

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1245044	LPIO-10011	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> the Council states in paragraph 2.7.4 that it has commissioned a new study of development density, to ensure that it can support the most sustainable patterns of development across Wirral. The study is yet to identify the most appropriate broad locations for increasing density, by focusing higher density development around locations where sustainable travel, such as walking, cycling and public transport can most easily be supported. Until the results of this study are known, and the success of density policies considered, then any exceptional circumstances cannot exist. by the council's own admission there is incomplete evidence from discussions with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the duty to co-operate that prove that they cannot accommodate some of Wirral's housing needs. Until such time that the Council is able to evidence properly that it has worked with neighbouring authorities to show housing and employment development cannot be more suitably located on existing brownfield sites in need of regeneration and in locations where there is existing infrastructure to cope, such as integrated transport and schools and hospitals, then exceptional circumstances do not exist. Wirral's local plan should not threaten to harm the sustainable development ambitions of neighbouring authorities In conclusion, in accordance with NPPF there are no exceptional circumstances that exist, or at least evidenced, which justify the inclusion of Green Belt development options in this local plan. 					
1246747	LPIO-10044	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues; Other (please state below);	How will amenities and public services be provided for these new dwellings? There doesn't seem to be enough info on infrastructure development in areas other than Birkenhead.	I agree that the Council is seeking to develop urban brownfield sites first - and that they are seeking to invest in a number of large developments which would then remove the need to develop on greenbelt land. However: NO greenbelt should be built on, regardless of viability/value'. The release and development of greenbelt land should not even be a consideration in this consultation. I'm concerned that many new dwellings will be built without enough thought being given to public services, schools, medical centres, the effect on local transport/roads, etc. I'm still not convinced that the figures are correct in terms of housing need. What if demand falls? What if there's a large recession?					
1246760	LPIO-10095	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Other (please state below);		I totally disagree with the proposed figure of 12,000 homes required between 2020-2035. I object strongly to you including this figure in Section 2.130 as the first of your key messages to take away as a strategic conclusion from your "evidence base conclusions" when not one scrap of evidence has been presented to justify this figure using local facts and figures. I object to you discounting the public submissions and expert reports from the Universities of Manchester and Liverpool simply because you don't like the numbers because they project that only half of the 12,000 homes are likely to be required (see answers to question 2.2). I disagree with your classification of weakly performing Green Belt land because the reasons for its very existence are stronger now than they have ever been. Viability aka profitability should not be used as a means to justify Green Belt release. No building should take place on Green Belt. Hinting that even some may be released will stifle investment and development of brownfield sites, and delay any homes being built anywhere.					
1246792	LPIO-1018	no	Housing need; Employment need;							
1241065	LPIO-10208	yes								
1246559 Cheshire Wildlife Trust	LPIO-10218	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		We do not agree with the key messages as set out in this section as they fail to acknowledge that there is a strategic requirement to consider environmental issues (particularly impacts on the natural environment). Indeed this was one of the key concerns that came out of the consultation and is one of the three main objectives of the NPPF. We question why the evidence for environmental issues such as non-statutory sites/ecological networks being ignored? Why are environmental issues missing from the list? The context of the local plan MUST reflect the three main objectives (social, economic and environmental) of the NPPF in order to achieve sustainable development. It is unacceptable that key environmental issues are missing from the messages.					
1246743	LPIO-10223	no	Housing need; Employment need;		Housing and employment need are based on numbers recorded while the UK formed part of the EU.					
1241629	LPIO-10250	no	Housing need;		There is no need above 4,000 new dwellings. this can all be accommodated by brownfield land. green belt land should not be offer. developers will have to reduce their financial ambitions and be prepared to take on more difficult areas of land. the council will be able to assist by ensuring all available grants are made available. profits for the few - developers and landowners - can not be at the expense of the many, of this generation and future generations..					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246731	LPIO-10288	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		The Wirral Local Plan 2020 - 2035: Issues and Options states that 'the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution;' However there are 46 Green Belt parcels make a weak contribution compared to only 42 that make a moderate contribution. Figure 8. Chloropleth map of Green Belt parcel assessment findings, would visually suggest that the area of the parcels that make a moderate assessment is slightly larger than that of the parcels that make a weak contribution, but this is not calculated and underplays the fact that by area the parcels that make a weak contribution is significantly greater than the areas that make a strong contribution. Even worse than this the report then seems to oversimplify the situation by using an Appendix C Justification for Merging of General Areas. This merges 24 parcels, with a justification that these 'General Areas were all merged to create General Area 2 as they all form part of the M53 corridor and therefore share similar characteristics. Many of the areas were very small due to the large number of roads and slip roads within the corridor. Parcel 7.26 could easily be in excess of 80 hectares, or 200 acres, and this is just one of the 24 parcels merged. This approach is completely inconsistent approach is arbitrary and at best misleading and at worst deceitful.					
1246717	LPIO-10298	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		It is considered that the methodology of the Green Belt Review assessment completed by Arup should be reviewed. The Supporting Statement submitted in response to Question 2.16 demonstrates that the Stage 2 methodology of the assessment, when General Areas of Green Belt are classified to parcels, is inconsistent. Only defining parcels which are adjacent to a settlement boundary results in suitable land which makes a weak contribution to the Green Belt being concealed in significantly larger 'General Areas', which are not considered for release from the Green Belt. The suitability of our Client's land interest, Land to the South of Clatterbridge Hospital, for release from the Green Belt, exemplifies this discrepancy. The Site clearly does not reflect the characteristics of the significantly larger Green Belt General Area 8, due to its varied character and that the site represents previously developed land. The suitability of the Site's release from the Green Belt is justified by our assessment of the site's contribution to the five purposes of including land within the Green Belt, concluding the Site makes an overall weak contribution to the Green Belt, as submitted within the Supporting Statement to question 2.16. Despite this the Site is judged to make a strong contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt as a result of its inclusion within a much larger 'General Area'.					
1246772	LPIO-10310	yes			Use of brown field sites and regeneration is key. But I do not agree with expected growth of housing demand you are modelling. I do not agree that the focus should be on rural areas and green belt just because redeveloping brown field sites is seen as mor expensive.					
1240223	LPIO-10421	no	Other (please state below);	Retail issues and proposed approaches	We note that the Council's analysis has had regard to a recently commissioned Retail Study. This Study has had regard to the survey-derived turnovers of key facilities both within and outside town centres. Out of centre facilities such as Junction One Retail Park and Rock Retail Park clearly represent important parts of the range of shopping facilities for local residents. As such, this does imply that they should not be identified on Proposals Maps as being "Primarily Industrial Areas" as this simply does not reflect reality. Going to points of detail, we note that Table 26C of the WYG Retail Study does recognise a commitment scheme in terms of mezzanine space for unit 6 at Junction One Retail Park. This is noted but we would confirm for completeness that the mezzanine has been implemented in recent months (but after the datum of the shopper survey). We would also note that the suggested sales density is far too low and should be uprated to reflect the sales density assumed for Birkenhead unless WYG can justify to the contrary.					
1238582	LPIO-10671	yes								
1246808	LPIO-10750	no	Housing need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		This consultation should be cancelled due to current pandemic. There are thousands of people dieing and freeing up homes. We don't need 12000 houses and we don't need any greenbelt building on					
1243890	LPIO-1088	no	Housing need; Employment need; Assessment of greenbelt;							
1247250	LPIO-11396	no			I question the 'key message' that 12,000 homes are required in the plan-period. I am aware that information has been provided to the Council that indicates the need is significantly lower than the Local Housing Need calculation. I urge the Council to seriously consider this information and review its proposals as appropriate.					
1247196	LPIO-11565				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247015	LPIO-11765				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1240731	LPIO-1189	no	Housing need;		One of the key messages states that the council have to plan for 12,000 dwellings. The council does not have to plan for this number of houses if the figures are challenged. WBC have commissioned and paid for 3 reports from Liverpool and Manchester Universities. They have chosen to ignore these reports which show much lower housing need figures. They have also chosen to ignore reports from local experts which also come to the conclusion that the housing numbers should be much lower than the 803 per year resulting from the standard method calculation. The Wirral Compendium of Statistics (also compiled by WBC) also shows that this housing number is not required. In fact, table 1H in this report shows that the population of the Wirral has only increased by 100 in the last 21 years, so how can it imagine that we will need dwellings for just under 29,000 people over the next 15 years (based on the average household of 2.4 fullfact.org and statista.com) The councillor in charge of the Local Plan herself has said in a meeting I attended, that she and the council officers believed that the 12,045 figure was too high.					
1247214	LPIO-12392				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247492	LPIO-12489				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1240843	LPIO-12655				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1241412	LPIO-128	yes								
1247578	LPIO-12853				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247510	LPIO-12977				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246335	LPIO-13101				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246853	LPIO-13369				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1243700	LPIO-1343	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues; Development density; Employment need;		The Options document does not provide evidence that Wirral needs 12,000 net new dwellings or 80ha of new employment land. The impact on infrastructure by green belt development has been neither robust or rigorous. The "presumption to build" ethos of the NPPF has distorted the evidence upon which the Council are relying. The foundations to the "presumption to build" and not evident in the Options document is "the right houses, in the right places to satisfy the right housing needs" The infrastructure evidence is outdated, produced from modelling and national trends and is unreliable as far as the Wirral is concerned.					
1246852	LPIO-13491				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247746	LPIO-13645				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1238192	LPIO-13787				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247012	LPIO-13842				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	
1247014	LPIO-13896				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.						
1242183	LPIO-13963				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1243254	LPIO-13977 1 of 2				The Planning Department's errors go even further. The example Site (Parcel 7.27 [SP060]) has been a 'target' for Release for years, during which misinterpretation and misrepresentation have persisted. Until recently, the surrounding distinct communities were termed a single 'Settlement'. For a start, the concept of 'Settlement' is flawed. It does not exist within the NPPF and is solely an administrative concoction and convenience of the Council, used inappropriately to suggest this vast site is an 'highly enclosed' area within a single settlement. The term has no standing (even if the initial capital letter is replaced) and the 'highly enclosed' contention is trumped by Purpose 2. Misleading presentation goes on. Compare this Site's presentation in the 'Potential Allocations' section of the Consultation Webpages with Site 7.26 (SP059D). The latter is tiny, with an area of just 0.51 hectares. Its site map is a full A4-page illustration. Whereas, Site 7.27 is 56.42 hectares (over 110 times the size), but its illustration is less than half-page or 222 times smaller. To a layperson, this might suggest the vast Site, measuring over a kilometre across and over 1.25km in length, (where to walk its public footpaths gives the impression of being in a completely rural setting of productive, high quality farmland with distant views of woodland, some rooftops and the Welsh Hills), is actually small and of diminished consequence. Worse still, the northern cut-off line of the map of Site 7.27 is at the 'hour glass' pinch point in a miles long 'green corridor', a narrowing interrupted by just 5 houses on one side of a road. Had the Site been fairly illustrated, the context of the majority of Irby as an 'island' within a sea of Green Belt farmland would have been evident. Purpose 3: to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment.						
1243254	LPIO-13977 2 of 2				The Review builds upon past mistakes (where encroachment had been permitted) and would make poor instances worse. Insufficient assessment and a lack of rigorous appraisal have resulted in 'unsound' conclusions and proposals, including vast areas of 'Weakly Performing Green Belt' for release. Purpose 4: to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns. Again the Review interpretation is too narrow. Wirral is steeped in areas and communities of 'special historic character'. These are not limited to Conservation Areas but the conclusions and proposals of the Review and of the Council would threaten the special character of conservation areas and other historic communities. Insufficient regard, assessment and rigorous appraisal have been completed to arrive at 'sound' conclusions. Therefore the conclusions reached are largely 'unsound'. Purpose 5: to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. Of all the Purposes of Green Belt inappropriately interpreted, as to how they apply to Wirral, Purpose 5 is the worst handled by the Review and in what flows therefrom. By stating that all green belt assists in such manner, no matter where in the Country (or on Wirral) the green belt exists, and therefore to discount the value of this Purpose (as having no absolute or relative contribution to the assessment of Wirral's Green Belt) is to miss the fundamentally special situation and 'exceptional circumstance' related to Green Belt on Wirral, as outlined earlier (page 1). How Wirral's Green Belt is so exceptionally significant in terms of the aim of Purpose 5 should instead be sounded loudly and clearly, but it is not. Deserving of special treatment, one measure would be to recognise the unusual, special and exceptional purpose and contribution Wirral's Green Belt could and should make to the future of the Peninsula and wider Region.						
1247218	LPIO-14058				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1247219	LPIO-14163				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1247220	LPIO-14260				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1247222	LPIO-14392				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1247226	LPIO-14480				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1247245	LPIO-14570				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247829	LPIO-14625				I cannot judge on every point made but certainly can express my doubts on the validity of some, foremost that as many as 1200 dwellings will be needed during the lifetime of the Plan (see my answer to questions 2.1 and 2.2; that neighbouring authorities may be able to help is unlikely but regardless of this, Greenbelt land is not needed to satisfy Wirral's development needs and therefore must not be used.					
1246827	LPIO-14699				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247016	LPIO-14832				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247018	LPIO-14892				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1238043	LPIO-1509	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;							
1239377	LPIO-1517	no	Housing need; Development density; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is based on the previous Council's failure in leadership to deliver their Local Plan. There are too many flaws in the Council's arguments over housing need figures and the reality of economic growth. It is up to the Council to make its case on our behalf to convey that national guidelines are not realistic for the Borough. As painful as it sounds, the data collection and analysis process should be repeated, this time with more emphasis on getting input from residents in plain English. The previous SHMA 2016 report and consultation process was meaningful only to those who could understand it! How could ordinary people respond to such a document? There needs to be more engagement in plain English so residents can understand and respond.					
1247021	LPIO-15304				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247246	LPIO-15319				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247248	LPIO-15422				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247251	LPIO-15536				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247252	LPIO-15628				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247274	LPIO-15721				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247275	LPIO-15831				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247936	LPIO-15974				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1244969	LPIO-1613	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		Reasons previously explained but in addition, WBC has failed in its duty to communicate sufficiently with owners of Brown Field land and encourage such land to be made available. Even at this late stage in the Local plan process they are asking for Brown Field. Failure to establish and maintain an up to date current Brown Field register since 2017 has resulted in increased pressure for Green Belt release. New strategies need to be put in place to make use of all available Brown field land and encourage its developable ability. There is sufficient and no need to release Green Belt.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1244969	LPIO-16177 1 of 2				Many of your evidence base documents related to sites SP061 and SP062 give reasons why The Western Urban Extension should not proceed. ECC1,ECC2, ECC4, ECC5, ECC11 and ECC12 are some. However, the Green Belt review 2019 GB1 seems to target Green Belt sites SP061 and SP062 and defines them as being amongst the most eligible sites proposed for Green belt release. Since there is no 'standard method' for Green belt appraisal ARUP seem to have adopted a rather extreme approach to assessment and this has resulted in large areas of Wirral's Green Belt being categorized into the alien term of 'weakly' performing. Are we to assume that the whole of the Wirral Peninsular will be 'fair game' for developers in the future? The five purposes for Green Belt as set out in NPPF are clearly open to interpretation and the outcomes of reviews are likely to vary but there does seem to be an unfavourable swing from the assessment made for the Development Options Review and that which we are presented with now. From a laypersons point of view all five purposes strongly apply to all the Green Belt sites in my locality. Purpose a. In my view Heswall and Pensby are large built up areas in comparison to Barnston. This purpose serves to prevent the spread of those built up areas into open countryside. Purpose b.					
1244969	LPIO-16177 2 of 2				In my view the removal of sites SP061 and SP062 from the Green Belt will increase the mergence of Heswall, Pensby and Thingwall and will swallow Barnston in Option 2b. The removal of SP061 and part SP065 will increase the mergence of Pensby and Thingwall in Option 2a Purpose c. In my view, as described above, site SP062 can only be described as open countryside. I challenge you to describe it as anything other than countryside. In my view SP061 and part SP065 enhance the countryside in the locality and in all cases development will encroach. Purpose d. On the Wirral we have historic towns and historic villages, generations of my family and many other residents' families are a testament to that. Flint axe heads have been found in Barnston and Thingwall, evidence exists of Roman, Viking and medieval occupation. How far back in history do you need to go? I suppose that purposes a,b,c and d could be interpreted differently depending on a base point of view. However, purpose e. with particular regard to the Wirral, is difficult to interpret differently other than from its simple message. I live in an affluent community but about twenty years ago I was asked to represent Barnston and Heswall in the formation of the Wirral Voluntary and Community Sectors Network. For three years I worked with groups living and working in communities in the most socially deprived areas of Wirral, groups that were desperately trying to make a difference in their own communities, groups which, despite their best endeavours, were struggling through a lack of support from WBC in terms of financial, professional and even moral support.					
1247287	LPIO-16194				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247349	LPIO-16369				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247353	LPIO-16457				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247354	LPIO-16545				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247935	LPIO-16579				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247434	LPIO-16643				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247436	LPIO-16759				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247437	LPIO-16879				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247439	LPIO-16880				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247441	LPIO-17056				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247960	LPIO-17177				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247962	LPIO-17264				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247966	LPIO-17369				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1242519	LPIO-1743	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		There is no evidence that Wirral needs this amount of development.					
1247971	LPIO-17471				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1241726	LPIO-17565				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247979	LPIO-17676				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247980	LPIO-17677				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1245502	LPIO-17856				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247541	LPIO-17958				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247539	LPIO-18067				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1237857	LPIO-18170				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1245060	LPIO-1819	no	Other (please state below);		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247996	LPIO-18217				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1245069	LPIO-1827	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		The are a couple of key factors that should be included within the key messages Firstly the need to deliver dwellings in line with actual need and secondly the need to NOT encroach on Green belt. This latter point should be a key policy decision, regardless.					
1247022	LPIO-18437				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247023	LPIO-18491				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247024	LPIO-18547				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247025	LPIO-18606				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247038	LPIO-18607				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247039	LPIO-18729				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247040	LPIO-18730				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247041	LPIO-18835				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247042	LPIO-18901				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247060	LPIO-18974				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247061	LPIO-18975				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247063	LPIO-19078				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247064	LPIO-19132				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247068	LPIO-19186				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247071	LPIO-19242				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247072	LPIO-19298				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247078	LPIO-19355				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247080	LPIO-19416				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247081	LPIO-19417				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1238379	LPIO-1949	no	Other (please state below); Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues; Employment need; Development density;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is questionable and should be revisited again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247082	LPIO-19623				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247083	LPIO-19678				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247084	LPIO-19733				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247085	LPIO-19796				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247088	LPIO-19857				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247089	LPIO-19918				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247090	LPIO-19978				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247091	LPIO-20033				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247092	LPIO-20089				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247093	LPIO-20150				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247094	LPIO-20211				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1245083	LPIO-2023	no	Housing need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		Much of the evidence collected is dubious and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part					
1247095	LPIO-20267				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1244898	LPIO-2030	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		Wirral's Housing Need is nowhere near 12,000 new-build homes. Population growth has been virtually NIL and is projected as low; inward migration is low and Cabinet LP Lead and Senior Officers have confirmed there will be NO policy to encourage it; Cabinet LP Lead stated no-one in Council believes 12,000 is correct – actual is lower; affordability is comparatively good, showing (as successive Secretaries of State have said) Wirral is NOT an area of higher Housing pressure; numbers on the Housing List bear little relationship to 12,000 figure – under 1,500; and expert advisors to Council (Universities) and from WGSA have all concluded that figure should be nearer 3,000. And now the Queen's Speech shows Government has reduced its estimate of need by 33% - but WBC won't budge. Shame. 80ha Employment land is overstated – still unrealistic aspirational growth assumptions. Reclassify more long-unused land for housing. Densities should be maximised taking due regard of good design, local character and open space requirements. Council admitted inadequate working with Neighbouring LAs. As Wirral's Regeneration needs are as acute and primary as when the LAs within Merseyside County Council drew up tight Green Belt boundaries on Wirral to direct development towards Regeneration, Wirral should DEMAND the same Policy now. Wirral has admitted being very slow to engage with Homes England and others over viability issues of brownfield sites and urgently needs to secure much more funding from Government, Homes England and other public and private sectors. Greenbelt assessment comments have been given earlier.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/567752				
1247096	LPIO-20322				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247099	LPIO-20379				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247101	LPIO-20433				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247108	LPIO-20559				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247102	LPIO-20560				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247106	LPIO-20599				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247105	LPIO-20600				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1237870	LPIO-2065	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		The Council are using data that is out of date / incorrect and frankly, flawed. The Council need to revise their figures based on present day data and information and NOT on out of date, inaccurate figures just because they suit their requirements.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247109	LPIO-20703				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247110	LPIO-20761				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247111	LPIO-20762				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1241016	LPIO-209	yes								
1247112	LPIO-20922				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247113	LPIO-20977				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247115	LPIO-21033				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1238036	LPIO-2106	yes								
1247116	LPIO-21087				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1246851	LPIO-21151				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246918	LPIO-21264				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246924	LPIO-21265				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246928	LPIO-21266				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1245112	LPIO-2138	yes								
1238835	LPIO-2139	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		In accordance with the Compendium of Statistics, we do not have the need for 12000 homes by 2035. According to the University of Liverpool report, the housing need in Wirral is less than half that amount. I understand that yet another independent report exists (maybe from Manchester), which confirms this. Much of the evidence in this report is dubious at best, and seems to me to have been collated in order to meet Council requirements and not a reflection of the actual true picture. As an example, we know that the Government formula for housing assessment is out-of-date and therefore should be scrapped. We also know that in his letter of January 2019, the Rt. Hon James Brokenshire MP suggested that the figure of 12000 is only a starting point and needs to be revised in order to meet local needs. WE DO NOT NEED THIS AMOUNT OF NEW HOUSING.					
1246920	LPIO-21515				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246926	LPIO-21516				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1247117	LPIO-21671				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247118	LPIO-21672				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247145	LPIO-21779				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247147	LPIO-21780				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247148	LPIO-21887				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247150	LPIO-21888				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1244329	LPIO-21997				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247119	LPIO-22059				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1246678	LPIO-22060				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247151	LPIO-22168				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247152	LPIO-22169				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247153	LPIO-22282				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247155	LPIO-22283				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247156	LPIO-22390				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247158	LPIO-22391				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247159	LPIO-22578				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247160	LPIO-22579				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247161	LPIO-22625				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247164	LPIO-22626				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247167	LPIO-22758				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247168	LPIO-22759				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247169	LPIO-22946				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247170	LPIO-22947				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247173	LPIO-23035				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247174	LPIO-23036				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247175	LPIO-23143				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247176	LPIO-23144				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1247177	LPIO-23271				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247178	LPIO-23272				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1247179	LPIO-23273				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1245145	LPIO-2330	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		There is , for reasons already given, no realistic need for 12000 more dwellings , neither within the timescale of this exercise , nor indeed within the foreseeable future. Further, any need which might arise can easily be contained within brownfield areas, which would ameliorate those areas and avoid permanent destruction of green belt					
1248420	LPIO-23659				The Council's Draft Local Plan approach seems to be to produce a something that could be called a "Local Plan" to avoid being placed in "Special Measures". This 3rd or 4th attempt AGAIN at massive cost to the ratepayer is now with the additional cost of retaining a QC and Consultants. Wirral Metropolitan Borough Council - Draft Local Plan Issues and Options, Reg 18, March 2020 The lack of Strategy is a fundamental flaw. Where is the justification for the allocation of housing land versus employment land and the value of the open spaces to the developing Leisure sector, food production and the reduction of climate change and improved air quality? The "need" for such housing numbers seems to be based on the Council's budget forecast "need" for new income from Council Tax in the coming years. This is a deeply flawed business case, not a Local Plan. Without new jobs the costs associated with the "new residents" in social care, health needs and new infrastructure would outstrip any increased income from extra Council Tax. (Assuming any houses are actually built and the taxes are actually paid (on time)). This draft Local Plan is just a deeply flawed business case.					
1244826	LPIO-2389	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		All of the above, housing needs of 12,000 is vastly overestimated and then becomes the driver for building on green belt that is not required. We have enough brownfield sites and urban regeneration areas that can easily exceed our demands for housing over the next 10 to 15 years.					
1242185	LPIO-23892 1 of 2				The Local Plan housing requirement should not exceed 4,000 net new dwellings. The Local Plan should, in addition, plan for a reduced amount of employment land and seek to maximise the effective use of land in line with Section 11 of the NPPF. The contribution from 'suitable' brownfield sites and through optimising development densities on sites will help. In conjunction with a more strategic approach to planning with neighbouring authorities, we believe the tests cannot be met for 'exceptional circumstances' to release Green Belt land as set out in NPPF Paragraphs 136 and 137. Identifying as much 'suitable', defined as both 'deliverable' and 'developable', brownfield land as possible for inclusion of the Brownfield Register is of paramount importance. We forwarded information on roughly 60 hectares of land from a rudimentary glance at Wirral's former industrial sites. Vacant and neglected former factory sites have a blighting effect and it has been a long term ambition to revitalise areas with previously developed land. The Birkenhead Regeneration Framework is widely supported and it is yet to be published, let alone had the opportunity to be delivered. Until this approach is proven to have failed to deliver sufficient brownfield development then any exceptional circumstance cannot exist. The Council states that it has commissioned a new study of development density, to ensure that it can support the most sustainable patterns of development across Wirral. Until the results of this study are known, and the success of density policies considered, then any exceptional circumstances cannot exist. There is incomplete evidence from discussions with neighbouring authorities in accordance with the duty to co-operate that prove that they cannot accommodate some of Wirral's housing needs.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006		

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1242185	LPIO-23892 2 of 2				Until such time that the Council is able to evidence properly that it has worked with neighbouring authorities to show housing and employment development cannot be more suitably located on existing brownfield sites in need of regeneration and in locations where there is existing infrastructure to cope, such as integrated transport and schools and hospitals, then exceptional circumstances do not exist. Wirral's Local Plan should not threaten to harm the sustainable development ambitions of neighbouring authorities. No exceptional circumstances exist, or at least are evidenced, in line with the NPPF, which justify the inclusion of Green Belt development options in this Local Plan. There is provision for Local Plans to be reviewed every 5 years. If regeneration efforts, and the brownfield land supply, fail to deliver the required rate of housing development then the first review of the plan could introduce some 'limited' Green Belt alterations to provide for future housing needs. Exceptional circumstances for changes to the Green Belt may exist sometime in the future but certainly don't exist at present. The reasons for the existing Green Belt boundary are as relevant in the context of NPPF policy today as they were when established. Green Belt should be retained where it performs any one, or more, of the important Green Belt purposes. Viability must not be assessed incorrectly as it has an impact on the amount of developer contributions. There should not be artificial capping of developer contributions as this will mean social housing and other important local infrastructure are not forth coming.					
1248472	LPIO-24012				With regard to Paragraph 2.130 the 12,500 dwellings is not a ceiling as stated by the Council it is a minimum requirement.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684824	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684823			
1248487	LPIO-24068				We have provided a response to each of the relevant 'evidence base conclusions' below: We have to plan for up to 12,000 net new dwellings: Support the identification of the use of the standardised methodology as a means for calculating the minimum housing need. As stated, we request the housing requirement derived from the standard methodology is considered in the context of not having an up-to-date Local Plan for an extended period which is likely to have impacted past based trends. It is of equal importance that the Council aligns its housing requirement with its economic growth scenario, and seeks to deliver the maximum number of new homes and jobs in the borough so as to actively expand the economic, social and cultural prosperity of the Borough. We will seek to maximise development densities on sites within the urban area to make the most efficient use of urban land balanced with high standards of development: Support the increase of densities on sites within the urban area, provided that this is balanced against the requirement to deliver a good standard of design which reflects the character and setting of the surrounding environs. We will continue to undertake work to ensure that our supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land has been thoroughly examined before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt: Support the Council's strategy towards the identification of land within the urban area as a first priority as a means of meeting it identified need.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656330	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656329			
1248517	LPIO-24279				The measures identified in paragraph 2.122 are not enough to meet Wirral's development needs and the Council ought to contemplate the release of land within the Green Belt. In such circumstances Paragraph 138 of the NPPF is clear that first consideration should be given to land that has been previously developed.					
1248542	LPIO-24356				We feel the amount of employment floorspace required for allocation should be revisited taking account of a more likely time period. There is a concern that the 80ha requirement mentioned in Paragraph 2.130 and its accompanying infographic is overstated. The conclusions of the Wirral Retail and Centres Study should also be fully addressed. That report forms a very important part of the evidence base for the Local Plan and its findings have far reaching implications for the regeneration of Birkenhead and other key centres across the Borough.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684894				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1248542	LPIO-24399				No specific questions are posed relating to Section 2.6 which deals with Retail and Leisure Needs. However, we have some observations to make. First, it should be made abundantly clear that Birkenhead town centre is not a healthy centre and that it is very susceptible to changes in the retail market. As it currently stands there is no consideration of qualitative factors or aspirations of the Borough. The assessment of need for retail and leisure facilities is undertaken on the basis of the household survey results in Section 2.6 and 6.3. There is no overarching commentary on the health of centres, nor mention of the regeneration efforts that are committed. This lack of qualitative information together with statements such as identifying some capacity for comparison goods is misleading and should be reassessed. Paragraph 2.56 says that after commitments / planning permissions there is 1,100sqm net of capacity by 2029, increasing to 5,600sqm by 2034. What this does not say is that currently a quarter of all retail floorspace in Birkenhead town centre is vacant, therefore that potential 'capacity' could all be re-provided within the town centre. To ensure the protection of regeneration initiatives in Birkenhead and to prevent its further decline we strongly recommend some sensitivity testing of the capacity figures identified against the floorspace availability in Birkenhead town centre. The stance being taken on the retail floorspace proposed at Wirral Waters also needs to be clarified before the Local Plan progresses to the next stage in its preparation to prevent an oversupply being created and the regeneration of Birkenhead town centre undermined.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684894				
1248551	LPIO-24412				The strategic conclusions and key messages do not properly reflect the current circumstances of the Borough. The conclusion that the Council will need to plan for 'up to' 12,000 net new dwellings and 'up to 80ha of new employment land' does not accord with the requirements of national policy and should be reflected as the minimum starting point. It is noted that the Council is continuing to work with neighbouring authorities to establish whether they can accommodate any of Wirral's development needs. The Council will need to recognise that this is a two-way street and will also need to consider whether it is necessary to accommodate neighbouring authorities housing needs. Paragraph 60 of the Framework is clear that in addition to the local housing need figure, any needs that cannot be met within neighbouring authorities should also be taken into account in establishing the amount of housing to be planned for. It is incorrect to assume that the majority of existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt when the evidence demonstrates the vast majority of the existing Green Belt only provides a minor to moderate contribution to the purposes of Green Belt. Further consideration of the Green Belt will be needed.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5655918				
1248557 Environment Agency	LPIO-24424	yes			We agree with Paragraph 1.13, page. 4, which states, 'It is essential that our proposals are based upon evidence about what the economic, social and environmental needs of the Borough...' and note the List of Evidence Studies as set out in Appendix 1.1. In addition to this list we would draw your attention to work being undertaken by Nature Connected through the Liverpool City Region Natural Capital Group to identify the Natural Capital assets of the City Region. While the work is ongoing it has thus far identified and delivered detailed baseline maps and ecosystem service maps. Given the level of detail we would strongly suggest it is utilised in support of the Wirral Local Plan.					
1248557 Environment Agency	LPIO-24429				We have no specific view but do emphasise again the importance of ensuring sound infrastructure, (including blue and green infrastructure), is sufficiently in place to accommodate any type and quantum of development planned.					
1248567 Historic England	LPIO-24515	no	Development density;		Historic England disagrees with the analysis of the key messages from the evidence collected so far in relation to development densities. Historic England recognises that the provision of more homes across England is a Government Priority with increasing residential density of development identified in the Housing White Paper and the NPPF as a key way of meeting growing housing need. In light of this it is important that the impact of such proposals have a positive relationship between any new development and the existing character of a place and the historic environment. Indeed, the NPPF requires that providing more homes is more about just providing a greater quantity of homes, it is also about quality and the need to understand and reflect local conditions. The NPPF also requires planning policies and decisions to address the connections between people and places and the integration of new development into the natural, built and historic environment. One of the requirements of the NPPF; the starting point of any new development is its location and what the surrounding area is like including the historic environment. Therefore, the plan needs to ensure that there is a balanced approach to new housing (and development) density on sites as it appears that the approach is only about maximising development densities rather than ensuring that it is appropriate and enhances its context.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246559 Cheshire Wildlife Trust	LPIO-24553				We do not agree with the key messages as set out in this section as they fail to acknowledge that there is a strategic requirement to consider environmental issues (particularly impacts on the natural environment). Indeed this was one of the key concerns that came out of the consultation and is one of the three main objectives of the NPPF. We question why the evidence for environmental issues such as non-statutory sites/ecological networks being ignored? Why are environmental issues missing from the list? The context of the local plan MUST reflect the three main objectives (social, economic and environmental) of the NPPF in order to achieve sustainable development. It is unacceptable that key environmental issues are missing from the messages.					
1242697	LPIO-24657				The Council's use of the standard method ignores the most recent demographic changes. The latest population trends supported by the later projections (2016) have a special implication for the numbers and shape of households in Wirral – which would not be replicated in all authorities – and is exceptional. Its use of outdated statistics is scientifically wrong. Its rigid application of the method fails to accommodate the recent changes with a consequence for the estimated number and profile of future households. On the housing supply, it looks like the numbers, while being estimated and explained, are in effect derived to minimise the future supply, and hence maximise the balance of need. The Council should derive the figures neutrally and without using outliers. The balance of need may be lower but would better support the preferred option of not releasing Green Belt. Further, the proposed dwelling mix ignores the expected increase in older households and smaller households. This is compounded by the Council's failure to base household numbers on the latest demographic changes.	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-24821				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	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-24943				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	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

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1248823	LPIO-25045				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849		
1248832	LPIO-25196				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562			
1248833	LPIO-25259				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	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-25360				12,000 net new dwellings is the absolute minimum the Council should be planning and should be uplifted up to 1,300 dwellings per annum over a 20-year period. Agree the provision of up to 80ha of new employment land is justified but do not consider that this aligns with the housing requirement. Agree the Council should be seeking to maximise development densities on urban sites but the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. Agree that there are significant issues with the viability of development in parts of Wirral which will impact on the Council's ability to identify some sites as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the plan period. Agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs. Agree that the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but that there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution. Agree that the Council need to undertake further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land, to inform decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677474	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684859			
1237647	LPIO-254	no	Assessment of greenbelt;							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1248986	LPIO-25455				The concluding messages misrepresent the real situation. While we generally agree with the key messages from the evidence the Council has collected, the Council have failed to consider the exceptional circumstances that warrant a different approach to the minimum figure provided by the standard method; the 80 hectare figure for employment land is also a minimum; there are issues with viability of development in Wirral, largely within the Urban Conurbation that will impact on the deliverability / developability of sites within the plan period; a lot of the sites put forward in the housing trajectory are undeliverable in their current form and further sites are required to be identified to ensure that a minimum of 12,000 homes are delivered; there are 46 Green Belt Parcels which make a weak contribution to the Green Belt; and the current analysis of the supply of developable / developable sites within the urban area, especially within the strategic regeneration areas, warrants the release of Green Belt land to achieve the housing requirement. This needs to be made very clear in the key messages. More consideration needs to be given to the Borough's growth strategy and why it is considered that it isn't appropriate to aim for further housing growth. We do not consider that the lack of supply is a sufficient reason to not promote further development. Maximising the development densities on urban land will help but will not necessarily provide the right type of development Wirral and the Liverpool City Region needs, such as larger family homes.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770		
1246035	LPIO-25487	no			We disagree with the 'key message' that 12,000 homes are required in the plan-period. Evidence provided by experts at Manchester and Liverpool Universities, and Prof David Gregg and Graham Stevens, has been provided to the Council. This evidence produces a revised figure that represents the real need that exists in the Borough.					
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-2552	no	Other (please state below); Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		Wirral Wildlife does not agree with the overall messages section, as it fails to mention the climate and environmental emergencies. Throughout all this Plan, the reality of the climate emergency has to be recognised and dealt with. Business as usual is no longer an option. Climate change is the greatest threat to all life, human and non-human. Therefore this message should headline this section and the whole Plan, not be buried in section 8. The analysis in section 8 is good, but should be moved to this first chapter ahead of all the rest. That then provides the justification for viewing all development in the light of whether it is really necessary, and changing how the necessary is done. This will include reducing the need to travel, changing travel modes, reducing heat demand and energy demand, expecting reduced consumption of material goods, de-centralising some services, increased recycling and all the needs of moving to a low carbon circular economy. This transformation needs to take place in the lifetime of this Plan to avoid catastrophic climate change. We challenge the housing target for the reasons given above. The calculation must use the latest data available (2018 ONS) and consider true need, not what some may want. Green Belt land must be assessed on a wider range of levels than just the five tests, as its ecosystem services and biodiversity value are vital in the fight against climate change. See attached document (labelled response to Q2.16)	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676767				
1249015	LPIO-25568				12,000 net new dwellings is the absolute minimum the Council should be planning and should be uplifted up to 1,300 dwellings per annum over a 20-year period. Agree the provision of up to 80ha of new employment land is justified but do not consider that this aligns with the housing requirement. Agree the Council should be seeking to maximise development densities on urban sites but the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. Agree that there are significant issues with the viability of development in parts of Wirral which will impact on the Council's ability to identify some sites as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the plan period. Agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs. Agree that the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but that there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution. Do not agree that the Council should wait until they have undertaken further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt. Land will need to come out of the Green Belt regardless of any further work.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684897				
1243721	LPIO-2565	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		We support the apparent regeneration first policy but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1246458	LPIO-25705				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246459	LPIO-25706				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1249100	LPIO-25872 1 of 3				12,000 net new dwellings is the absolute minimum the Council should be planning and should be uplifted up to 1,300 dwellings per annum over a 20-year period. Agree the provision of up to 80ha of new employment land is justified but do not consider that this aligns with the housing requirement. Agree the Council should be seeking to maximise development densities on urban sites but the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. Agree that there are significant issues with the viability of development in parts of Wirral which will impact on the Council's ability to identify some sites as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the plan period. Agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs. Agree that the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but that there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507		
1249100	LPIO-25872 2 of 3				12,000 net new dwellings is the absolute minimum the Council should be planning and should be uplifted up to 1,300 dwellings per annum over a 20-year period. Agree the provision of up to 80ha of new employment land is justified but do not consider that this aligns with the housing requirement. Agree the Council should be seeking to maximise development densities on urban sites but the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. Agree that there are significant issues with the viability of development in parts of Wirral which will impact on the Council's ability to identify some sites as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the plan period. Agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs. Agree that the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but that there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution.	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-25872 3 of 3				12,000 net new dwellings is the absolute minimum the Council should be planning and should be uplifted up to 1,300 dwellings per annum over a 20-year period. Agree the provision of up to 80ha of new employment land is justified but do not consider that this aligns with the housing requirement. Agree the Council should be seeking to maximise development densities on urban sites but the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. Agree that there are significant issues with the viability of development in parts of Wirral which will impact on the Council's ability to identify some sites as 'deliverable' or 'developable' within the plan period. Agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs. Agree that the majority of the existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within the Green Belt but that there are areas that currently only make a weak contribution.	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-25873 1 of 3				Do not agree that the Council should wait until they have undertaken further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt. Land will need to come out of the Green Belt regardless of any further work.	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-25873 2 of 3				Do not agree that the Council should wait until they have undertaken further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt. Land will need to come out of the Green Belt regardless of any further work.	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-25873 3 of 3				Do not agree that the Council should wait until they have undertaken further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt. Land will need to come out of the Green Belt regardless of any further work.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507		

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1244896	LPIO-2627	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		Wirral's Housing Need is nowhere near 12,000 new-build homes. Population growth has been virtually NIL and is projected as low; inward migration is low and Cabinet LP Lead and Senior Officers have confirmed there will be NO policy to encourage it; Cabinet LP Lead stated no-one in Council believes 12,000 is correct – actual is lower; affordability is comparatively good, showing (as successive Secretaries of State have said) Wirral is NOT an area of higher Housing pressure; numbers on the Housing List bear little relationship to 12,000 figure – under 1,500; and expert advisors to Council (Universities) and from WGSA have all concluded that figure should be nearer 3,000. And now the Queen's Speech shows Government has reduced its estimate of need by 33% - but WBC won't budge. Shame. 80ha Employment land is overstated – still unrealistic aspirational growth assumptions. Reclassify more long-unused land for housing. Densities should be maximised taking due regard of good design, local character and open space requirements. Council admitted inadequate working with Neighbouring LAs. As Wirral's Regeneration needs are as acute and primary as when the LAs within Merseyside County Council drew up tight Green Belt boundaries on Wirral to direct development towards Regeneration, Wirral should DEMAND the same Policy now. Wirral has admitted being very slow to engage with Homes England and others over viability issues of brownfield sites and urgently needs to secure much more funding from Government, Homes England and other public and private sectors. At a recent Full Council Meeting, figures of £200m and £250m were quoted as available and waiting for Wirral to apply in the appropriate manner. So far just £6m has been secured in conjunction with Peel. Greenbelt assessment comments given earlier.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/567751				
1249782	LPIO-26420				We do not agree that the Council must only plan for up to 12,000 net new dwellings; this is an absolute minimum that should not be automatically translated to the housing requirement figure. Instead, the Council should be considering an economic growth led figure, which exceeds the standard method figure. The Council should also be pursuing a longer plan period than the minimum 15-year plan period requirement, rather a minimum 20-year period due to the historic issues faced in the Wirral in terms of the already protracted process to adopt an up-to-date Local Plan. We disagree with the strong focus and over-reliance on delivery within the urban area, as we have significant concerns that the urban area will not be able to provide the number of homes envisaged or achieve the types of homes that are needed. We agree that the Council should continue to work with neighbouring authorities and remain open to the fact that it may need to accommodate some of Liverpool's needs, in line with the Duty to Cooperate. We agree that the Council need to undertake further work on the supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land which will need to inform decisions regarding the clear need to take land out of the existing Green Belt. We have significant concerns with the evidence base which supports the Council's preferred option of Heswall under Spatial Option 2B. This is because: the alternative option of Eastham performs similarly well on a number of matters (see Appendix 2 for full details); Eastham performs better on landscape sensitivity grounds; and The evidence base has not comprehensively assessed the Eastham urban expansion area as thoroughly as Heswall, therefore does not allow for cross-comparison of the two options to support the Council's justification for identifying Heswall as the preferred option. The Council must address these issues and gaps in the evidence base as part of future rounds of consultation on the Local Plan, so that the plan can be deemed sound.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683892				
1249219	LPIO-26459				We support the apparent regeneration first policy, but we do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677529	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677528			
1243254	LPIO-26576				Regenerated, Wirral can once more play a huge role in the 'Northern Powerhouse' and become a net contributor to the Economy and life of its Peninsula, to the Region, to the North generally, and even to the Country. Conclusions of the flawed Green Belt Review include the entirely unnecessary and inappropriate designation of vast areas of so-called 'Weakly Performing Green Belt'. Almost all of the areas designated as such are clearly NOT weakly performing as regards the Purposes of Green Belt. Such an extensive designation would condemn large tracts of Green Belt land to a decline in productive use and proper management, as landowners and developers with options sit by with increased land values on their 'books' whilst awaiting any opportunity to build. In addition, the Review fails to take proper account of 'character' and 'productive' nature of the Green Belt, which in the future will only grow in significance as sustainable, climate-controlling, pollution-reducing, and local food-producing farmland. Further, little regard is taken of the role Green Belt is playing now and will increasingly do so, in making a massive contribution to the quality of life, health, the tourist industry, outdoor leisure and sporting activities, and the local economy, as well as protecting wildlife, their habitats and heritage. There is certainly no need to destroy wonderful countryside with its distinct towns, villages and community life to appease landowners and developers who seek easier, short-term financial gains. Allowing new housing within Green Belt would actually stall rather than encourage much-needed regeneration elsewhere. To downgrade the significance of the potential of Wirral's Green Belt to improve the life chances of those most in need is deplorable.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	
1243254	LPIO-26577				The latest Green Belt Review may tick more boxes of a 'sound' process but in several ways it is less acceptable or useful than its forerunner. It is substantially flawed and does not recognise the 'exceptional circumstances' applying to Wirral. Consequently, many of its critical conclusions are either wrong or inappropriate. Its approach seems more in keeping with the Council's former, now admitted and abandoned, policy of releasing Green Belt for development. Interpretation of the Five Purposes of Green Belt appears somewhat unusual, rather extreme, and poorly applied to Wirral's particular situation, as explained in brief below. Purpose 1: to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas. This has been taken to refer only to Birkenhead and conjoined communities. This is ridiculous. For example, Thingwall, Pensby, Heswall and Gayton each have different characters and communities but constitute a large built-up area where further 'sprawl' would be detrimental and cause 'Harm' in planning terms. Consequently, many areas of Green Belt are undervalued in the Review as regards contribution. Purpose 2: to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. This appears to have been misinterpreted and misrepresented by both the Reviewer and the Planning Department. The Reviewer attributes to the term 'town' a scale that the Guidance, precedent and Case Law do not. Worse, it takes no account of 'distinct communities', character or extent of linkage which Guidance, precedent and Case Law do. WGSA has received legal advice on this. For example, Irby, Thingwall and Pensby are each very different communities, in character, form, scale and hub (community buildings, retail centres, etc.). To infill between these very distinct communities (Parcel 7.27 [SP060] Land between Irby and Pensby) would defeat Purpose 2 (as suggested by the Site Title alone), create a very large built-up area, and effect enormous 'Harm' to ancient woodland, pollute a watercourse, damage ecology and wildlife (including a cross-Wirral 'green corridor'), also heritage remains and artifacts related to ancient farmsteads, the remains of the first Irby Village, a fine and rare example of medieval farming land formation, connections to the Battle of Brunanburh and the historic routes between Dawpool Port and several villages.						
1240932	LPIO-26594	no			No, we disagree with the Council's analysis of, and conclusions drawn from, the key messages discussed at paragraph 2.130 of the Issues and Options document. 12,000 net new dwellings: We consider that a figure of 1,300 dwellings per annum would likely represent a closer alignment with the Council's growth aspirations and should be included in the emerging Local Plan. This would result in 19,500 homes being required over the plan period. Maximise development densities on sites within the urban area: This must be aligned with delivering the mix, type and tenure of homes that the Borough requires. The Council's Preferred Approach of driving up densities on urban brownfield sites risks an overprovision of small apartment units and a significant under provision of the larger family homes and affordable homes which the Council's evidence shows are required. We will continue to undertake work to ensure that our supply of 'deliverable' and 'developable' urban land has been thoroughly examined before making any decisions regarding the need to take land out of the existing Green Belt: Whilst this approach broadly aligns with Government guidance in the Framework, it is clear from the evidence provided that the exceptional circumstances exist to warrant releasing land from the Green Belt to meet the Borough's development needs and to enable a sound Local Plan to be produced.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701			
1245180	LPIO-2663	no			I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1245073	LPIO-2898	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		I totally disagree with the proposed figure of 12,000 homes required between 2020-2035. I object strongly to you including this figure in Section 2.130 as the first of your key messages to take away as a strategic conclusion from your "evidence base conclusions" when not one scrap of evidence has been presented to justify this figure using local facts and figures. I object to you discounting the public submissions and expert reports from the Universities of Manchester and Liverpool simply because you don't like the numbers because they project that only half of the 12,000 homes are likely to be required (see answers to question 2.2). I disagree with your classification of weakly performing Green Belt land because the reasons for its very existence are stronger now than they have ever been. Viability aka profitability should not be used as a means to justify Green Belt release. No building should take place on Green Belt. Hinting that even some may be released will stifle investment and development of brownfield sites, and delay any homes being built anywhere.						
1245159	LPIO-2966	yes									
1244896	LPIO-3018	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		We have summarised our comments in our earlier Responses. In addition to the uploaded documents and evidence of our earlier Responses, we would refer assessors to a further Report (File Ref: Wirral Household Projections and Standard Method IOD). Please take account of the section relevant to this Question.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677113					
1241315	LPIO-3037	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1241491	LPIO-3977	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		We disagree with the 'key message' that 12,000 homes are required in the plan-period. Evidence provided by experts at Manchester and Liverpool Universities, and local experts, has been provided to the Council. This evidence produces a revised figure that represents the real need that exists in the Borough.					
1245501	LPIO-3998	no	Housing need; Employment need; Assessment of greenbelt;		This proposal was compiled under too short a timescale to allow a thorough and detailed investigation of the real need for Wirral going into the next 30 years due to the incompetence and negligence of the leaders of Wirral Council. A more credible, open and approachable investigation should be conducted that truly allows for the participation by Wirral residents into the future plan for their living and working environment.					
1245289	LPIO-4077	no	Housing need;		As noted earlier I think that the number of new houses required is overstated and that in turn is driving a bigger requirement for land use than necessary with the consequent impact on pollution, local services, drainage systems & carbon footprint.					
1240939	LPIO-4111	yes								
1245638	LPIO-4222	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1245153	LPIO-4356	yes								
1244629	LPIO-4520	no	Housing need; Development density; Assessment of greenbelt;		I am not a planner but a retired engineer. Of the evidence i have seen, a fair portion of it seems unclear and leaves one to question it. Under these circumstances I feel lost of it should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1237667	LPIO-4534	no	Housing need; Employment need; Assessment of greenbelt;		For the reasons set out above I consider the housing requirement of 12000 to be excessive. I also consider that the new employment land may be overstated. I support the regeneration first and use of brownfield sites. I do not consider that there is any necessity to encroach upon the Green Belt nor do I accept that the classification method properly reflects the value of the Green Belt as a whole nor the value of areas the the Green Belt as a whole.					
1244720	LPIO-4598	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		We do not need 12,000 new homes over 15 years. The calculation which has been used by WBC is flawed. We currently have 5,000 empty properties(2018 figures) which, following appropriate restitution could be classified as new homes. We have several large housing developments across Wirral which have not been included in the total targets, see above. Wirral requires homes for RENT and not new homes to buy, since most people who are on waiting lists are not in a position to buy. Rental property, as well as homes to buy, do not have to be NEWLY built. The housing strategy adopted by Wirral is driven by those in the house building and property and land owning sector, and not by the average citizen.					
1238550	LPIO-4627	no			It is clear that the council wants early development of greenbelt (specifically option 2B) at the commencement of the timescale of the local plan as this will require minimum effort to deliver results early on. They have therefore started with the conclusion that greenbelt is required and all the reports on the amenity, viability and infrastructure have then been framed to fit this conclusion. Greenbelt should not be considered but if the council have to include it as claimed it should not form part of the local plan until the very latest part of the timescale if the numbers cannot be met elsewhere. Developers clearly have plans in place and should not be able to dictate that they will only develop brownfield if they can also have greenbelt. The council needs a strategy to avoid being held to ransom by developers land banking. Had the council acted on the requirement for a local plan in a timely manner we would not be in this position. Green Belt should not pay the price for council incompetence and developer greed.					
1237696	LPIO-4685	yes								
1242528	LPIO-475	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	
1246041	LPIO-5545	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;								
1246159	LPIO-5590	no	Development / Viability issues;		I do not understand how the development / viability issues have been determined, particularly their scale. These issues - particularly relating to Wirral Waters and wider Birkenhead regeneration - need to be set in context of the potentially huge benefits in terms of transforming this area, let alone avoiding unnecessary countryside development.						
1245767	LPIO-5848	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		For reasons stated answering previous questions, I believe the 12,000 units hugely overstates Wirral's actual housing need which I believe experts have assessed at nearer 3,000 for the plan period. I agree that consideration should be given to increasing development densities within existing urban areas, provided that it is respectful of its surroundings and any existing neighbouring development. I agree that the Council should continue to undertake work to maximise delivery of developable land in urban areas. I don't believe that a true estimate of Wirral's housing need justifies any consideration of taking land out of the Green Belt.						
1246303	LPIO-5874	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;		I believe that the housing requirements is an over assessment and that the need for the use of greenbelt in any circumstances is not valid till full urban regeneration has taken place.						
1246310	LPIO-5918	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1242751	LPIO-592	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.						
1246339	LPIO-6099	no	Housing need;								
1241133	LPIO-61	no			It is difficult to state yes or no The document is long winded and complex. You need to be legally trained to fully understand it. More than likely to put the public off opposing anything the council want to do ?						
1238310	LPIO-6130	no	Other (please state below); Housing need; Employment need; Development/Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		The key message is WBC is not ready to produce a plan. The issue of the draft plan should be delayed. WBC states they have to plan for 12000 new dwellings. WBC have published commissioned reports that have proved they need to provide 6000 homes maximum for a predicted population growth of 4700 over 15 years The NPPF allows issues of viability of both greenbelt and brownfield site to be decided by use of Typologies. This information is in the 2018 Viability report. Arup's report gives an overall assessment of how greenbelt strength works as a whole across Wirral. Most option 2a is in area 3 strong greenbelt. The NPPF states greenbelt is to be assessed as a whole. WBC have ignored this principle and weakened sites by isolating them. WBC does not have to use greenbelt if brownfield sites currently have no deliverable or developable evidence. NPPF allows brownfield sites to be included in the plan as developable on typology test. Option 1a has a brownfield capacity for 8500 homes. WBC has identified 15500 brownfield sites. The plan only needs 5 years of deliverable sites, 5050 homes. Green belt need not be introduced. A key message is sites with developer interests are being prioritised above all other factors. This does not constitute an analysis of the evidence. The selection process Appendix 4.7 does not check the selected sites thoroughly against all the evidence base. The sustainability, habitats and traffic spatial modelling reports were not used in the site selection process. The greenbelt sites were chosen before the reports were completed. This is not in the best interest of the Wirral or in line with the documents approach statements 2.12 Secretary of State (MHCLG) 2019. Stated that "Up-to-date plans are essential in providing clarity to communities and developers about where homes should be built and where not, so that development is planned rather than the result of speculative applications Sustainability is not listed as a key message.						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1240964	LPIO-6159	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;							
1246161	LPIO-6223	yes			Agree with overall messages. We need to ensure that these principles are underpinned by improvements to health infrastructure.					
1245086	LPIO-6270	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Employment need; Development / Viability issues;		There is ample evidence (see my answers to earlier questions) that we do not need to build 12000 new homes. It seems that the effects of brexit & the corona virus will have a large negative impact on the economy, already depressed by long years of totally unnecessary austerity & any projection of future employment needs has to be reassessed. One thing is for certain - the green belt must not be built on & the excellent plans for the regeneration of Birkenhead should go a long way to ensuring that there is no need for it to be built on.					
1246402	LPIO-6401	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		I don't trust the projections					
1246425	LPIO-6537	no	Other (please state below); Development/Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		We disagree with the Council's analysis of the key messages from the 2019 Green Belt Review because it is inconsistent with national policy to review Green Belt boundaries on the basis of an area of land's contribution to Green Belt purposes only. National policy says that when reviewing Green Belt boundaries, the need to promote sustainable patterns of development should be taken into account (138, Framework). Where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has previously been developed and/or is well serviced by public transport (138, Framework). In suggesting areas of land for potential release from the Green Belt the Council has made no assessment of whether a parcel has been previously developed and/or is well served by public transport. Consequently, each parcel should be assessed against these two points and parcel's that perform highest on this assessment should be given first consideration for potential release. By not taking into account the need to promote sustainable patterns of development in suggesting potential sites to be released from the Green Belt the Council's analysis has resulted in an unsound spatial strategy that is not in accordance with its own preferred approach of encouraging increased development in the Urban Conurbation. See further comment in the attached report.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/566956				
1246348	LPIO-6587	no	Housing need; Employment need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues; Development density;		The whole exercise is based on a false assumption - that we need 12,000 houses when we do not. So as the foundation upon which everything else depends is false then so are the proposals.					
1241096	LPIO-6705	yes				https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684262	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661944			
1246401	LPIO-6920				I do not agree with the analysis and wonder how conclusions were reached. Local people are well placed to make comment and should be allowed that opportunity.					
1246482	LPIO-7016	no	Housing need; Employment need; Assessment of greenbelt;		From the beginning, the Council is using invalid data and from that data, the entire plan has been made very badly.					
1246488	LPIO-7115				I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246551	LPIO-7474 1 of 2	yes			In response to Q2.17 there should be a presumption in favour to develop land that is deliverable within the existing urban areas and the re-allocation of achievable sites in urban areas for residential development should be promoted over the extension of urban settlements to Green Belt land. The particular object site located to Paulsfield Drive Woodland represents one such opportunity to achieve the key aims of the Local Plan to be sound in its strategy for delivery of 12000 new dwellings throughout the plan period. The particular site is presently underutilised land that forms a reasonable option for meeting identified development need prior to considering Green Belt land as an option. The site constitutes an option for the Council's preferred option to identify sufficient 'deliverable' land to meet development needs within the existing urban area. Paragraph 99 of National Planning Policy Framework states designation of land as Local Green Space should be consistent with local planning of sustainable development and complement investment in sufficient homes. Furthermore, NPPF (para. 99) states that Local Green Spaces should only be designated when a plan is prepared or updated and be capable of enduring beyond the end of the plan period. Paragraph 100 of NPPF states that Local Green Space should only be used where the green space is demonstrably special to a local community and holds a particular local significance.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/567967				
1246551	LPIO-7474 2 of 2	yes			The designation of Local Green Space must be consistent with planning for sustainable development and should not undermine the aim of plan making. Local Green Space will rarely be appropriate where the land has planning permission for development, which this site does – as can be seen from the scout hut and the previously developed land that is formed by a concrete element to the site for a previously installed swimming pool. The site is furthermore, on private land and not accessible to the wider public and should not therefore be considered as contributing toward amenity space for the area, to which there is an abundance. Designation as urban open space is not therefore appropriate and given the present situation with regard to the former concrete swimming pool; the post development benefits of the site from an aesthetic green value is to be enhanced when compared to the presently proposed allocation. The minimum standard for the supply of accessible public open space which is currently set at 2.4 hectares for every thousand people does not take into consideration the soundness of the Local Plan moving forward and the development needs of the borough. The network analysis based on the principle that no part of the Primarily Residential Area should be further than comfortable walking distance away from an open space would not be impacted by the allocation of new development land in this location to meet the borough's development needs.					
1240932	LPIO-7604	no	Other (please state below); Housing need; Development density; Development/Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;	Please refer to our accompanying representations.	No, Our Client disagrees with the Council's analysis of, and conclusions drawn from, the key messages discussed at paragraph 2.130 of the Issues and Options document. This follows our critique of the Council's Issues and Options document, evidence base and supplementary commentary provided by our consultant team which can be found in our representations. The table at paragraph 3.60 of our representations summarises our views on each issue, however in response to the key messages we believe that: 1. The Council underestimates its housing requirements and due to exceptional circumstances should plan for up to 19,500 homes over the plan period to align with its economic growth aspirations and affordable housing need; 2. Driving up densities on urban brownfield sites risks an overprovision of small apartment units and a significant under-provision of the larger family and affordable homes which the Council's evidence shows are required; 3. Council has provided insufficient information to make a full assessment of the various viability assumptions proposed. It is our view that a significant number of the Council's proposed urban allocations have critical gaps in their viability and as such are not deliverable or developable; 4. The majority of existing Green Belt makes a moderate or strong contribution to the purposes of including land within Green Belt, however there are a number of parcels that make a weak contribution including those identified in their assessment for the Council with some further parcels identified by Barnes Walker in their report which accompanies these representations; and 5. It is clear from the evidence provided to accompany our representations that the exceptional circumstances exist to warrant releasing land from the Green Belt to meet the Borough's development needs and to enable a sound Local Plan to be produced.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701		
1246581	LPIO-7636	no	Assessment of greenbelt;	I not believe that there is any need for the release of Green belt and identification of specific green Belt sites where an erroneous classification has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking						
1243342	LPIO-768	yes								
1246592	LPIO-7695	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part. No development on any greenbelt					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246431	LPIO-7740	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		Housing need has been addressed in great detail by experts in the field and the 12,000 figure contradicts work commissioned by the council from Liverpool and Manchester universities. I can not find any reference to grading greenbelt as weakly performing in the NPPF. So called weakly performing sites which are being put forward have developer interest and are therefore being put at risk of unnecessarily developed, since the council has identified sufficient brownfield sites, especially if the lower housing number was used.					
1246594	LPIO-7764	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		Much of the due diligence and assessment of Green Belt land is flawed by having Agricultural land included within potential Green Belt Land release parcels. WBC is going against their own logic to simply 'make up the numbers' and these parcels should be removed from any kind of potential identification - SP030 is a prime example. WBC have protected Agricultural land.					
1240903	LPIO-7845	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246596	LPIO-7981	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;		Do not think there is any need for use of green belt land.					
1246605	LPIO-8127	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1246598 Hoylake Vision	LPIO-8151	yes								
1239029	LPIO-824	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		We do not need 12000 new dwellings. The Green Belt should remain.					
1246612	LPIO-8279	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		I think your overestimation of housing need has caused you to consider the greenbelt. If you use your other estimates of housing need then greenbelt is removed from the plan. So do that! Once you have done that you can then focus all your efforts on developing a vision for Birkenhead and then you will have all Wirral residents supporting you 100%					
1237882	LPIO-8321	no	Housing need;		I question the 'key message' that 12,000 homes are required in the plan-period. I am aware that information has been provided to the WBC that indicates the need is significantly lower than the Local Housing Need calculation. I urge the Council seriously consider this information and review the proposals as appropriate.					
1244670	LPIO-8432	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					
1243448	LPIO-852	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Employment need;		According to historical data from the Office of National Statistics, the population of the Wirral reached its peak around 1970 and has been decreasing ever since until 2000 when there has been a small annual increase. The projections of future housing need made by WBC are pure fiction! The population of Wirral is made up of a high percentage of elderly/retired people. This group do not have a high requirement for employment opportunities. The green areas of Wirral should be protected at all costs. Any future developments MUST NOT be on greenbelt/field sites. If large scale development of Wirral is to go ahead it will cease to be the pleasant place that its residents enjoy today.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246624	LPIO-8538	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		As this report states you had to revisit earlier proposals following residents outcry. I do not have trust in your projections, I do not believe you have changed your strategy					
1237832	LPIO-8581	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		You should continue strongly to challenge the arbitrary and inflated target for building houses. It would make sense to create a sub-plan for a smaller more realistic target - one which WMBC itself could evidence the need for. The key issue is Green Belt. It is needed. If you are going to remove any part of it for development, you must add (newly designate) an equivalent area elsewhere. This could be done across Merseyside. I do not accept your notion of a "weak contribution", a term invented simply to remove land from designation. All it means is "on the edge". It all contributes equally.					
1240872	LPIO-8610	no	Housing need; Development density; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		SP043 wrongly classed as a weak performing site. This needs correcting as the site is moderate to high performing. 12000 is incorrect and needs revising to take the correct growth figures into account. Densities must remain as is with the exception of Wirral Waters					
1246638	LPIO-8679	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt; Development density;							
1246631	LPIO-8684	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		The assessment of different parcels of greenbelt land appears to be highly subjective. Describing some of it as weakly performing is at best disingenuous, since all of it contributes significantly, when assessed against the five tests. Clearly, the last (assisting in urban regeneration) is hugely important, but, in such a relatively confined geographical area as Wirral, the importance of each designated parcel of greenbelt in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment is also incalculable. There is also an important point about setting a precedent. Allowing certain parts of the greenbelt to be released now will help pave the way for further releases in the future, especially since the house-building developments that occur as a result of the release will help to cause so-called weak performance of other parts of it.					
1246544	LPIO-8741	yes			Yes, except for the baseline figure of 12000 houses being needed					
1237807	LPIO-8847	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		12000 houses must be challenged. This one sized fits all concept is nonsense. So perhaps Wirral should show some backbone and work for all its citizens by not agreeing with the concept. Only the market can decide if a site is deliverable and developable. There are no experts for this. The awful example of Oak and Eldon gardens should never be forgotten. There are no areas of the green belt that make a weak contribution. They may make a different contribution depending on the circumstances, but 'weak' is a subjective word that can be applied, changed or modified according to changing circumstances and the opinion of the planning authority and of landowner or developer.					
1237724	LPIO-8921	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;		Did the Council consult but then ignore the views of respondents, but in a round about way?:- By continuing to suggest that there might just be a need to release large parcels of green belt despite the clear wishes of the populous. Ignoring the fact that building on the greenbelt, the easy option will stall the regeneration of brownfield sites which will continue to blight the area. By continuing to suggest that some green belt land is weakly performing when it is demonstrably not. By continuing to insist that they are duty bound to build huge numbers of house which are clearly not needed. By ignoring the productive character and nature of the greenbelt which in future will only grow in significance as climate change, sustainable and local food production become major issues. In addition, and we have witnessed with Corona pandemic a huge increase in the use of our greenbelt fields for leisure and walking and hopefully this may persist after we are through with it.					
1246678	LPIO-9287	no	Assessment of greenbelt;		Green Belt is Green Belt, it is there to prevent Urban Sprawl. To state one area of Green Belt achieves this better than another is beyond comprehension.					
1241495	LPIO-9382	no	Other (please state below); Assessment of greenbelt; Housing need;	Climate Emergency	I disagree with the housing target. This should be set using the latest data. Houses should only be built based on a genuine need. When assessing Green Belt land for release due consideration should be given to its value for wildlife. No, there is no mention of the climate emergency. This must be recognised and appropriate measures taken.					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.17 - Do you agree with any of our analysis of the key messages from the evidence we have collected so far?	Question 2.17a - If you answered No, which key messages don't you agree with? (please select):	Question 2.17b - If you answered Other, please state here:	Question 2.17c - If No, please explain why (clearly stating the subject/evidence topic). If Yes, you can comment here:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5
1246699	LPIO-9533	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		Broadly agree with key messages to build in urban areas but:- the forecasts of need underpinning this analysis are just wrong and not based on recent experience. Recent economic shocks will no doubt make this error even more pronounced - the plan should be based on the homes that are needed not the viability and profitability of developers - it is 'loud and clear' that the green belt should not be released at all. Green belt should be absolutely protected					
1246705	LPIO-9543	yes			As stated in earlier section comments, the figures for required new homes are difficult to substantiate in the light of actual population growth. This undermines the majority of the plans.					
1246693	LPIO-9614	no	Housing need; Employment need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is out of date, incorrect and dubious the most obvious being the population growth. 1997 - 2017 population growth 100 and then the Council wants to use a standard calculation for 12000 house over the next 15 years. The figures just dont add up and there is a lack of evidence. All residents should be given full disclosure with accurate information and the opportunity to consult on this should be provided.					
1238193	LPIO-9634	yes			Appendix 3 of the Issues and Options document submitted as part of Question 10.1 provides commentary on a number of the Council's technical evidence base documents that support the Local Plan Issues and Options. These comments are primarily transport and infrastructure focused.					
1246717	LPIO-9644	no	Other (please state below); Assessment of greenbelt	Preferred Strategy for residential development	Strategy It is considered that the strategy to meet all of the Borough's development needs by focusing development on a significant number of previously developed sites within the existing urban area is a high risk strategy. At Paragraph 4.7, the most recent SHLAA shows that currently there may not be enough specific deliverable or developable sites within the urban area and on existing brownfield sites that are able to provide the number of new homes or the mix of types and sizes of property required to be delivered within the Plan period. Therefore, dispersed Green Belt release as identified within Option 2A would support and 'de-risk' the Urban Intensification strategy by meeting any residual requirements. Previously developed sites within the urban area are generally significantly more constrained than greenfield sites which form part of the Green Belt. Land ownership within urban areas is often more complex, where scheme development, agreement of any planning obligations and delivery may depend on successful co-operation of multiple land-owners. Accordingly, these sites require more investment to make them suitable for residential development, and generally have longer lead-in times. A large number of the proposed urban housing allocations identified within Appendix 4.1 have small residential capacities and as such the successful delivery of the Urban Intensification Strategy relies on a large number of these sites coming forward. Greenbelt In line with the proposed settlement hierarchy, if dispersed Green Belt release is considered, those parcels which are adjacent to the Urban Conurbation should be considered for release, and allocation for residential development. We do not agree that sites should be discounted on the basis of being located within a parcel scored as making a moderate contribution, due to the significant size and varied character of some parcels, set out in the Supporting Statement submitted to Question 2.16.					
1246691	LPIO-9718	yes			I support the apparent regeneration first policy, but I do not believe that there is any need for the release of Green Belt and the identification of specific Green Belt sites where an erroneous classification methodology has been employed and any detailed on the ground land characterisation is lacking.					
1246719	LPIO-9858	no	Housing need; Assessment of greenbelt;		The housing need over the next 15 years is hugely overstated! Even if there was sufficient additional employment to support such a number, the infrastructure needed to support such an increase would be catastrophic for the Wirral, not to mention the additional schools, hospitals etc. Completely unviable.					
1238147	LPIO-9860	no	Housing need; Development / Viability issues; Assessment of greenbelt;		The housing need has been overestimated and therefore forces a review of Green Belt land which undermines the primary objective of urban regeneration. The assessment of the Green Belt is flawed and does not recognise the role it plays in urban regeneration. Brownfield sites in Birkenhead would become more viable if there was more focus on obtaining government grants.					
1246724	LPIO-9895	no	Assessment of greenbelt; Development / Viability issues; Development density; Employment need; Housing need;		I believe that much of the evidence collected is dubious to say the least and should be looked at again giving residents the opportunity to take part.					

