

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1245794	LPIO-4893	no	"Settlement" is a WBC invention, with no existence in the NPPF or credibility in planning terms. Heswall, Pensby, Irby and Barnston are entirely separate settlements, not one enormous "enclosed area".							
1244681	LPIO-1215	no	I do not agree with the 'Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7)'. The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldý, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch'. But 'Urban settlement' is not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their independent, separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities.							
1246792	LPIO-4910	no	I do not agree with the 'Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7)'. The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldý, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch'. But 'Urban settlement' is not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their independent, separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities.							
1245346	LPIO-3247	no	I do not agree with the 'Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7)'. The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldý, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch'. But 'Urban settlement' is not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their independent, separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities.							
1248825	LPIO-10634	no	Any hierarchy should not treat Wirral Waters and all other parts of the Urban Conurbation equally, as currently proposed. Wirral Waters (and potentially other strategic regeneration sites) should either sit at an elevated level, above the Urban Conurbation or could be clearly identified as the priority area(s) within this level of the hierarchy. This approach would be consistent with the recognised role of these areas 'at the heart' of the top tier and the stated purpose of focussing development towards the areas with the greatest need. In addition, it would also direct development towards the areas with the greatest opportunity for change and responding to these needs – namely Wirral Waters.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684264						
1246747	LPIO-9967	no	Areas on the outer edges of West Wirral settlements (such as Caldý, West Kirby, Greasby, Irby) are currently very rural, and are havens for wildlife. With the greenbelt at risk - these currently defined settlements, and their surrounding countryside, are at risk of being subsumed by urban sprawl. Therefore the green areas on the outer edges of these 'suburban' settlements should be given the same protection as the areas surrounding small villages and hamlets.							
1237937	LPIO-9517	no	As a general comment, this consultation is extremely difficult to understand online. I accept that more houses will be needed and that these should be shared across the area. My only concern, where I live, is that all green space from Lever Causeway to Raby Mere has been put forward for building. I think it reasonable to build on some of it, but to build on all of it would be catastrophic for the area. In particular, loss of Storeton Woods, the Dibbinsdale Nature Reserve, and Claremont Farm, should be avoided at all costs.							
1241319	LPIO-10046	no	As addressed in the previous questions I would like west wirral the be grouped into large villages for protection purposes.							
1239029	LPIO-662	no	As commented in 2.4. You seem to have introduced these settlement areas to make make changes to the green belt easier to achieve because the requirement to maintain the individuality of small villages has been conveniently removed.							
1245443	LPIO-3675	no	As I stated previously is too vast and there are other places on the Wirral that could be regenerated to accommodate new builds							
1245288	LPIO-3694	yes	As previous comments.							
1246736	LPIO-26560	yes	As previous question, our client agrees that Eastham should be included within the area identified as the Urban Conurbation and would welcome development within the village, specifically at the site at Eastham Hall.							
1240872	LPIO-8505	no	As previously explained concentrating urbanization on the East of the M53 is not possible as multiple housing estates have been built making this area overutilized. There are places like Spital which cannot be urbanised further, they do not have that characteristic and must be removed from this zone.							
1248487	LPIO-24065		Broadly agree with settlement definitions and groupings. Given that there is no clear distinction between Birkenhead and its conurbation, it is strategically appropriate for these areas to be considered as one, with the M53 used to delineate the western most boundary of the Urban Conurbation.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656330	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656329					
1246678	LPIO-9267	no	Brown Field should be the only places to build on as this will cause regeneration in struggling areas as opposed to causing stress on semi rural areas.							
1244956	LPIO-1676	no	Caldý should not be designated as an urban settlement. It should be designated as a large or small village.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247839	LPIO-23440		Comment relating to the 'Settlement Hierarchy' and re-designation of Eastham as a 'Small Village' Wirral Local Plan 2020 - 2035 Issues and Options Consultation As Eastham Ward Councillors we have received representations from the Eastham Village Preservation Association. In the original consultation Eastham village and its green belt were included in 'Settlement Area 8' or the Rural Areas. Concerns have been raised that Eastham Village has now been 'lumped together' with 'everything else on East Wirral' as being in the Urban Conurbation. On behalf of the Association, Chair of the EVPA, fears that this means Eastham will be subject to even greater development pressures than previously by being considered along with Birkenhead and Bromborough. Chair of the Association argues that its removal splits the Green Belt and makes the argument for developing this critical part of the Green Belt easier to progress. He has, therefore, requested that 'Eastham Village and the surrounding must be reinstated in the 'small village' category.' Urban conurbation (previously identified as settlement areas 1-4): Bidston, Birkenhead, BEbington, Beechwood, Bromborough, Bromborough Pool, Cloughton, Eastham, Egremont, Liscard, Mountwood, New Brighton, New Ferry, Noctorum, Oxtan, Port Sunlight, Poulton, Prenton, Raby Mere, Rock Ferry, Rock Park, Seacombe, Spital, Transmere, Wallasey Village Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7): Urban Barnston, Caldy, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton Pensby, thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch Large Village (previously identified as Settlement Area 8): Thornton Hough Small Village (previously identified as Settlement 8): Barnston Village, Brimstage, Frankby, Raby, Saughall Massie, Storeton, Thurstaston Hamlet (previously identified as Settlement Area8): Landican This refers to the table in the report which suggests classifications, above. On examining the point we accept his suggestion as entirely reasonable to avoid doubt about the intentions in the table. In order to provide proper re-assurance about Eastham Village, as distinct from the urban area of Eastham, it would be desirable to place Eastham in the 'small village' category. There are similarities with Saughall Massie. In our comments on the first round of consultation we sought to protect areas surrounding the village from development. In this we covered the issues affecting Carlett Park, Ferry Road, Rivacre Road, the hear of the village, essentially all land on the eastern side of the A41, especially agricultural land and land which retained the rural character of the area. With the exception of SPO 49 these areas are not included in the current consultation – but might be challenged by developers at a future inquiry. We have submitted detailed comments on SPO 49 separately							
1246348	LPIO-6062	no	Council should stop courting developers and address the true needs of Wirral and, under no circumstances, should building be allowed to take place on farmland and/or greenbelt, especially as we do not need the amount of housing the councils and developers want. These definitions are designed to make life easier for unnecessary development to take place.							
1249321	LPIO-26225	no	Disagree - Separate 'rural' from 'urban', otherwise it would be easier to build on Green Belt.							
1246594	LPIO-7720	no	Do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT. MANY GREENBELT SITES HAVE THEIR OWN INTRICACIES AND MANY HAVE DEFINED USES SUCH AS SP030 THAT IS AN ACTIVE FOOD PRODUCING ARABLE LAND. THESE SHOULD NOT EVEN BE CONSIDERED FOR RELEASE AT ANY POINT.							
1242519	LPIO-1561	no	Each town/village has its own identity and history, greenbelt surrounding these areas must be protected .							
1237807	LPIO-14374		Eastham Village Conservation Area and the adjacent land to the east of the A/41 must be returned to the rural areas category and Eastham included as a 'small village.'							
1239471	LPIO-22269	yes	Economy In relation to Town Centres and Retail, (paras 6.32 – 6.57) we welcome the categorisation of West Kirby as a Town Centre and we support the designated boundary to West Kirby Town Centre. We support the preferred approach in the Local Plan to best accommodate and encourage flexible uses in addition to retail that will complement town centres by maximising vitality and viability. We note the assessment of a need for some 1300sqm of convenience floorspace over the next 10 years in West Kirby and we welcome in principle that this demand should be met in the town. However we consider it equally if not more important that any such development is carried out in a form and at a scale which enhances the quality and character of the Town Centre for the benefit of those who use and visit it.							
1245767	LPIO-5816	no	Following on from my answer to Question 2.4, the suggested Urban Settlement groups together a large number of existing 'Townships'. These are strong distinct communities with their own individual character, identity, history and pride. They should continue to be treated as such individually.							
1246631	LPIO-8651	no	For the reasons given in my answer to question 2.4, I believe that most of the settlements categorised as urban developments (e.g. Irby, Thingwall, Caldy) should be re-designated as villages.							
1240964	LPIO-6077	no	Given the industrial and business future of the Wirral, which is unknown but not positive, then how can the creation of new villages either large or small be justified? These are the profit gems for the potential main developers, who are no doubt littering this consultation with their enthusiastic comments, regardless of the expense of the greenbelt.							
1245146	LPIO-2315	no	Grouping of areas as "settlements" is not defined in NPPF and identification of Heswall, Irby, Barnston and Pensby together as one area is erroneous and misleading.							
1246303	LPIO-5862	no	I am against any building on greenbelt land especially in our situation - climate change, Covid-19, Brexit. In my opinion it is vital that Wirral, and the nation, maintains the potential to increase local food production, namely by the efficient usage of agricultural land. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. Any large scale use of fields removes the potential for agriculture and when greenbelt is gone it will not return.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247981	LPIO-17938		I am baffled by any reference made by the Council to Settlement Areas. This term and these areas are of the Council's making and unknown to those of us who are residents.							
1238116	LPIO-886	yes	I am certain that the recent floods throughout GB should now be taken into account when determining planning applications. This must now trump all other considerations, economic or otherwise.							
1246699	LPIO-9521	no	I am concerned that the hierarchy might allow traditional green belt to be released to developers more easily. A simple urban /green belt split might be better							
1241924	LPIO-1005	no	I believe that villages should be kept as such to keep these communities intact. Making huge urban sprawls by filling green belt between villages will cause immense problems to these areas.							
1239492	LPIO-313	yes	I can only agree with the ones local to us - and understand the model by comparing our local areas with others. So the classifications for West Kirby, Hoylake, Caldy and Thurstaston all look appropriate.							
1246310	LPIO-5893	no	I certainly do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246624	LPIO-8509	no	I do not agree. Rural and Urban areas should be identified separately. It seems that to define an area as 'a settlement area' would enable swathes of greenbelt be identified for building by developers and or WMBC. Do not develop on Green belt - it should be left as it is.							
1242541	LPIO-1769	no	I do not agree that 'Urban Barnston, Caldy, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch' can be described as 'urban settlement'. There is no definition of 'urban settlement'. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities. Residents and other evidence documents view the areas as rural and villages. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. Residents view Barnston, Caldy, Gayton, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Pensby, Thingwall and West Kirby as separate entities. Settlement area 7 (Heswall Gayton, Pensby, Thingwall and Irby) is not continuous - specifically Heswall to Pensby, Pensby to Irby is separated by green spaces. Their needs are different and cannot be addressed by 'one size fits all' solution to a settlement area.							
1238549	LPIO-334	no	I do not agree with Irby being regarded as URBAN SETTLEMENT. Irby is still referred to as a Village locally. Past development has enlarged the area which tends to be Commuter belt. Major employment centres are Chester, Liverpool, Merseyside. Further development here will increase commuting and the environmental consequences.							
1238310	LPIO-6109	no	I do not agree with settlement definitions and grouping; these are not defined in the NPPF. There are no advantages to this re-structure only disadvantage. At worst we should retain the 8 settlement areas. I would like to see an increase in settlement areas. Villages such as Irby should be classed as an individual settlement when considering planning proposals. The 8 existing settlements are already blurring the edges of our individual areas. This proposal reduces Wirral to 2 very large areas and 3 small specialised areas. Larger settlement groupings lose the ability to assess in detail the requirements of the very different areas proposed to be grouped together, Caldy and Woodchurch for example. Planning should protect diversity; character and identity not eradicate it. The proposed regrouping does not bring any additional value to the regeneration of Birkenhead. WBC knows where Birkenhead is and what needs to be done. This regrouping will not change that. It does, however reduce the chances Woodchurch, Leasowe and Moreton from getting the help they need and reduces the protection Caldy Barnston Irby need from over development, losing character and keeping their individual and identity. The dangers of this have been made evident by the option 2a and 2b plans. Note; This is Wirral's local plan not Liverpool city regions plan. Comparison with City region is irrelevant							
1241723	LPIO-6543	no	I do not agree with the 'Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7)'. The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldy, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch'. But 'Urban settlement' is not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their independent, separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities.							
1247062	LPIO-10796		I do not agree with the settlement definitions and groupings. Such individual settlements as Barnston, Heswall, Irby and Pensby have their own characteristics and boundaries.							
1246402	LPIO-6378	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas as rural and urban and semi urban areas have their own identities and should maintain those separate identities. They are not defined in the NPPF. If any area was to become a settlement area it would open the floodgates and make it too easy for developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT. Green belt is a special area and this would destroy the character of many of Wirral's towns and villages.							
1245496	LPIO-3850	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement would mean it is far too easy for the council/developers to create huge areas of green belt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREEN BELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246760	LPIO-10070	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF and are completely at odds with the definition and purposes of Green Belt. The use of this term/classification makes me highly suspicious of the Council's intentions to circumnavigate the basic principles of the Green Belt. Taking this concept to the extreme, you could classify the whole of the Wirral as a settlement and infill the lot of it! Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245073	LPIO-2687	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF and are completely at odds with the definition and purposes of Green Belt. The use of this term/classification makes me highly suspicious of the Council's intentions to circumnavigate the basic principles of the Green Belt. Taking this concept to the extreme, you could classify the whole of the Wirral as a settlement and infill the lot of it! Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245994	LPIO-9928	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF and are completely at odds with the definition and purposes of Green Belt. The use of this term/classification makes me highly suspicious of the Council's intentions to circumnavigate the basic principles of the Green Belt. Taking this concept to the extreme, you could classify the whole of the Wirral as a settlement and infill the lot of it! Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245638	LPIO-4198	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area means it would be extremely easy and convenient for the council, landowners and developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. There should be no building on our GREENBELT.							
1244629	LPIO-1370	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1244826	LPIO-2374	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. A settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. We should NOT and their is no need to build on Wirral greenbelt, it needs to be protected to ensure our well being and to stop climate change by offsetting our carbon footprint.							
1247935	LPIO-15874	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245060	LPIO-1789	yes	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1237857	LPIO-18121	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245180	LPIO-2643	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1241891	LPIO-277		I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1237873	LPIO-4810	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1242751	LPIO-580	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246592	LPIO-7681	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT							
1246691	LPIO-9571	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246724	LPIO-9848	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1238379	LPIO-402	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. The term settlement is used by the Council to devalue the Green Belt lands between existing towns and villages. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. Neither do I agree with the fact that Irby has been classified as an Urban settlement. Irby is not a town. It has village centre and is clearly separated from urban sprawl by the Green Belt land that surrounds it. It is not at all comparable to Heswall, Woodchurch etc which are far larger. Irby should be classified as a large village.							
1247196	LPIO-11553	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247214	LPIO-12379	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247492	LPIO-12474	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1240843	LPIO-12643	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247578	LPIO-12841	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247510	LPIO-12965	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246335	LPIO-13087	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246853	LPIO-13357	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246852	LPIO-13479	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247746	LPIO-13633	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1242183	LPIO-13950	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247218	LPIO-14046	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247219	LPIO-14151	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247220	LPIO-14249	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247222	LPIO-14380	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247226	LPIO-14468	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247245	LPIO-14558	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246827	LPIO-14687	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247246	LPIO-15307	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247248	LPIO-15407	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247251	LPIO-15524	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247252	LPIO-15616	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247274	LPIO-15704	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247275	LPIO-15811	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247936	LPIO-15962	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247287	LPIO-16182	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247344	LPIO-16269	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247349	LPIO-16357	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247353	LPIO-16444	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247354	LPIO-16533	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247434	LPIO-16629	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247436	LPIO-16740	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247437	LPIO-16841	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247439	LPIO-16842	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247441	LPIO-17044	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247960	LPIO-17165	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247962	LPIO-17252	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247966	LPIO-17357	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247971	LPIO-17459	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1241726	LPIO-17552	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247979	LPIO-17652	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247980	LPIO-17653	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245502	LPIO-17844	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247541	LPIO-17946	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247539	LPIO-18048	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1247996	LPIO-18205	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246851	LPIO-21139	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246918	LPIO-21282	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246928	LPIO-21283	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246924	LPIO-21284	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246920	LPIO-21491	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246926	LPIO-21492	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246458	LPIO-25681	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246459	LPIO-25682	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1241315	LPIO-3022	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237904	LPIO-3146	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT							
1246605	LPIO-8106	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1237882	LPIO-8241	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT							
1244670	LPIO-8372	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1245083	LPIO-2010	no	I do not agree with the term settlement areas. Rural and urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy to easy for council to create huge areas of green belt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1246651	LPIO-8880	no	I do not agree with the Urban Settlement (previously identified as Settlement Areas 5-7). 'Urban Settlement's is not defined in the NPPF. Rural and Urban areas should have their own particular identities. Calling these locations 'Urban Settlement' belies their independent, separate VILLAGE (and in most cases RURAL) identities.							
1244898	LPIO-1596	no	I do not agree with the way Council Officers have been using this term, as if the towns and villages (communities) within a Settlement Area may be grouped together and dealt with as single entities which can be inflated in a cynical attempt to circumvent Green Belt Purpose 2 - merging of Towns, distinct communities (distinct referring to character and not any physical attachment). 'Settlement' is not defined or used in this way, nor intended to be used in this way, in the NPPF or other Guidance. The habit must stop. The public and councillors are being misled and, if perpetuated and incorporated into the Local Plan, the Local Plan will be found to be unsound at Plan Inquiry at great cost and delay, opening the door for developers to force green belt release. See also my answer to Q2.4a							
1244896	LPIO-2529	no	I do not agree with the way Council Officers have been using this term, as if the towns and villages (communities) within a Settlement Area may be grouped together and dealt with as single entities which can be inflated in a cynical attempt to circumvent Green Belt Purpose 2 - merging of Towns, distinct communities (distinct referring to character and not any physical attachment). 'Settlement' is not defined or used in this way, nor intended to be used in this way, in the NPPF or other Guidance. The habit must stop. The public and councillors are being misled and, if perpetuated and incorporated into the Local Plan, the Local Plan will be found to be unsound at Plan Inquiry at great cost and delay, opening the door for developers to force green belt release. See also my answer to Q2.4a							
1246581	LPIO-7583	no	I do not agree. The term 'Settlement' does not exist within the NPPF and is solely an administrative convenience for the Council and has no standing in a planning context. Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Irby are all individual settlements with their own boundaries and characteristics							
1245816	LPIO-5014	no	I do not recognise the term 'Settlement' in the context of the plan. The OED definition of settlement 'A community formed by members of a group' implies an identified and cohesive set of people. I am part of the Barnston/Heswall community and do not identify myself with Pensby, Irby, Thingwall, etc.							
1246460	LPIO-6893	yes	I fundamentally disagree with the settlement groupings Land package 7.27 - land south of Thingwall Road – forms a major part of the proposed Green Belt release in Irby (1106 new homes, 38% of total dispersed release, nearly 90% of release in Irby). It is common knowledge that the Green Belt exists to check the unrestricted sprawl of built-up areas effectively merging towns and villages into one another. To start building such large numbers of new homes on land package 7.27 would contradict this very purpose in that Irby, Thingwall and Pensby would effectively be merged into a giant-sized conurbation. Irby, Thingwall and Pensby each have their own specific identity by way of libraries, village halls/community centres, shops, post offices, schools, etc. This proposal represents the clearest case I can imagine where losing Green Belt land would cause 3 villages/towns to lose their identity. I simply do not subscribe to the idea that land package 7.27 is 'infill' land because it is located within Settlement Area 7. Settlement Areas are defined by artificial boundaries drawn for convenience by Wirral Borough Council. They do not exist on the ground; I live in Irby, NOT Settlement Area 7.							
1239571	LPIO-3337	no	I have some difficulty with the very broad 'urban settlement' category, embracing quite different communities e.g. Pensby and Caldby. Also, can it be confirmed that each settlement within the box is regarded as an individual unit, and that they are not all, or in part, being lumped together as one urban settlement? If the latter, this would seem to open up the danger of important 'green lung' areas between them becoming targets for development.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1238246	LPIO-521	no	I note that Irby has been designated as an Urban Settlement in the categories. I would contest this classification as both wrong and deliberately made in order to facilitate further development. The Oxford English Definition of a Village is "A group of houses and associated buildings, larger than a hamlet and smaller than a town, situated in a rural area." Irby meets the above definition. It is not a town, nor is it part of an Urban Sprawl. Irby has a small village centre and is clearly distinct from most other parts of Wirral in so much as it is separated from urban sprawl by Green Belt land which surrounds it. It is as such located in a rural setting, albeit in close proximity to urban areas. It is in no way comparable with the urban areas which it has been categorised with, such as Woodchurch, Leasowe, Moreton, West Kirby, Heswall, Greasby, etc, all of which are much larger by several orders of magnitude and are not distinctly defined by green space around them. Irby should be classified as a Large Village.							
1245105	LPIO-2074	no	I think the groups are too broad and more consideration should be given to individual towns							
1241337	LPIO-9805	no	I understand that the term 'settlement' does not exist within the NPPF. Rural and urban areas should have their own identity. Heswall, Barnston, Pensby, Irby, Caldby, Greasby etc cannot reasonably be considered as one settlement. All are individual settlements with their own boundaries and characteristics. Green belt exists between them and this should be protected - considering them all as one settlement would make intrusion into the green belt a more likely move.							
1246846	LPIO-22790	no	I wish to register my objection to the apparent change of classification of Eastham village from "small village" to inclusion in the general area of urban conurbation, east of the m53 motorway. Eastham is currently protected in its green conservation area, and should remain so							
1243481	LPIO-891	yes	I would ideally answer neither yes or no as the areas classed as small villages are barely recognisable as such. They have been largely swallowed up into the adjacent urban area: e.g. Brimstage into Heswall, Saughall Massie into Upton etc. They scarcely qualify to be described as a village!							
1246578	LPIO-13328	no	In my view there should be no building on greenbelt at all							
1242947	LPIO-534	yes	In principal yes, however, Irby, Greasby were always considered villages but now seem to be getting bigger and moving closely together. We each have our own character and it is a shame if this is lost.							
1246551	LPIO-26257		In response to Q2.5 The area of Moreton / Upton / Hoylake should certainly be considered as urban in its character and substance and urban areas should be prioritised for meeting deliverability of the new local plan. Wirral have to plan for 12,000 net additional homes over the Plan period to 2035 and there are requirements for the Local Plan to provide for the size, type and tenure of different housing that has been identified as needed for different groups in the Borough and where it should be located based on the strategic context. The assessment concludes that for the Plan period, 17.2% of new affordable dwellings should have one-bedroom, 46.8% two-bedrooms, 29.7% three-bedrooms and 6.3% four or more-bedrooms. The Draft SHMA 2020 also recommends an overall split of 60% rented and 40% intermediate tenure. The delivery of these types and sizes of homes would have to be secured through site allocations and through conditions and obligations attached to planning permissions for market housing. A final judgement on what will be viable to require and where can only be made once the full range of likely Local Plan requirements have been agreed and assessed and will be included in the draft Local Plan, taking account of any comments submitted, based on the viability assessment to be prepared alongside the draft Local Plan. The future households in the Borough is summarised by dwelling type and size as a percentage of dwellings required. For the purpose of this response the tenure is regarded as affordable housing. Requirements of affordable housing by dwelling type over the plan period:							
1247277	LPIO-23512		In the original consultation Eastham Village and it's green belt were included in 'Settlement Area 8' or the rural areas. The revised document Eastham Village and it's green belt have now been lumped together with other areas on East Wirral as being in the area for urban conurbation!! The council states that 'The review underlines the importance of embedding the continued Regeneration of the urban conurbation in the area to the east of the M53 motorway, within the Local Plan'. This new draft Local Plan has categorised the so called 'settlement areas' in the green belt as Large Village, Small Village and Hamlet. As stated Eastham Village and its surrounding green belt 'lung' was included in Settlement Area 8. Its removal from this area splits the green belt and allows an argument for development of this critical part of the Green Belt easier to progress! Eastham Village is a small village and must be reinstated to the 'small village' category!							
1246743	LPIO-10084	no	Include brownfield's. Keep natural breaks and do not use the M53 as a natural break.							
1245086	LPIO-6204	no	Including rural areas as part of a "Settlement Hierarchy" implies that the places listed are also open for further development. Places classed as "Urban Conurbations" should be classified differently to the less densely populated areas of the Wirral. To group them in the way suggested risks facilitating plans that the council & developers may have for encroaching on the green belt with their building schemes. All new developments must be on brownfield sites and most of these are in the Urban Conurbations.							
1240846	LPIO-2857	no	Irby is not part of an urban settlement as indicated in table 2.2. It is distinct from Pensby, Thingwall and Heswall and physically separated from them from green belt land. Irby has it's own village hall, post office, primary school, etc. As you drive/walk along Thingwall Road you are welcomed to "Irby Village" by a road sign stating exactly that. WBC's own website contains numerous references to Irby village. Thus, Irby is a village in it's own right, and is not part of a 'settlement area'. It has the characteristics of a large (even small) village and should appear as such in table 2.2 (along with Thornton Hough or Brimstage).							
1242372	LPIO-5302	no	Irby should be classed as a large village, it is no where near the scale of places like Woodchurch							
1237991	LPIO-2258	no	Irby, Greasby, Pesnby and Thingwall should not be in the urban settlement category; they are all large villages.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249746	LPIO-26388		It is appropriate to define an Urban Conurbation in principle, which would be based on the continuous built up area to the east of the M53 motorway. However, the Council has not produced a map but has referred to 'townships' without any indication of where these are identified. This has led to a confusing situation whereby peripheral Raby Mere is included within the same category as the centre of Birkenhead. The Local Plan needs to specifically identify the Urban Conurbation using a map base, with a view to focusing on regeneration and making efficient use of land within this area and directing urban extensions to sustainable locations on its edge.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683633	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683637	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683635	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683638	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683639	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683636	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683657
1249743	LPIO-26355 1 of 2		It is highly questionable as to whether all the housing needs of Wirral, and the needs of existing and potential new residents, would be met by the delivery of a limited choice of high rise apartment / high density housing type developments within the most urban areas of Wirral and Birkenhead. Whilst delivery of renewal is an admirable aspiration of the WLP a greater range of matters providing more certainty of long-term choice, supply and demand factors should also be taken into account by the Council through this emerging plan process. Focusing a narrow choice of housing within a geographically small area that is known to be an underperforming housing market, will produce similar types of housing products that will only naturally appeal to some groupings of the population more than others, but also saturate the already weak housing market. For example, as currently proposed within the WLP at Table 2.8 'Strategic Sites Maximum Dwelling Capacity', 4,650 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered at Wirral Waters, which equates to 38.75% of the overall housing requirement. As highlighted by the Consortium the vast majority of Wirral Waters is to be built at extremely high densities in the form of apartments; this does little to respond to the Local Plan Preferred Option of 60% houses, 18% bungalows and 60% of the homes to be 3+ units. The Council is taking a precarious strategy by focusing so strongly on the objective of increasing densities on previously developed land through an urban renewal strategy. Some of the settlements which are identified as a priority will not deliver the scale of investment or sustainable residential development which could offer a greater choice to the market, due to the fact that they do not have enough appropriate brownfield sites suitable for higher density development.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684858						
1249743	LPIO-26355 2 of 2		Wirral's Housing Delivery Test 2019 (published by MHCLG in February 2020) shows an average delivery rate of 76% over the previous 3 years. This confirms the ongoing recent trend of under-delivery in the Borough, with annual completion rates consistently below the housing requirement. Bebington is an area which the WLP says should be within the top hierarchy for development and investment. SHLAA1942 is highly sustainable, will be attractive to investors and benefits from the legal interest of a known high-quality developer who has committed to the delivery of a quality scheme. The scheme would add choice to the local housing market in the East of the Conurbation through the delivery of high-quality, 2, 3 and 4 bedroom market and affordable homes in a landscaped, urban extension setting. The high-quality nature of SHLAA1942 and strategic positioning adjacent to the M53 is likely to attract new, economically, active residents to the area. Yet despite those positives and the position of Bebington in the top tier of the settlement hierarchy, the Site has not been selected as a development option under any of the 3 Options being consulted on in this Regulation 18 process. This is in spite of the weak contribution the Site is considered to make to the purposes of including land in the Green Belt contribution. This lack of a proposed Green Belt Release and allocation for residential use is a peculiar anomaly. Taken together, all of these points lead us to the conclusion that whilst the principal of the Settlement Groupings has some merit, the narrowness of the objectives which the Groupings are trying to achieve – urban renewal and high density focus – removes the ability of the WLP to deliver much needed residential development for the Borough at the quantum which is required.							
1238835	LPIO-1579	no	It is not clear how Wirral Borough Council (WBC) define a settlement area, and as a consequence, I cannot agree with the term "settlement areas". As there is no explanation in the NPPF, the term becomes irrelevant for this report. Both rural and urban areas need to have their own individual identities defined, because each has its own individual characteristics, which cannot be combined. To do so would enable developers to exploit any ensuing confusion for their own gains, which could mean encroachment onto green belt. We have already lost too much of our precious green belt unnecessarily, and this needs to stop with immediate effect. There should be no building on or green belt.							
1237667	LPIO-3660	no	It is not possible to answer this question with a "yes" or "no". There are many "Urban Settlements" which are already suffering from the effects of over development and lack of appropriate infrastructure. The obvious example is Heswall where; the levels of traffic are often greater than the road system can handle; the lack of public transport particularly in the outlying areas causes problems for those reliant and discourages use of public transport by others ; the absence of any integrated connection with the railway service which could be better used; the over subscription of some primary schools; the general lack of adequate facilities and the loss of character, are all evident. If it becomes necessary to consider "Urban Settlements" then each must be reviewed carefully and with regard to its individual circumstances. Whilst infill might be appropriate in some situations, the indiscriminate building of inappropriate units and the steady increase of population in an area that cannot reasonable be expected to absorb more must be avoided.							
1248472	LPIO-24007		It is noted that the Council has not published a Settlement Hierarchy document as part of its evidence base for the Local Plan. The Council will need to publish its evidence to justify the settlement grouping and categories in the emerging Local Plan. Failure to do so would render the Plan unsound in that it would not be justified given the absence of proportionate evidence.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684824	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684823					
1246159	LPIO-5583	no	It is unclear how a 'hamlet' is different to a 'small village'.							
1248588	LPIO-24595		Land within Eastham village should be included within the area identified as the Urban Conurbation.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5681617						

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248426	LPIO-23704		Merging of villages I notice in the Local Plan, too, that a number of villages and small towns are to be open to merger by building on the land between them. In addition to the points raised about Green Field and Green Belt land already raised, I would point out that those areas listed as Urban Settlement include villages like Barnston, Irby, Thingwall, Caldby etc in the same category as small towns like Heswall and West Kirby. Most of the villages listed identify as villages and not as suburbs to a small town. Retaining the green space around such areas is vital to the identity and wellbeing of the community. In order to provide the best possible environment for all Wirral Residents, I urge WBC to concentrate their efforts on the regeneration of the areas of Birkenhead and Mersey river front, to work strenuously and imaginatively with brown field site owners to develop their land sustainably and fairly and to strive to retain and protect the Green Belt and Green Field land.							
1246482	LPIO-7004	no	No building on any green belt ! Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on.							
1246401	LPIO-6855	no	No I completely disagree. Villages have their own identities. For example, Irby, Thurstaston and Pensby are considered to be separate villages by residents. Each village is defined by a band of green belt land. In seeking to remove green belt status in these areas and allowing development of hitherto undeveloped green belt land the proposal will destroy the openness and character of the Wirral. Exceptional circumstances required to develop green belt land has not been demonstrated. Local residents feel very strongly about this.							
1246693	LPIO-9525	no	No I do NOT agree with the term settlement areas, these are not defined in the NPPF and I'm confused as to where its come from on this basis. Urban and rural areas are very different and should have their own identities. To me it seems that the term is being used to lump together greenbelt areas and urban areas in an effort to circumvent the issue of releasing greenbelt land for housing development. For example in 'Urban Conurbation (previously identified as Settlement Areas 1-4)' the Council has included Birkenhead and Raby Mere. These are two very different areas. It is well established that Birkenhead is an urban area in desperate need of regeneration. Raby Mere on the other hand is clearly surrounded by Green Belt land and there are no areas which require regeneration. So the question of why these 2 areas have been included in the same grouping needs to be evidenced and answered. The obvious answer would be that it provides the Council with an easy option to release the greenbelt land under the 'grouping' and allow housing to be built. It is well established across the Country that this forms part of the bargain with housing developers - releasing both the urban and rural areas for development. The Rural area will be developed first as this will then bring in profit to allow this to be sunk into the redevelopment of the urban area, however the urban area suddenly becomes too expensive to regenerate and this does not go ahead. To fail to regenerate the urban areas would be for the Council to fail its residents completely. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1240932	LPIO-26586		No, we disagree with the settlement definitions and groupings. For economic growth to be achieved that will benefit all the communities across the Borough, we recommend that the growth enabled through the settlement hierarchy needs to be spread proportionately between the urban conurbation east of the M53, urban settlements in the west and rural areas in the central belt. The Borough's rural settlements are currently all included within and are 'washed over' by the Green Belt. These include the 'large village' of Thornton Hough and seven 'smaller villages'. Given the restrictions in national planning policy relating to new development in the Green Belt and the Council's preferred approach of avoiding Green Belt release unless in exceptional circumstances, we are concerned that the Local Plan will not provide the opportunity to support sustainable growth in these communities in line with national policy and guidance. Therefore, we also recommend that villages currently 'washed over' by Green Belt should be 'inset' and this should be accompanied by a policy allowing an appropriate level of development in these locations in line with paragraphs 77 and 78 of the Framework. For example, the villages of Thornton Hough, Raby and Brimstage could be considered as suitable inset villages where some sensitive development within its boundaries could be accommodated. The settlement hierarchy will also require revisiting to take into account the need to release sites in the Green Belt. We also request that the Council should include a question on the settlement hierarchy in their next consultation alongside the draft policy wording for the scale of development to be permitted for each level in the hierarchy. This will enable a more meaningful comment to be made on the draft settlement hierarchy when it can be considered alongside the development the Local Plan envisages supporting in each location.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				
1242554 Port Sunlight Village Trust	LPIO-9621		No. We do not believe that areas like Port Sunlight, Oxton, Mountwood and Bebington should be grouped together with prime regeneration sites like Birkenhead.							
1245457	LPIO-3577	no	One of Wirral's attractions is its diverse nature of individual settlements and these should stay as separate identities. I do not want to see urban sprawl because separate towns and villages have been grouped together and there is a danger that Green Belt land between them will be built upon.							
1237567	LPIO-5185	yes	Our Client agrees that the Eastham is part of the Urban Conurbation, it is within and on the edges of the Urban Conurbation that need should be met	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5658055	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5669873					
1240932	LPIO-7586	no	Our recommendation is that the Local Plan's strategy needs to combine urban renewal to the east of the M53 with promoting development in the rest of the Borough, including land currently in the Green Belt next to sustainable locations to allow the rest of the Borough to grow sustainably. Our Client believes that the Council have not taken the needs of each area in Wirral into account by focussing such a high proportion of the proposed development around the Birkenhead area, contrary to paragraph 9 of the NPPF.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1244720	LPIO-4549		Please see above comment, re "urban settlement" description. There are areas east of the M53 which are classified as green belt, and which are protecting the integrity of for example, Eastham village, Storeton village, and ancient wooded areas, and which provide sites of ecological value and should not be developed.							
1246712	LPIO-9567	no	Please see our attached statement for our full case.							
1238645	LPIO-3062	no	Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities - using the term 'Urban Settlement' (not used in the NPPF) belies the independent, separate 'village' (and in many cases, rural) identities of the areas listed							
1237923	LPIO-5040	no	rural and urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean its too easy for greenbelt to be used to create huge areas to be built on. No greenbelt should be built on it is too precious to our environment and lifestyle, there are better options available.							
1245502	LPIO-3991	no	Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT. IT IS THERE FOR US TO ENJOY, FARM AND HAVE GREEN AREAS.							
1245713	LPIO-4956	no	Rural and urban areas should have their own identity. A settlement would mean it is easy for Council/Developers to create huge areas of greenbelt to build on. Greenbelt should not be built on.							
1237807	LPIO-8650	no	See answer to previous question. Eastham Conservation Area must be included as a small village in the new classification.							
1238147	LPIO-9777	no	See answer to question 2.4							
1240383	LPIO-5406	no	Settlement area definitions fail to define the characteristics of individual communities and neighbourhoods particularly within Urban development. Rural settlements are not limited to buildings by definition, but also includes field systems, woodland, hedgerows and ponds, which determine them as rural.							
1242697	LPIO-24643		Settlement Areas (SA) 1, 2 and 3 may be the simplest grouping for the desired regeneration, subject to views from Wallasey. This major work is in SA1, SA2 and SA3. These form an urban hierarchy and are the subject of regeneration. The rest - SA4, SA5, SA6, SA7, and SA8 - are standalone communities and should remain so. For example, Barnston is well separated from Newton, West Kirby cannot conceivably be considered in the same urban area as Woodchurch, or through other named areas to try to link them. The list could go on. They have their own communities and centres though the rural parts can be dispersed. The rural parts see their small village as their community. It is fundamentally wrong to brigade these communities together with the purpose of making loss of Green Belt parcels and building easier to justify.	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			
1237870	LPIO-2044	no	Settlement areas are NOT defined by NPPF so I DO NOT agree with the term. To become a "Settlement Area" would make it far too easy for Council or Developers to allocate Green Belt for building purposes. KEEP OUR GREENBELT GREEN - there should be no building on Greenbelt Land at all.							
1243700	LPIO-1293	no	Settlement areas are not defined by the NPPF. Rural and urban areas should have their own identity. The word settlement will encourage developers and landowners to challenge the Council's vision of Urban development. Green Belt is more lucrative for them to develop and needs to be prevented.							
1244412	LPIO-996	no	Settlement areas are not defined in the NPPF. Rural and urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area means it is far too easy for the council and developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. Once again this contradictory to the council declaration in Autumn 2019 that there is a climate crisis. There should be no building on greenbelt and active promotion of greening up the brownfield development.							
1241031	LPIO-24	no	Some of those areas in 5-7 are along side current rail lines and should be used first to maximise use of the trains for transport. Some areas along the Bidston Wrexham line should also be included as this line could be electrified to join the Mersey rail system.							
1238424	LPIO-9697	no	Some parts of the urban settlement were originally villages in their own right but have been allowed to sprawl and join in to each other. Further sprawling should be discouraged, for example the fields between Barnston, Irby, Pensby and Heswall.							
1248542	LPIO-24346		Table 2.2 lists all the 'Townships' within one level of the hierarchy, listing them in alphabetical order, referring to 25 different towns as 'Urban Conurbation'. Birkenhead is the largest conurbation on the Wirral Peninsula and the focus of strategic development opportunities including a masterplan for the transformation of the commercial centre and redevelopment of underutilised previously developed land for a range of housing development. On this basis, rather than applying a blanket direction of development to the 'Urban Conurbation' development should first be directed to Birkenhead. The regeneration of Birkenhead is a key priority for the Council and due to the fragile economic climate, it would be easy for the ongoing regeneration efforts to be undermined by future development outside Birkenhead. It is, therefore, imperative that the investment being made in Birkenhead is protected for the duration of the plan period. For this reason, we recommend that a distinction is made between the settlements in the Urban Conurbation and that Birkenhead should be placed on a tier above the other settlements or 'Townships'.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684894						
1248749	LPIO-24809		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248769	LPIO-24939		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684956		
1248823	LPIO-25034		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	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-25138		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562					
1248833	LPIO-25248		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	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			
1248986	LPIO-25444		Take no issue with the proposed settlement hierarchy and welcome the split into individual townships, as each town has its own district character and needs. We also take no issue with the settlement definitions and groupings, and do not propose any changes. What is not entirely clear is whether the townships are to be considered as separate settlements or collectively as per the previously defined settlement areas. The somewhat blurred approach raises difficulties when it comes when assessing the supporting evidence base. For instance, the Sustainability Appraisal and other evidence base documents utilise the settlement areas categorisation which groups together several townships under the previously identified settlement areas. This in itself may be fine but it does not strictly follow Table 2.2 in the Issues and Options paper.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770				
1241852	LPIO-902	no	The "small villages" section is totally inaccurate!!!! these places are NOT villages, they have no shops, post offices etc....they are just named areas with random dwellings. IRBY AND HESWALL by definition are small villages (visually self contained and do not sprawl or blur into other areas). These areas should be cherished and protected as rarities .							
1246544	LPIO-8530	no	The "urban settlements" listed would be better described as small town or large village, and they each have their own identities. Urban settlement is not defined in the NPPF							
1243721	LPIO-2228	no	The areas to the west of the M53 are not just one extended 'town'. Heswall, Irby, Barnston, and Pensby are separate identities and should be maintained as such, to avoid a random sprawl.							
1240903	LPIO-7787	no	The classifications do not take account of the areas definition and ignore the type of area. This seems to be a randomly gathered grouping that ignores character and area definition. This needs to be redefined as it was obviously completed by a company with no understanding of the Wirrals areas and character.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249638	LPIO-26268 1 of 2		The grouping of the settlements is underpinned by a drive for the delivery of urban brownfield and / or infill sites largely focused around Birkenhead and Wirral Waters, all of which are envisaged to come forward at high densities. It is highly questionable as to whether all of Wirral's housing needs would be met through the concentration of delivery of high-rise apartments / high density housing developments to the east of the M53. For example, as currently proposed within the WLP at Table 2.8 'Strategic Sites Maximum Dwelling Capacity', 4,650 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered at Wirral Waters, which equates to 38.75% of the overall housing requirement. Whilst consideration and delivery of renewal is important for the WLP, it also needs to consider wider matters related to flexibility through the provision of long-term choice, supply and demand. Focusing a narrow choice of housing within a geographically small area will produce similar types of housing products that will naturally appeal to some groupings of the population more than others. As such Council is adopting a risky strategy by focusing almost entirely on the objective of increasing densities on previously used land and focusing solely on urban renewal objectives. Some of the settlements which are identified as a priority won't actually deliver the scale of investment in social and physical infrastructure that's needed because of the viability concerns that exist. Nor will these locations deliver truly sustainable residential development which could offer a greater choice to the market, due to the fact that there are insufficient appropriate and available brownfield sites available. Wirral's Housing Delivery Test 2019 measurement of 76% confirms this recent trend and past completion rates have consistently been well below the housing requirement.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063
1249638	LPIO-26268 2 of 2		What we would like to see changed is a greater recognition of the sustainability benefits of a proportionate distribution of housing across the whole of Wirral and an acknowledgement that flexibility is a key driver given the over-reliance upon Wirral Waters. The supporting text at 2.30 states the following: "2.30. In the Council's view the hierarchy set out in Table 2.2 below best reflects the existing role and function of each the Borough's main settlement areas, by identifying a single major urban area to the east of the M53 Motorway and by taking account of the difference between this area and the more commuter-based urban settlements to the west of the M53." This is an extremely blinkered approach to take and completely ignores the sustainability credentials of individual settlements. We would like to see individual settlements as identified in the settlement hierarchy assessed on their own individual merits and this would assist with the wider housing distribution. As drafted, the current settlement hierarchy strategy will have a clear over-reliance on Wirral Waters, which has yet to deliver any housing despite benefitting from planning permission since 2012. This development can come forward irrespective of the Local Plan process and the regeneration of this area is supported by us, however a sensible view must be taken in respect of lead-in times for infrastructure delivery, the fact that the site is in single ownership and the need for Wirral to deliver a mix of housing needs across the borough. The presumption in favour of sustainable development at Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is clear that in respect of plan-making, "plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change". The current settlement hierarchy and approach towards the distribution of new housing across Wirral would simply not achieve that.							
1249638	LPIO-26300 1 of 2		The grouping of the settlements is underpinned by a drive for the delivery of urban brownfield and / or infill sites largely focused around Birkenhead and Wirral Waters, all of which are envisaged to come forward at high densities. It is highly questionable as to whether all of Wirral's housing needs would be met through the concentration of delivery of high-rise apartments / high density housing developments to the east of the M53. For example, as currently proposed within the WLP at Table 2.8 'Strategic Sites Maximum Dwelling Capacity', 4,650 dwellings are anticipated to be delivered at Wirral Waters, which equates to 38.75% of the overall housing requirement. Whilst consideration and delivery of renewal is important for the WLP, it also needs to consider wider matters related to flexibility through the provision of long-term choice, supply and demand. Focusing a narrow choice of housing within a geographically small area will produce similar types of housing products that will naturally appeal to some groupings of the population more than others. As such Council is adopting a risky strategy by focusing almost entirely on the objective of increasing densities on previously used land and focusing solely on urban renewal objectives. Some of the settlements which are identified as a priority won't actually deliver the scale of investment in social and physical infrastructure that's needed because of the viability concerns that exist. Nor will these locations deliver truly sustainable residential development which could offer a greater choice to the market, due to the fact that there are insufficient appropriate and available brownfield sites available.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063
1249638	LPIO-26300 2 of 2		Wirral's Housing Delivery Test 2019 measurement of 76% confirms this recent trend and past completion rates have consistently been well below the housing requirement. What we would like to see changed is a greater recognition of the sustainability benefits of a proportionate distribution of housing across the whole of Wirral and an acknowledgement that flexibility is a key driver given the over-reliance upon Wirral Waters. The supporting text at 2.30 states the following: "2.30. In the Council's view the hierarchy set out in Table 2.2 below best reflects the existing role and function of each the Borough's main settlement areas, by identifying a single major urban area to the east of the M53 Motorway and by taking account of the difference between this area and the more commuter-based urban settlements to the west of the M53." This is an extremely blinkered approach to take and completely ignores the sustainability credentials of individual settlements. We would like to see individual settlements as identified in the settlement hierarchy assessed on their own individual merits and this would assist with the wider housing distribution. As drafted, the current settlement hierarchy strategy will have a clear over-reliance on Wirral Waters, which has yet to deliver any housing despite benefitting from planning permission since 2012. This development can come forward irrespective of the Local Plan process and the regeneration of this area is supported by us, however a sensible view must be taken in respect of lead-in times for infrastructure delivery, the fact that the site is in single ownership and the need for Wirral to deliver a mix of housing needs across the borough. The presumption in favour of sustainable development at Paragraph 11 of the NPPF is clear that in respect of plan-making, "plans should positively seek opportunities to meet the development needs of their area and be sufficiently flexible to adapt to rapid change". The current settlement hierarchy and approach towards the distribution of new housing across Wirral would simply not achieve that.							
1237944	LPIO-263	yes	The Local Plan should include a very robust policy to ensure that there are green ribbons between Settlements to encourage and promote the unique character of each Settlement and thus create viable local Communities, rather than urban sprawl. In areas already undefined, small boundary green spaces (Trees/Flowerbeds/etc) could be provided with little cost and low future maintenance to provide this social improvement.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249745	LPIO-26374		The overarching strategy in the Local Plan is to focus development towards the 'Urban Conurbation', in the area to the east of the M53 motorway to support and provide for the most sustainable patterns of development. As a result, the 'Urban Conurbation' forms the 1st tier of the Settlement Hierarchy identified in the Local Plan. The settlement of Storeton is only 0.6 miles from the 'Urban Conurbation' and it also lies on the eastern side of the M53. It therefore has a close functional relationship with the 'Urban Conurbation' and the range of shops, services and facilities in this area. It is considered that development of the Storeton Garden Village could support regeneration efforts in this area by meeting housing need which is unlikely to be met through the strategic development opportunities at Birkenhead and Wirral Waters. We consider that Storeton should be identified as part of the 'Urban Conurbation' which forms tier 1 of the Settlement Hierarchy. This approach would align with the Council's overall strategy of focussing investment and regeneration toward the Urban Conurbation to the east of the M53 Motorway.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5680005	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684864	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684863	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5680006	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684860	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684862	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5680001
1245984	LPIO-5666		The settlement hierarchy focuses too much on the term settlement. By very definition it fails to address the rural nature of parts of the Borough the implication being if it is already defined as a settlement what is to stop it being developed? Protection of the green belt should be one of the overriding principles of the local plan.							
1248438	LPIO-23756		The settlement hierarchy should be amended to reflect that contained previously in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, with the urban conurbation and urban settlement tiers of the hierarchy merged to form a single 'Urban Settlement' tier at the top of the settlement hierarchy.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684850	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657890					
1247798	LPIO-24228		The settlement hierarchy should be amended to reflect that contained previously in the Proposed Submission Draft Core Strategy, with the urban conurbation and urban settlement tiers of the hierarchy merged to form a single 'Urban Settlement' tier at the top of the settlement hierarchy.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684846						
1245501	LPIO-3962	no	The term 'settlement areas' is not consistent with the National Planning Policy Framework. Both rural and urban areas should have their own identities. Adding a label to categorise individual communities, areas and population groups, normalises tracts of land and zones, facilitating pet projects of local politicians and developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. Greenbelt, green areas and agricultural land must be left as is, not to be developed.							
1237724	LPIO-4290	no	The term "settlement area" is an artificial construct with no Planning context. The areas of Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Irby are separate villages with their own characteristics. To group them as a settlement area and then suggest merging them into one massive grouping is absolutely unacceptable and undesirable. The only interest in favour of this are builders who want an easy passage.							
1239377	LPIO-1465	no	The term 'settlement areas' is not defined in the NPPF and therefore, offers itself as a term to suit the needs of any user who wishes to apply it within planning dialogue. It should be dropped from the narrative immediately. Furthermore, Wirral's rural and urban areas are unique enough to define their own identities. Applying the title of 'settlement area' to a piece of land which was previously undefined is terminology open to abuse, should the title ever be applied to land within or surrounding green belt.							
1246596	LPIO-7948	no	The term settlement does not exist and is solely for Council administration convenience. I think settlements (villages) should have their own boundaries and characteristics.							
1245158	LPIO-3220	no	The term 'settlement' has no standing. Heswall, barnston, Pensby, Irby are individual settlements each with its own boundaries and needs							
1242155	LPIO-13445		The township boundaries (actual or assumed) need to be detailed on a map accompanying this issues and option paper. Specifically the boundaries of Newton and Caldby need to be defined for consultation. For example the proposed potential release of greenbelt parcel 6.15 (SP013, SHLAA 4056) West of Column Road, West Kirby (Table 4.5) will effectively merge the settlements of Newton and Caldby and should be reconsidered for that reason. This merging of settlements does not appear to have been given due weight in assessments of the site for potential release.							
1247829	LPIO-14605		The urban development taking place mainly on the eastern side of Wirral means that potentially more people might threaten the nationally and internationally protected Ramsar / SPA sites along the Mersey estuary and the east part of Wirral Foreshore, designated for the birds (mainly waders) which feed and roost there at low tide. This must be born in mind in the Local Plan.							
1245100	LPIO-2055	no	The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldby, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby and Woodchurch.' But Urban Settlement is not defined in the NPPF. Calling these locations "Urban settlements" belies their independent, separate, "village" and in many cases rural identities.							
1245058	LPIO-2675	no	The Urban Settlement grouping is listed by WMBC as 'Urban Barnston, Caldby, Gayton, Greasby, Heswall, Hoylake, Irby, Leasowe, Meols, Moreton, Newton, Pensby, Thingwall, Upton, West Kirby, Woodchurch'. But this ignores that each has their own village, and in some cases rural, identity.							
1237748	LPIO-8489	no	The use of settlements by the Council may be useful in certain management scenarios but has no justification in terms of the NPPF and certainly not in the context used in the Local Plan. It is pure nonsense to consider townships like Heswall, Brinstage and Pensby as part of one settlement area - these are separate entities and should not be combined.							
1241412	LPIO-116	no	The West of the M53 should be in the same category as the East of M53. It just makes me mad that the West of M53 is seen as superior to East of M53 or is it because the residents in this area will complain and protest more? In the East of M53 we need to keep what green spaces we have not lose them.							
1241629	LPIO-10178	no	There is a failure to recognize and support the continuing separation of distinct areas. The purpose of green belt preventing areas from merging is being deliberately undermined.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.5 Do you agree with the settlement definitions and groupings?	Question 2.5a - If not please explain what changes would you wish to see and why? (If you agree with the proposed approach, you can comment here.)	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246523	LPIO-7992	no	There seems to be a lot of confusion of terms or terminology. How have the definitions been arrived at?							
1245044	LPIO-8287	no	There should be more focus on deprived areas around Birkenhead etc. One of the purposes of Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another'. The Issues and Options Local Plan treats several neighbouring towns as a single large settlement, but does not explain how these settlement areas have been defined. Towns / Villages such as Irby Pensby and Thingwall are distinct separate areas with different characters. To call them one settlement goes completely against planning policy which seeks to keep towns from merging in to one another							
1246612	LPIO-8237	no	These do not match the definitions in NPPF. There should be a clear distinction between urban and rural. These definitions blur the boundaries between towns and villages AND greenbelt. There is no need for, and should be no, option to build on greenbelt							
1243448	LPIO-811	no	These settlement areas are not defined in the national planning policy framework. Rural and Urban areas should have their own identities. To become a settlement area would mean it is far too easy for council/developers to create huge areas of greenbelt for building on. THERE SHOULD BE NO BUILDING ON OUR GREENBELT.							
1237823	LPIO-3388	no	This question overlaps with our response to Question 2.4. The focus for regeneration and investment ought to be the Urban Core (Areas 1 and 2) Wallasey and Birkenhead. Areas 3,4 and 5 are primarily residential areas along the M53 corridor. The Western Peninsular, comprising Hoylake, West Kirby and Heswall and Pensby are separate settlements but with similar characteristics. Defining spatial areas with similar characteristics is more appropriate in terms of policy formulation and land use control.							
1249116	LPIO-25957		Tiers 3, 4 and 5 focus on different sized villages. It is not clear how the Council derived the decision to include the listed villages in these tiers and what makes a village large or small. Saughall Massie is included in tier 4 'small village'. Given its status as 'small village' it would be expected that it would be isolated from surrounding settlements however it is directly connected to a large built up area of Moreton to the north and east. Moreton sits at tier 2 of the settlement hierarchy as an 'urban settlement'. The Spatial Portrait 2020 recognises that there are a range of key services and facilities in Settlement Area 5 (mid-Wirral) which includes Moreton. Moreton is recognised as a 'Key Town Centre' and the wider settlement area benefits from a number of facilities. The assessment of Settlement Area 5 also notes that the majority of the Settlement Area is highly accessible by road, with access to three junctions along the M53 Motorway and is also highly accessible by public transport with high frequency electrified rail services between Liverpool and West Kirby that pass through Moreton. It therefore seems unreasonable that Saughall Massie, which adjoins the existing built up area of Moreton within Settlement Area 5, is listed as tier 4 in the Council's proposed settlement hierarchy. It would be more appropriate to identify Saughall Massie in tier 2, 'Urban Settlement'. This point is further supported by the fact that given its location on the edge of Moreton, Saughall Massie does not resemble settlements identified under tier 3 and 4 of the proposed settlement hierarchy. For example, Thornton Hough, which is in tier 3, is surrounded by Green Belt and is much more isolated than Saughall Massie. Furthermore, Brimstage, Raby, Storeton and Thurstaston, all of which are identified in tier 4 of the settlement hierarchy, are also isolated settlements surrounded by Green Belt.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675698	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675693	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675700	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675692	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675694	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675696
1246425	LPIO-6531	yes	We agree with the Council's view that the settlement definitions and groupings 'best reflects the existing role and function of the each of the main settlement areas, by identifying a single major urban area to the east of the M53 motorway and by taking account of the difference between this area and the more commuter based urban settlements to the west of the M53' (our emphasis) (2.30, Local Plan). It follows that we agree with the Council that Eastham forms part of the major urban area to the east of the M53 where development should be increased and that Heswall is a more commuter based urban settlement to the west of the M53 where development should meet locally identified needs. Eastham contains sites (including SP050 West of Rivacre Road (parcel 4.14)) that, if allocated, would reinforce the settlement definitions and groupings.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5669548						
1242185	LPIO-23878		We agree with the proposed hierarchy set out in Table 2.2 ranging from Urban Conurbation to Hamlet but not the way the settlements have been classified into 'Townships'. PP1 Borough Spatial Portrait 2020 more correctly refers to Irby, Thingwall, Pensby, Heswall and Gayton as dormitory settlements, which is more accurate as they have characteristics of small villages with limited community facilities. NPPF Paragraph 134 (b) is clear that one of the purposes of Green Belt is to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another. The Issues and Options Local Plan treats several neighbouring towns as a single large settlement, without offering a rationale or justification, in the evidence base. This is clearly contrary to NPPF, which seeks to keep towns from merging, as opposed to coalescing together and seeking to narrow the gaps, keeping them distinct. This point is of immense importance for the Local Plan. The Council's flawed interpretations and approach are demonstrated in its selection of Green Belt Sites in especially Option 2A.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006				
1242950	LPIO-2540	yes	We agree with the settlement definitions.							
1240223	LPIO-10094	yes	We are agreed with the proposed settlement groupings. We particularly note that the Council's top tier of settlements includes Bidston and Prenton, which we agree with.							
1246242	LPIO-7660	no	We do not agree with the term 'settlement areas'. Rural & Urban areas require their own identities separated by Green Belt. There is ABSOLUTELY NO NEED TO BUILD ON GREEN BELT							
1247015	LPIO-11422		We do not agree with the use of Settlement areas. The term 'Settlement' does not exist within the NPPF and is solely an administrative convenience for the Council. The term has no standing in a planning context. It is ridiculous to suggest that Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Irby are one vast 'highly enclosed' area within a single settlement. These are all individual settlements with their own boundaries and characteristics.							

