If they wish to build on Wirral, their choices should be limited and targeted, with issues of Viability shared between the Public and Private sectors. 'Homes England' have a major role here but it's up to the Council to sell the 'Vision', do the job expected and come up with the Funding.						
1246458	LPIO-25691	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246459	LPIO-25692	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1249100	LPIO-25865 1 of 3		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested. There is a lack of consideration given to the market implications and viability of concentrating housing delivery within a small geographical area, on sites located in predominantly low value areas, which will require high rise apartments to deliver the densities expected.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684951	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677510	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684895	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677508	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677511	
1249100	LPIO-25865 2 of 3		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested. There is a lack of consideration given to the market implications and viability of concentrating housing delivery within a small geographical area, on sites located in predominantly low value areas, which will require high rise apartments to deliver the densities expected.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677514	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677512	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684898	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684949	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677509	
1249100	LPIO-25865 3 of 3		We note and welcome that the Council's affordable housing requirement has been viability tested. There is a lack of consideration given to the market implications and viability of concentrating housing delivery within a small geographical area, on sites located in predominantly low value areas, which will require high rise apartments to deliver the densities expected.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507			
1249116	LPIO-25923		Our attachments show significant issues with the viability evidence, which underestimates the extent of viability issues in the area. Site specific viability appraisals undertaken on the Council's strategic sites demonstrate a vast viability gap, to the extent that it is very unlikely that public funds would be secured to bridge the level of deficit.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674092	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674093	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674095	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674096	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684833	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684836
1249116	LPIO-25960 1 OF 2		Our attachments show significant issues with the viability evidence, which underestimates the extent of viability issues in the area. Site specific viability appraisals undertaken on the Council's strategic sites demonstrate a vast viability gap, to the extent that it is very unlikely that public funds would be secured to bridge the level of deficit.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675698	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675693	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675700	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675692		
1249116	LPIO-25960 2 OF 2		Our attachments show significant issues with the viability evidence, which underestimates the extent of viability issues in the area. Site specific viability appraisals undertaken on the Council's strategic sites demonstrate a vast viability gap, to the extent that it is very unlikely that public funds would be secured to bridge the level of deficit.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675694	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675696			
1238156	LPIO-26	yes	Yes - this seems sensible to me: just one example, the comments on not pursuing speculative office developments (paragraphs 2.80 and 2.81) sound wise.						
1249116	LPIO-26024		Our attachments show significant issues with the viability evidence, which underestimates the extent of viability issues in the area. Site specific viability appraisals undertaken on the Council's strategic sites demonstrate a vast viability gap, to the extent that it is very unlikely that public funds would be secured to bridge the level of deficit.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684802	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684835	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677041	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677037	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684804	
1249116	LPIO-26058		Our attachments show significant issues with the viability evidence, which underestimates the extent of viability issues in the area. Site specific viability appraisals undertaken on the Council's strategic sites demonstrate a vast viability gap, to the extent that it is very unlikely that public funds would be secured to bridge the level of deficit.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674240	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684832	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674256	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684834	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684837	
1249269	LPIO-26142		We can confirm that market housing development on brownfield land in the lowest value areas around Birkenhead is generally not viable without adjustments to the level of developer profit or land price or both, which has the potential to have a significant impact on the 5-year housing land supply. A zonal approach to affordable housing, reducing the requirement in low value areas where most of the Borough's housing growth is currently proposed, would result in the significant need for affordable housing not being met. Development in higher value areas of the Urban Conurbation is more likely to support higher affordable housing provision.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675699					
1248490	LPIO-26345		The level of net increase to Market Values required and the development and sales rate required to achieve viable development is unrealistic.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1248490	LPIO-26346		BCIS costs should be adopted at the appropriate level for the Wirral area.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1248490	LPIO-26347		For Greenfield sites the KM development costs currently make only a small provision for site infrastructure and opening up costs and exclude any provision for abnormal development costs. For Brownfield sites the combined level of abnormal and infrastructure allowances are too low which limits their value at the plan making stage.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1248490	LPIO-26348		The Benchmark Land values adopted for both residential and commercial uses are low.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1248490	LPIO-26349		Finance costs for small developers should be increased to represent the higher costs of funding they incur. Developer Profit Margins of 20%, inclusive of affordable housing provision should be adopted for all developments	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1248490	LPIO-26350		Discounts from market value for affordable housing require adjustment.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676992	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673252	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5673251	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684866	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684853
1249782	LPIO-26417		[2018 Viability baseline report findings quoted] It is notable that nearly all housing growth in the Council's preferred spatial option is directed to the Commercial Core, which falls within Zone 1 and which is not generally not viable. As such, we consider that the number of homes from this element of the supply will inevitably reduce as sites are not taken forward in the Draft Local Plan on viability grounds. Similarly, most of the new homes are also directed to a zone which cannot support the delivery affordable housing8. As such, whilst we note and welcome the fact the Council's affordable housing requirement is viability tested, affordable housing requirements within the Borough will not be met by the Council's preferred spatial option. Furthermore, the Commercial Core is also lacking in infrastructure to support the levels of housing growth envisaged, and with financial contributions at risk owing to lack of viability, there is a risk that housing growth will not be supported by the necessary infrastructure in this area. Conversely, very little housing growth is envisaged within the Urban Settlements which largely fall within Zones 3 and 4 where market and affordable housing is viable, especially on greenfield sites. These are areas where affordable housing requirements are much more likely to be viable and able to be delivered on site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683892					
1249219	LPIO-26453		An Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more economically attractive Zones 3 & 4. It should not be used to show why Green Belt rather than urban brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pump priming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677529	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677528				
1245180	LPIO-2653	no	I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1240932	LPIO-26589 1 of 2	no	No, we disagree with the findings of the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. A key issue with the report is that, contrary to national planning policy guidance, no high-level site-specific viability assessments have been completed of the key strategic sites upon which the Council's Preferred Approach relies. Also, no consideration has currently been given to the market implications and therefore viability of concentrating housing delivery into a small geographical area of Wirral upon sites located in predominantly low value areas which will require high rise apartment-based schemes to deliver the densities proposed. The report concludes that market housing development on brownfield land in the lowest value areas (Zone 1) around Birkenhead is generally not viable without adjustment to the level of developers' profit or land price or both. Viability in Zone 2 improves depending upon density and whether the site is greenfield or brownfield whilst in Zones 3 and 4 market housing is generally viable. We note that the vast majority of the new homes planned for as part of the Council's Preferred Approach lie within the least viable Zone 1. By way of contrast our land lies wholly within the most viable Zones 3 and 4. The report findings indicate that it may be appropriate to consider introducing differing levels of affordable housing requirements within each geographical zone, to reflect the range of development values and hence viability in each area of the Borough. As a result of such an approach, we have significant concerns over the ability of the Local Plan to deliver the affordable housing the Borough requires if the Council continues with its Preferred Approach.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701			
1240932	LPIO-26589 2 of 2	no	Indeed, the Council recognises that it may be "unachievable to deliver some of the sites identified as part of the Council's housing land availability study (SHLAA) due to viability considerations, which may not be able to be included as proposed allocations unless viability can be overcome by other means." This is supported by the conclusions of the site specific viability assessments in the attached Technical Assessment for the four key strategic proposed allocations of Hind Street, Woodside, Wirral Waters and Dock Road South, which between them account for up to 8,400 dwellings, or in other words, 70% of the Council's proposed housing requirement over the plan period. The appraisals in the attached Technical Assessment demonstrate that each of these sites have significant viability gaps in each scenario they tested. The scale of the gap in each case is exacerbated by the Issues and Options document's proposals to increase both density and delivery rates on these sites. There remains however, a significant viability issue even when densities and delivery rates are reduced to the levels previously proposed in the Council's SHLAA. This being the case, for these sites to come forward during the plan period in the form currently proposed would require both a significant increase in net market sales values, far in excess of any increase in build cost inflation - and also, very substantial levels of public funding. When these sites are considered together, it seems inconceivable that they could be considered to represent good use of precious public funds and as such the Council's Preferred Approach of allocating and densifying these urban brownfield sites cannot be considered sound.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1245073	LPIO-2695	no	As a layperson I could have told you that for nothing, and I don't agree with it being used to justify development in the higher number zones. From a developer's perspective, you could rename the Zones in Figure 2 as "Profitability Zones", with Zone 1 being the least profitable and Zone 4 being the most profitable. Clearly developers and landowners are always going to angle for the higher zone numbers because there is more money to be made. This illustrates perfectly why it is vital that the release of Green Belt is removed from the plan. If a developer gets any hint of a possibility that Green Belt land might become available, then they are going to hold off developing brownfield land and wait until Green Belt is released. This will result in delays to any development taking place, and put the Council even further off track with regards to historic under-delivery, as well as thwarting the Councils efforts to regenerate the East side of the Wirral where everyone acknowledges the development is most needed. I can also tell you for nothing that there is a much greater chance of building affordable homes (and the area is far more suited by way of employment and public transport) in the lower number zones than the higher number zones – and hence would help the Council meet its targets for affordable housing.						
1245159	LPIO-2959	yes							
1237944	LPIO-302	no	The viability baseline reasoning appears to be driven by speculative development, rather than public need. For example, paragraph 2.78 states Zone 1 is not viable due to land price and adjustment for developers profit. However, Planning Policy has a direct impact on land price, therefore the Council has control of land pricing. House/Home prices are driven by desirability and location not by developers profits. House construction costs are roughly the same across the UK (https://costmodelling.com/regional-variations). Robust policy for residential use in Zone 1 brownfield sites will be reflect in land value and costs. Zone 3 – these show areas outside M 53, yet the council is proposing residential development East of the M 53. There appears to be a conflict in proposed policy principles. Zone 4 – this appears to include desperately needed greenbelt areas. Developers are only interested in this land because it is cheap to build on, requiring little remedial works. This should be excluded from major development proposals, to encourage redevelopment of brownfield sites. Only when all brownfield sites are used should Zone 4 areas be considered for development. This requires a very robust planning policy.						
1241315	LPIO-3028	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245287	LPIO-3045	yes							
1237904	LPIO-3158	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245311	LPIO-3206	no	This is based on value, namely profit to the developers/landowners. Birkenhead, as an neglected urban area, is of course is going to have a lower value as it would require the developers to build low cost/ low price, affordable housing. In the area described as viable the developers know this a more desirable part of the Wirral for many & therefore the return on investment would be higher as house prices would be higher. How does this address the key issues surrounding affordability & the types of housing needed?						
1239571	LPIO-3340	yes	I agree provided that it is used to high-light the challenge of focussing development where it is needed in Zones 1 and 2 and the need for funding support from Housing England and other sources to achieve this focus.						
1245416	LPIO-3355	yes							
1238549	LPIO-339	no	The cost of environmental cleaning of brownfield sites should be met to ensure that we develop the sites which historically have been the centres for economic and social activity. These normally have the better communication infrastructure and need investment to regenerate the area which has been allowed to decline. There are good examples of other areas which have developed similar locations successfully. EG Manchester/Salford. Liverpool. Glasgow. The reintroduction of residential areas has contributed to the economic development.						
1240653	LPIO-3446	yes							
1241770	LPIO-3447	yes							
1245457	LPIO-3599	no	Developers want to build high specification large 'executive' properties in leafier areas because they make more money. You are the council, you should tell them you want brownfield sustainable building, aimed at people who need it, or you don't build at all. Stay off green belt. Zones 3 & 4 are what gives the Wirral its character, we do not want sprawl.						
1245288	LPIO-3699	yes							
1237827	LPIO-3770	yes							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1242359	LPIO-393	no	We pay taxes and council taxes so that our government and local government provide the best possible environment for us to live in. Economic viability consideration for housing developers should not feature in deciding on the development of our environment. Public funds should be spent to make development of brownfield sites viable. This is an investment in our environment and quality of life which will pay off in greater social cohesion and reduced crime.						
1245501	LPIO-3989	no	It seems that your study has identified that costs in zones 3 and 4 are less than zones 1 and 2, however the need for housing is greater in zones 1 and 2. Furthermore, Wirral Council is concerned that developers will not want to reduce their profits by building in zones 1 and 2, which incidentally have the better transport and communication links, which would indicate the tail is wagging the dog!?! If developers want to build houses, then they should build where there is a need, not elsewhere because they can maximise their profits. If one developer doesn't want the zone 1 & 2 land, another one will, that will maximise density and achieve profitability in a more efficient way. Or is there more to it, bigger homes, in more affluent zone 3 & 4 areas deliver higher council tax and land revenue incomes for hypocritical Wirral Councillors...perhaps?						
1240939	LPIO-4102	yes							
1245638	LPIO-4206	no	Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should cover the costs of remediation of the land.						
1237724	LPIO-4337	no	An economic viability is not suitable for the task in hand. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want the much more attractive (to them) opportunities presented by the Greenbelt options. The cost of making brownfield sites more attractive for building needs to be addressed. These areas need to be regenerated and a fair way of assisting builders to overcome some of the costs need to be arrived at either with central or local government funding or perhaps imaginative business involvement.						
1244720	LPIO-4575	no	Housing developers are not interested in providing so called affordable housing because it undermines their profits. They will want to build in the western areas of the peninsula where homes are more expensive, to maximise profit. The pressure on the green belt is acute and we have to protect it. ALL open spaces need to be protected, including sports fields, parks, gardens, woods, school sites, allotments, and public spaces, even where they appear to be in urban areas. The amenity and mental health value of these spaces are invaluable, as well as being important for habitat reasons.						
1237696	LPIO-4673	yes							
1242528	LPIO-468	no	houses should not only be built where they can be sold for a profit but should be built where they are needed ie social housing is needed but large executive houses are not						
1237873	LPIO-4815	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1245794	LPIO-4896	no	It is an inadequate measure and/or is being used wrongly. Of course housebuilders and developers will favour Zones 3 & 4, because there are higher profit margins there. They would always want to develop Green Belt rather than Brownfield. This assessment should be used to work out what housebuilders and developers need (if anything) to develop Brownfield/Urban Regeneration sites.						
1245713	LPIO-4986	no	Developers will want to build in zones 3 and 4. This study is biased towards the Developers.						
1237923	LPIO-5043	no	Developers would only want to build in Zones 3 & 4 not 1 or 2. Developers should foot any costs for remediation.						
1245496	LPIO-5191	no	Developers do not want in zone 1 and 2 but want to develop in zone 3 and 4. This study on viability is for a developer. Therefore I strongly object to the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the cost.						
1242372	LPIO-5304	yes							
1240383	LPIO-5410	yes							
1245954	LPIO-5485	yes							
1245607	LPIO-5494	yes							
1246041	LPIO-5540	no	This is out of date and invalid. University and WGSa experts would disagree with it. Recent issues from Brexit and coronavirus suggest that this is wrong and should be revised significantly down.						
1245984	LPIO-5669		This study is primarily for developers. Their key motivation is profit and not protecting the Borough or its amenities. Excuses should not be made for non-viability. Brownfield sites should be brought into good condition either by grants from central government or developers being asked to develop brownfield sites as part of a package i.e. if they want to develop more profitable pieces of land they must also bring a less profitable site up to spec. They can't just be allowed to develop greenbelt land because they are the only sites they see as viable.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1245767	LPIO-5820	no	It is inevitable that developers will favour developing sites in Zones 3 and 4 over those in Zones 1 and 2. Since the majority of the Green Belt lies within Zones 3 and 4, it follows that developers would relish the opportunity presented by opening up the Green Belt to the detriment of regeneration through Brownfield development where it is most needed in Zones 1 and 2.						
1242751	LPIO-585	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation						
1246303	LPIO-5867	no	Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation of brownfield sites.						
1246310	LPIO-5904	no	What a surprise!!!! Of course developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely looking after the interests of the developer. I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses they should bear the costs of remediation.						
1246345	LPIO-6051	no	The Council should work more with developers to ensure that Zone 1 is economically viable. This plan should be about meeting the housing need and not ensuring maximum profit for developers.						
1246306	LPIO-6052	no	I do not accept that an area is considered unviable because any potential developer rejects the low profit margin. Surely to use economic viability to choose sites for development just condemns the very places that need regeneration and investment to a future of degradation.						
1246339	LPIO-6086	no	Grant funding should be used to subsidise the development of brown field sites to make them more attractive to developers						
1240964	LPIO-6115	no	This model is all about profitability. Wirral's housing plan should not be based on how much the developers can make, they will always go for the highest value. It should be based on need and protection of the greenbelt. If developers won't build in 1 then the council should build instead. But I believe this argument to be wrong, Peel are interested in premium property in Zone 1 and the waterfront all along offers great views of the Liverpool skyline. With the right infrastructure and drastic remodelling of Birkenhead there is no reason why condominiums wouldn't work for young couples and retirees alike.						
1238310	LPIO-6116	no	I do not agree. Keppie Massie viability report 2018 is not based on sites in the local plan options proposal. It is based entirely on Typology assessment using the existing UDL spatial plan and data from 2012 /14. It groups towns into general zones. E.g. Irby is in zone 3 with Oxton, Bidston Prenton Bromborough Greasby Upton Bebington Eastham, Thingwall and Rural East Wirral. In effect all these areas being assessed as the same site. The build out rates provided in this report averages 35 dwellings per annum per site. WBC council would need approximately 23 sites starting on site now 1-4-2020 to deliver the 800 new build homes required in 2020. (1003 homes required less demolitions and conversions = 800 new build) If this report is correct then it proves the viability of delivering 12000 homes is seriously in doubt. An up to date viability study of the new proposed spatial options plan is required. It should as a minimum use the 8 settlement areas for typology assessment not 4 Keppie Massie self-selected zones. Greenbelt sites need specific detailed assessments of land cost, multiple ownership issues, sustainability, habitats, flood risk and accessibility to establish the real viability. The findings from detailed individual site research are likely to increase development costs and therefore reduce viability significantly. Note this reports findings contain all the typology assessment data to bring brownfield sites forward to developable without evidence. Brownfield sites can be brought forward ahead of greenbelt sites using typology. 155500 urban brownfield sites are listed in the document. WBC should be able to find a further 1272 deliverable and developable sites to complete year 0-5 allocation Greenbelt does not need to be prioritised over brownfield to provide evidence of deliverability.						
1246161	LPIO-6218	yes	Agree with this approach.						
1246348	LPIO-6249		This is incomprehensible but it's probably for the benefit of developers.						
1245086	LPIO-6263	no	Of course the developers want to build 5+ bedroom houses in zones 3 & 4 but this shouldn't be entirely up to them. They should be made to behave more responsibly & not just to do as they please. Although there have been quite a few new houses built on land which has already been used for housing in Heswall nearly all have been large, expensive residences. Surely more affordable dwellings need to be built all over the Wirral provided existing sites are used. But of course these are less profitable. We live in a culture where these companies can do more or less what they like - this has to stop.						
1246402	LPIO-6391	no	This seems to be aimed totally to the developers advantage. Of course developers will want Zones 3 & 4 rather than zones 1 or 2. Developers should be responsible for paying for remediation						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246425	LPIO-6534	yes	We agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update that market housing on brownfield land around Birkenhead is generally not viable and that market housing around Eastham is generally viable. This means that we agree with the Council's view that 'it may therefore be unachievable to deliver some of the sites identified as part of the Council's housing land availability study (SHLAA) due to viability considerations, which may not be able to be included as proposed allocations unless viability can be overcome by other means' (2.84, Local Plan). Consistent with national policy, the Council should support development across all of the Urban Conurbation as it contains a range of available sites suitable for different types of housing taking into account local market conditions and viability (122, Framework). Eastham contains sites (including SP050 West of Rivacre Road (parcel 4.14)) that are demonstrated to be viable for meeting different types of housing across the Borough.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5669551					
1246401	LPIO-6904	no	I do not agree with this approach. Developers will always be interested in virgin sites in existing communities where they can take advantage of existing infrastructure and not have to clear what might be contaminated sites or clear existing structures. Work to redevelop the docklands would be costly but developers should be made to carry the cost of much of this.						
1246482	LPIO-7009	no	Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. It is cheaper to build on a green field site. The prices for homes in zones 3 & 4 will be higher and more fat profits can be made. This study on viability is completely for a developer and not for the existing residents. I reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment.						
1246488	LPIO-7108	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1241958	LPIO-733	yes							
1246581	LPIO-7592	no	An economic study is not enough in itself. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1&2 but will want to build in 3&4 which is economically more attractive. It should not be used to show why Greenfield rather than Brownfield sites should be developed but rather used to determine the amount of financial aid and pumppriming capital needed to progress regeneration in Brownfield sites.						
1240932	LPIO-7594	no	No, Our Client disagrees and our detailed comments can be found in paragraphs 3.27 to 3.35 of our representations and the accompanying reports prepared by a Consultant. Whilst we support the general approach to viability testing and the methodology of the Council's evidence, The Consultant identifies a number of areas of concern where further clarification is required. Insufficient information is provided to make a full assessment of the various viability assumptions proposed and some key assumptions are not set out in any detail. This must be addressed before the Council's evidence base can be found sound. However, Our Client notes that the vast majority of the new homes provided by Council's Preferred Approach lie within the least viable Zone 1 where development is generally not viable without adjustment to the level of developers' profit and/or land price. Our landholding lies wholly in the most viable Zones 3 and 4. No high-level site-specific viability assessments have been completed of the Council's key strategic sites. The Consultant's own site specific viability assessments of the four key proposed allocations of Hind Street, Woodside, Wirral Waters and Dock Road South, which combined comprise 70% of the Council's proposed housing requirement over the plan period, demonstrate that each has significant viability issues. No consideration has been given to the market implications and therefore viability of concentrating housing delivery into a small geographical area of Wirral on sites located in predominantly low value areas which will require high-rise apartment schemes to deliver the densities proposed. Also the Council's evidence indicates that it may be appropriate to consider introducing differing levels of affordable housing requirements within each geographical zone to reflect the range of development values and hence viability in each area. Our Client is concerned that the Council's approach will fail to deliver the affordable housing the Borough requires.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701			
1243342	LPIO-763	yes							
1246592	LPIO-7686	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246594	LPIO-7729	no	Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should factor in the cost of remediation. This should be part of their development costs. IT IS NOT EQUITABLE TO SIMPLY LET DEVELOPERS SELECT EASIER TO DEVELOP LAND THIS GOES AGAINST THE BASIC PRINCIPLES OF THE LA PLAN!						
1240903	LPIO-7809	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1239029	LPIO-790	yes							
1246596	LPIO-7967	no	I don't think that is enough in itself.						
1246605	LPIO-8113	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.10 - Do you agree with the findings of the Economic Viability Baseline Update 2018?	Question 2.10a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6
1246598	Hoylake Vision LPIO-8117	yes							
1243448	LPIO-816	no	Of course it is much easier and lucrative for developers to build on greenfield/belt sites (zones 3 and 4) than on land that has been previously developed! (zones 1 and 2) That does not mean it should happen! WBC should encourage development in zones 1 and 2 by providing (financial) incentives to developers for doing so. Any large new commercial developments in zones 1 and 2 (e.g. cinema, retail park or supermarket) adjacent to these new housing developments should be required to contribute to the additional costs of these housing developments, as they will ultimately benefit from the local population increase. WBC should make every effort to identify and secure national, European and international sources of funding which could offset the additional costs of developing in zones 1 and 2. e.g. environmental, regeneration funding etc Developers should only be allowed to develop on greenfield/belt land when the brownfield sites have been completely exhausted. The increased costs of developing housing on brownfield sites should NEVER be a reason for it not to go ahead.						
1237882	LPIO-8250	no	This question tells all. Developers will not want to build in Zones 1 or 2 but will want Zones 3 & 4. This study on viability is completely for a developer. Therefore, I strongly reject the Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment. If developers want to build houses, then they should foot the costs of remediation.						
1246612	LPIO-8259	no	This is a study that looks at things only from the developer's stance. They want to build where they can make the most money for the smallest outlay. It does not consider what is needed for the region. It is a totally flawed argument						
1246624	LPIO-8525	no	This Baseline is for developers -Well Done!! A developer is not going to want Zones 1 or 2 having seen this. These 2 zones should be priority - how else are you going to regenerate?. The developer/council should pay for remediation.						
1240872	LPIO-8596	no	Disagree with just colouring in one side of the M53! All greenbelt and adjacent settlements e.g. Spital must be placed in Zone 4 like the rest of the greenbelt Splitting this just based on an outdated proposal using the M532 is wrong. Clearly greenbelt is not viable so why is it in zone 3? take it out of zone three along wit Spital and parts of Bebington.						
1246631	LPIO-8659	yes	I agree with the findings, but believe that they are based on an economic model that may need to be revised in the light of new assumptions. For example, it may come to be recognised that greater national and local subsidies, in order to improve the economic viability of areas that have suffered greater economic deprivation in recent years, would be justifiable.						
1246544	LPIO-8718	yes	Difficulties are understandable, but developers' profits must not be allowed to skew the required housing provision. A developer which will not undertake to tackle a difficult site should not be given permission to develop an easy site						
1246202	LPIO-8746	no	I agree with the findings BUT the viability is based on the sale-ability of developments in this area. If these areas are improved generally, the sale-ability of developments within them will increase, making them more viable.						
1237807	LPIO-8803	yes	Yes, but..... Only the market can accurately decide if the site has economic viability. Of course land owners will want to hold out for the best possible price, so I suggest that compulsory purchase orders should be looked for reluctant sellers of brown field sites.						
1246678	LPIO-9274	no							
1246699	LPIO-9526	no	Whilst I recognise you are constrained by the requirements of government policy this analysis seems at odds with any analysis of housing need. It seems focused on meeting developers needs rather than what homes are needed for the community.						
1246693	LPIO-9548	no	I strongly disagree. Again I appreciate this is a technical consultation but believe the complexity of this is to discourage local residents to provide an adequate response while allowing big national companies with lawyers the opportunity to provide well researched and written responses. Clearly developers/businesses are all about maximising profit and they will not want to build on Zones 1 or 2 as this will reduce their profit. Clearly they will want to build on 3 & 4 where their profit will be maximised. If this is allowed to happen Wirral Council will be putting national businesses profit before the needs and requirements of Wirral residents. Developers will still make a profit on Zone 1 & 2 developments even taking into account the costs of remediation - it is just that the profits will not be as big as Zone 3 & 4 development. The Council should not be putting businesses and their profit before the people of Wirral.						
1246691	LPIO-9601	no	The Economic Viability Study Baseline Assessment is correct inasmuch as it is more profitable to develop areas in which property values are high and costs of development are low. However, following this approach will lead to the opposite outcome that WBC wants. Brownfield urban areas will not be developed and high value green belt areas will. Solutions need to be introduced to make it as profitable for brownfield development as green belt.						
1246651	LPIO-9784	no	Developers will be reluctant to build in Zones 1 and 2 and will prefer Zones 3 and 4. The study regarding viability appears slanted in the developers favour. If developers want to build houses then they should be responsible for the costs of remediation in Zones 1 and 2.						
1238147	LPIO-9790	no	There is not enough emphasis on seeking government grants or planning policy to make urban regeneration sites more viable in comparison to Green Belt sites.						

