

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1241629	LPIO-10301	no									
1244412	LPIO-1034	no									
1241065	LPIO-10388	yes									
1246724	LPIO-10435	no									
1246772	LPIO-10470	no									
1246778	LPIO-10517	no									
1246731	LPIO-10524	yes	Part of 7.26	The attached plan shows an infill site, adjacent to an existing settlement that is developable and deliverable in a good market area within an area of Green Belt that has a 'weak' contribution to the purposes that Green Belt exists to serve. It is a site that would deliver approximately 100 residential units, including an appropriate and significant contribution to affordable housing and education provision, and that the housing will meet the identified need for family and mixed sized accommodation.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5666962						
1246756	LPIO-10709	yes	4.16	Parcel 4.16, for the reasons set out in section 5 of our representations.							
1246242	LPIO-10781			Green Belt is Green Belt and any ' weakly performing ' !!!! should NOT be touched or considered for development.							
1243890	LPIO-1103	no									
1238549	LPIO-11525			There may be some scope for development to the small plots outlined on Thurston road as these would appear to have less impact.							
1247196	LPIO-11578	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247015	LPIO-11784			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247214	LPIO-12405	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1244681	LPIO-1244	no									
1247492	LPIO-12504	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1240843	LPIO-12668	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247578	LPIO-12866	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247510	LPIO-12990	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246335	LPIO-13123	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246578	LPIO-13335	no									
1246853	LPIO-13382	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246852	LPIO-13504	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247746	LPIO-13659	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1243700	LPIO-1367	no									
1238192	LPIO-13797			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration.							
1247012	LPIO-13852			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247014	LPIO-13906			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1242183	LPIO-13978	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247218	LPIO-14071	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247219	LPIO-14176	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247220	LPIO-14276	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247222	LPIO-14406	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247226	LPIO-14493	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247245	LPIO-14584	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247829	LPIO-14656			The release of Green Belt parcels, in the (unlikely) case that all other land had been allocated to development, should be delayed as long as possible into the last phase of the Plan's life (Years 11 to 15). In fact I like to stress that I am totally opposed to the notion that some Green Belt parcels are of lower value ('weak') than others. They all help to keep settlements apart and provide enjoyment and mental enrichment to human visitors. In fact it can be said that Wirral has hardly any Green Belt land without wildlife importance, and it is clear that the biological value of some of the proposed parcels for release has not been fully appreciated by the Council, eg parcels 6.15 in West Kirby and 7.27 in Irby which carry the important albeit not statutory designation of Local Wildlife Site (LWS) as do numerous other parcels (or parts of parcels). I am elaborating on this omission further in answer 8.14.							
1246827	LPIO-14712	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247016	LPIO-14842			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1242155	LPIO-14887	yes		Yes. Parcel 6.16 offers a strong case for release against NPPF guidance. The SHLAA sites 3055 and 3056 are subject to land promotion agreement and hence could be brought forward without delay. The make up of the site and local demand could also lead to near immediate delivery. A further updated detailed case for release is in the process of preparation and will be submitted to the Council under separate cover. The SHLAA sites 3055 and 3056 when assessed against the 2019 Local Plan evidence base provide a very strong case for release.							
1247018	LPIO-14909			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247246	LPIO-15331	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1244901	LPIO-1542	no									
1247248	LPIO-15446	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247251	LPIO-15549	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247252	LPIO-15642	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247274	LPIO-15741	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247275	LPIO-15855	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247936	LPIO-15995	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247287	LPIO-16207	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1244969	LPIO-1627	no									
1247344	LPIO-16295	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247349	LPIO-16382	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247353	LPIO-16470	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247354	LPIO-16558	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247434	LPIO-16662	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247935	LPIO-16699	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247436	LPIO-16771	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247437	LPIO-16906	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247439	LPIO-16907	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247441	LPIO-17069	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247960	LPIO-17190	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247962	LPIO-17277	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247966	LPIO-17382	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247971	LPIO-17487	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1241726	LPIO-17582	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247979	LPIO-17702	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247980	LPIO-17703	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1242966	LPIO-17775			Q 4.12 and 4.17 and 4.12- 4.20, Both of options 2: Option 2A, Dispersed Green Belt Release and Option 2B Urban Extension conflict with National Planning Policy Framework. None of these sites are weakly performing green belt sites they all meet the test of green belt as set out in paragraph 134 of National planning Framework. site 11 is preventing neighbouring towns from merging into one another, they all check unrestricted urban sprawl and safeguard the countryside from encroachment. Therefore none of these sites meet the Exceptional test for removing land from the Green Belt. None of the sites in either of option 2 are served by adequate public transport, they will result in additional traffic generation, leading to congestion, noise and have an adverse impact on air quality. This is unsustainable development with an adverse impact on climate change, the Council needs o make a more concerned effort to deliver Option 1 and Central Government needs to look at the Standard Method for addressing the housing requirement as a matter of urgency.							
1238043	LPIO-1779	no									
1247541	LPIO-17971	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247539	LPIO-18080	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247996	LPIO-18233	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1237857	LPIO-18242	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247021	LPIO-18393			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247022	LPIO-18447			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247023	LPIO-18502			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247025	LPIO-18629			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247038	LPIO-18630			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247039	LPIO-18751			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247040	LPIO-18752			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247041	LPIO-18845			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247042	LPIO-18911			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247061	LPIO-18995			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247063	LPIO-19087			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247064	LPIO-19141			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247068	LPIO-19196			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247071	LPIO-19253			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247072	LPIO-19308			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247078	LPIO-19365			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247080	LPIO-19437			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247081	LPIO-19438			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1245069	LPIO-1957	no									
1247082	LPIO-19633			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247083	LPIO-19688			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1238379	LPIO-1972	no									
1247084	LPIO-19743			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247085	LPIO-19806			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1242519	LPIO-1984	no									
1247088	LPIO-19872			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247089	LPIO-19933			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247090	LPIO-19989			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247091	LPIO-20043			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247092	LPIO-20101			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1246454	LPIO-20162			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247093	LPIO-20169			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247094	LPIO-20221			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247095	LPIO-20277			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247096	LPIO-20332			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247099	LPIO-20389			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247101	LPIO-20443			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247108	LPIO-20579			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247102	LPIO-20580			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247106	LPIO-20619			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247105	LPIO-20620			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247109	LPIO-20713			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247110	LPIO-20781			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247111	LPIO-20782			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1237870	LPIO-2088	no									
1247112	LPIO-20933			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247113	LPIO-20987			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247115	LPIO-21043			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247116	LPIO-21097			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1246851	LPIO-21164	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246918	LPIO-21306	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246924	LPIO-21307	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246928	LPIO-21308	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1245112	LPIO-2147	no									
1246920	LPIO-21541	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246926	LPIO-21542	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1247117	LPIO-21691			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247118	LPIO-21692			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1241016	LPIO-217	no									
1247145	LPIO-21799			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247147	LPIO-21800			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247148	LPIO-21907			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247150	LPIO-21908			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1244329	LPIO-22010			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247119	LPIO-22080			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1246678	LPIO-22081			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247151	LPIO-22188			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247152	LPIO-22189			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247153	LPIO-22302			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247155	LPIO-22303			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247156	LPIO-22410			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247158	LPIO-22411			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1245100	LPIO-2246	no									
1247159	LPIO-22605			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247160	LPIO-22606			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247161	LPIO-22645			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247164	LPIO-22646			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247167	LPIO-22778			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1247168	LPIO-22779			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							
1238835	LPIO-2279	no									
1247169	LPIO-22973			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248517	LPIO-24283			The redevelopment potential of land within Green Belt Parcel 4.16 at Carlett Park would accord with a pro-active, regeneration-focused, policy-led approach. The site ought to be prioritised for release from the Green Belt and identified as being suitable for development, as it is previously developed land which is a national and local priority for release for development. Wirral is repeatedly failing to meet its Housing Delivery Test (HDT) delivery targets and we believe that the site of the Carlett Park Oil Depot, shown on the plan in our attachment , is "developable". The site is a former petrol storage facility formerly owned by the Ministry of Defence. The entire site is previously developed and occupied by a large underground concrete storage structure and its associated surface petrol distribution and pumping infrastructure. The site is classified as a "Hazardous Installation". The historic planning consent for petrol storage does not require any restoration of the contamination following the cessation of the use. It is accordingly appropriate that the Wirral Local Plan recognise the status of the site. We believe that the emerging local plan is an opportunity to recognise the sites potential and would accord with a "brownfield first" strategy of meeting development needs. In our view the redevelopment of the site would comprise "Sustainable Development" and would provide a range of economic, social and environmental benefits, in accordance with NPPF, Paragraph 8.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5658055						
1248525	LPIO-24321			Parcel 4.17 - SHLAA0928 Land East of Ferry Road, Eastham (SHLAA 0928) is a candidate residential allocation (potentially along with other uses) for inclusion in the emerging WLP, which can contribute to WMBC's local housing needs, including affordable or specialist housing. Our separate 'Call for Sites' submission provides details of the site. The site is a deliverable and developable opportunity in accordance with PPG. The site is demonstrated to make a limited contribution to Green Belt when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. As such and, given its suitability for development, it is a candidate for further consideration to sustainably accommodate growth.							
1245996	LPIO-24587			SHLAA 1980 in Parcel 7.26 can assist in meeting Option 2A. It is part brownfield, underused and overgrown and relates well to the character and built form of the residential development to the north off Townshend Avenue. The site is well contained due to the trees and hedges located to the south and west, which would provide a visual buffer from the wider Green Belt, and a long-term defensible urban boundary. If allocated, it could deliver at least 30 dwellings within 12 to 18 months of a planning permission being granted, once the Local Plan was found sound. The site is suitable, available and achievable and there are no technical constraints that would prevent it from delivering housing in the first five years of the plan. The site is well related to the settlement of Irby, with good access to public transport and local facilities and services and would comprise a logical small scale urban extension. It would not appear as an intrusion into the open countryside and would not utilise agricultural land. It would be comparable to sites 8 to 11, which are already suggested for release from Parcel 7.26. Further information is provided in our attachment.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5681950						
1242697	LPIO-24681	no		No Parcels in the Green Belt are that weak.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659148	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659119	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659120	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121			
1245936	LPIO-24739			<ul style="list-style-type: none"> As stated within Question 2.16, this SHLAA 0642 land should was not assessed appropriately during the Green Belt Review. As a consequence, there is the possibility if the appropriate methodology had been used correctly, that the site would have been recognised as a weakly performing land and considered for release. the local authority should review its position and consider 'Land to the North of Fern Close, Heswall' to meet any residual housing requirement. 							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24747			Parcel 1.3 Wallasey Approach Road No wildlife comment							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24748			Parcel 1.4 Moreton Common Part of North Wirral Coastal Park and adjacent to the Wallasey embankment. We object to development here because of a high risk of disturbance to birds on the North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA, by light and noise pollution and increased risk of disturbance from dogs and walkers when the birds are roosting. The forthcoming LCR study on recreational impacts on the Habitat Sites is important, and this site must be protected at least until it is concluded. A Habitats Regulations Assessment would certainly be needed.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24749			Parcel 2.6 Bidston Station Bidston Marsh Local Wildlife Site runs along the railway edge; that area is included because of marsh flora, as the site drains down to that edge and the railway embankment impedes further drainage. We object to development here unless it includes a substantial buffer and SuDS to keep the marsh wet and prevent pollution of its water. Since much of the area is car park to Bidston station, the sustainability of development here would be questionable if it removed that car park, which encourages train use into Birkenhead/Liverpool.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24750			Parcel 3.5 River Fender (Parcel ref corrected from 3.4): Would need SuDS and substantial buffer strip along the river, especially as it is canalised with steep banks							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24751			Parcel 4.4 East of Mount Road (SP038) The main wildlife issue we are aware of on Brackenwood Golf Course is the presence of Great Crested Newts, presumed breeding in one of the ponds, but the breeding site is not known. There are also good numbers of mature trees. Due area would need to be set aside for the Great Crested Newts, which would require extensive terrestrial habitat and SuDS to maintain water levels in the ponds. We would object unless very considerable habitat was kept and managed, as the record of maintaining GCN long-term in built sites is not good.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24752			Parcel 4.5 South of Peter Prices Lane (SP039) We are not aware of any special wildlife concerns on this parcel. There are good numbers of mature trees.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24753			Parcel 4.6 North of Old Clatterbridge Road (SP040) We object to loss of this parcel to housing development on the grounds of environmental sustainability and wildlife value. It forms part of Claremont Farm. This has some of the highest quality agricultural land in Wirral, used for horticulture and arable food production. Once land is built on, it is very difficult to restore to agricultural production because of loss of soil fertility. It is foolish, and contrary to the NPPF (170b), to build on some of the best agricultural land in Wirral, in a time of climate change and increased uncertainty over food supplies. The hedges running across the parcel are "important" in Hedgerow Regulation terms and probably worthy of Local Wildlife Site status. The land is an important part of the green corridor east of the M53. This corridor must be maintained to keep a route open for wildlife movement (NPPF 171). The farm is in Higher Level Stewardship and therefore managed to give various environmental and societal benefits, including an education programme. It has a thriving farm shop, supplying fresh produce to the adjacent estate and the wider community.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24754			Parcel 4.8 East of Poulton Road Spital (SP043) We object to loss of this parcel to housing development on the grounds of environmental sustainability and wildlife value. The parcel is adjacent to parts of Dibbinsdale SSSI. This is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. It also includes Boden's Hey, a large area of neutral grassland currently undergoing restoration to good ecological condition. We also oppose housing next to the SSSI, as development next to an ancient wood leads to its deterioration, because of disturbance and trampling, to which the ground flora is particularly sensitive. There is already considerable use of the public parts of the SSSI, by people and dogs, which has noticeably increased since the imposition of parking charges at Eastham Country Park. Further increases in usage are highly likely to be damaging, and will require more management investment. The area is a large Core Biodiversity Area, one of the largest in Wirral. As such, the mitigation required to meet "net biodiversity gain" would be extensive and likely to render the development of the parcel unviable. At the time of the UDP inquiry, this parcel was considered for housing, and the Inspector ruled it was to be kept as farmland – see the UDP report. The reasons given still apply. This is the last major "green lung" into the lower part of Dibbinsdale SSSI. The SSSI inevitably, being clough woodland, consists of narrow valleys which are vulnerable to disturbance, pollution and general edge effects along the boundaries. Dibbinsdale needs more buffers not less, and ameliorating not worsening its drainage problems.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24755			Parcel 4.8 East of Poulton Road Spital (SP043) Dibbinsdale is of major importance for bats, supporting some of the highest diversity of species and estimated numbers of individual bats in Wirral. The bats forage in all the areas surrounding the Dibbinsdale woods, and are known to use hedgerows as foraging corridors. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24756			Parcel 4.8 East of Poulton Road Spital (SP043) This is high quality agricultural land in Wirral, used for horticulture and arable food production. Once land is built on, it is very difficult to restore to agricultural production because of loss of soil fertility. It is foolish, and contrary to the NPPF (170b), to build on some of the best agricultural land in Wirral, in a time of climate change and increased uncertainty over food supplies. The land drains to the Dibbinsdale river system, which runs through our Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserves. Development would affect this with increased pollution risk and increased run-off in rain, exacerbating the problems of scour in the Dibbinsdale SSSI. The Dibbin is an important river corridor from central Wirral via Dibbinsdale SSSI, where we have several nature reserves, and the Dibbinsdale LNR, to the Mersey. Part (14%) of the area is already in Flood Zone 3 or above. The land is part of an important part of the green corridor east of the M53, from the southern boundary of Wirral Borough to Prenton. This corridor must be maintained to keep a route open for wildlife movement (NPPF171). Land is under consideration for development along all the currently-undeveloped Dibbinsdale boundary. Cumulative effects of these proposed areas must be considered, as in total they would represent a very large threat to the continued health of the SSSI.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24757			Parcel 4.9 Spital tip Development here is not likely to be viable. The land is a 1960-1970s landfill site behind a very tall bund, and probably unsuitable for building, it is POS with considerable use from the adjacent estate, and as such helps to buffer Dibbinsdale SSSI from public pressure. Pollution from this tip into the Dibbin was for long a major problem, and is only now easing as the tip ages. Major SuDS would be required to prevent the return of pollution to the Dibbin. We oppose building here as a possible risk to the SSSI.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24758			Parcel 4.10 West of Dibbinsdale Road (SP044) We object to loss of this parcel to housing development on the grounds of environmental sustainability and wildlife value. The parcel adjoins Intake Wood, part of Dibbinsdale SSSI and a Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserve. This is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. We oppose housing next to the SSSI, as development next to an ancient wood leads to its deterioration, because of disturbance and trampling, to which the ground flora is particularly sensitive. Dibbinsdale is of major importance for bats, supporting some of the highest diversity of species and estimated numbers of individual bats in Wirral. The bats forage in all the areas surrounding the Dibbinsdale woods, and are known to use hedgerows as foraging corridors. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. The land drains to the Dibbinsdale river system, which runs through our Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserves. Development would affect this with increased pollution risk and increased run-off in rain, exacerbating the problems of scour in the Dibbinsdale SSSI. The Dibbin is an important river corridor from central Wirral via Dibbinsdale SSSI, where we have several nature reserves, and the Dibbinsdale LNR, to the Mersey. About 10% of the land is already in Flood Zone 3 or above.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24759			Parcel 4.10 West of Dibbinsdale Road (SP044) Most of the grassland is currently run as organic beef grazing. Organic farmland supports significantly more wildlife than conventional systems. Once land is built on, it is very difficult to restore to agricultural production because of loss of soil fertility. It is contrary to the NPPF (170b) to build on the best agricultural land, and ill-advised in a time of climate change and increased uncertainty over food supplies. The land is part of an important part of the green corridor east of the M53, from the southern boundary of Wirral Borough to Prenton. This corridor must be maintained to keep a route open for wildlife movement (NPPF171). There are two good ponds in the area, cleared out by Wirral Wildlife some years ago. One in particular has developed a good invertebrate fauna and may be considered for LWS status when next surveyed. Cumulative effects of development along the SSSI boundaries and in its water catchment must be considered, as in total they represent a threat to the continued health of the SSSI.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24760			Parcel 4.11 West of Raby Drive (SP045) We object to loss of this parcel to housing development on the grounds of environmental sustainability and wildlife value. The parcel adjoins Foxes Wood, part of Dibbinsdale SSSI and a Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserve. This is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. We oppose housing next to the SSSI, as development next to an ancient wood leads to its deterioration, because of disturbance and trampling, to which the ground flora is particularly sensitive. A large part of this parcel is Raby Mere and Woods LWS. We oppose any housing on the LWS, which is deciduous woodland supporting bird and bats. The central part of the parcel, between the SSSI and LWS, would be difficult to develop without damaging something, so in practice considerably less than 50% of the area is developable. Housing between these two important wildlife sites would damage both by disturbance, lights, pets, and noise. Extensive SuDS would be required. Dibbinsdale is of major importance for bats, supporting some of the highest diversity of species and estimated numbers of individual bats in Wirral. The bats forage in all the areas surrounding the Dibbinsdale woods, including Raby Mere and Woods LWS, and are known to use hedgerows as foraging corridors. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. The land drains to the Dibbinsdale river system, which runs through our Cheshire Wildlife Trust nature reserves. Development would affect this with increased pollution risk and increased run-off in rain, exacerbating the problems of scour in the Dibbinsdale SSSI. The Dibbin is an important river corridor from central Wirral via Dibbinsdale SSSI, where we have several nature reserves, and the Dibbinsdale LNR, to the Mersey. The land is part of an important part of the green corridor east of the M53, from the southern boundary of Wirral Borough to Prenton. This corridor must be maintained to keep a route open for wildlife movement (NPPF171). Cumulative effects of development along the SSSI boundaries and in its water catchment must be considered, as in total they represent a threat to the continued health of the SSSI.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24761			Parcel 4.12 West of Plymyard Dale (SP046) We object to loss of this parcel to housing development on the grounds of wildlife value. The parcel includes several Local Wildlife Sites: Plymyard Dale LWS. This is ancient woodland, given specific protection under the NPPF (175) because of its irreplaceable nature, species-richness and sensitivity to disturbance. We oppose housing next to ancient woodland, as development next to an ancient wood leads to its deterioration, because of disturbance and trampling, to which the ground flora is particularly sensitive. The ancient woodland, though mostly east of the Dibbin Brook, extends onto the golf course land west of the brook in places, and up the tributary valley into the course. Bromborough Golf Course ponds LWS: currently some 6 ponds scattered across the golf course are designated in the LWS, with the possibility of more to be added as the course has been actively bringing them into good management. Ponds are difficult to retain in ecological health in a built development, because the soil water table usually falls, drying out the ponds, water pollution risks increase greatly, disturbance increases e.g. dogs, and amphibians need substantial areas of terrestrial habitat for life outside the breeding season. Gardens cannot be regarded as suitable for this as it depends too much on how the owner manages them. Residents sometimes also have safety concerns. Pond life does much better where there is a cluster of ponds, so that aquatic life can move around as the environment varies. Hargrave House ponds LWS. A cluster which was excellent in the past but has not been surveyed recently for lack of access. The Same considerations apply as to the golf course ponds.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24762			Parcel 4.12 West of Plymyard Dale (SP046) The land drains to the River Dibbin and through that to the Dibbinsdale SSSI river system. Development would affect this with increased pollution risk and increased run-off in rain, exacerbating the problems of scour in the Dibbinsdale SSSI. The Dibbin is an important river corridor from central Wirral via Dibbinsdale SSSI to the Mersey. Dibbinsdale valley, including the SSSI and the various LWS, is of major importance for bats, supporting some of the highest diversity of species and estimated numbers of individual bats in Wirral. The bats forage in all the areas surrounding the Dibbinsdale woods, and are known to use hedgerows as foraging corridors. Bats are legally protected species under EU and UK legislation. While roosts and the animals themselves have direct protection, it is up to Local Plans such as this to protect foraging areas. Loss of green land to built development impacts on bats both directly (loss of invertebrate food) and through increased lighting. Building on this parcel is therefore likely to harm local bat populations. The land is part of an important part of the green corridor east of the M53, from the southern boundary of Wirral Borough to Prenton. This corridor must be maintained to keep a route open for wildlife movement [NPPF 171]. Cumulative effects of development along the Dibbinsdale SSSI boundaries and in its water catchment must be considered, as in total they represent a threat to the continued health of the SSSI. Currently this is a relatively quiet and tranquil area, and should be retained as such [NPPF 170, 180].							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24763			Parcel 4.15 Eastham Village No comment on wildlife grounds (already urban and playing fields).							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24764			Parcel 4.17 Mayfields cemetery and adjacent POS between Ferry Road and R. Mersey. The assessment fails to note that Mayfields cemetery is on tipped land held by a high bund, consists of poorly-drained silt, and therefore may not be suitable for building. Some parts now contain human remains. Most of the rest of the parcel is part of Eastham Country Park POS and as such is in beneficial use. We consider this parcel unsuitable for built development.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24765			Parcel 4.18 Eastham golf course south of Carlett Park Road. The allotments are a statutory set, and there is huge demand for allotments in Wirral so they are certainly not surplus to requirements. We object to building on allotments, which usually support a range of wildlife and are a supply of vegetables and fruit with very low food miles. Allotments are beneficial to the health of those who work them. More land needs to be found for allotments and community food-growing. More development in this area would increase the public pressure on Eastham Country Park (=Eastham Woods LWS), a part-ancient woodland which is already a honey-pot site for Wirral people. Buffering of the Woods, SuDS and a substantial contribution to a fund to manage the woods better would be required.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24766			Parcel 4.19 Leverhulme playing fields and golf course north of Carlett Park Road. (part SP054) We object to any development on Eastham Country Park, which is a LWS (Eastham Woods) and ancient woodland, so given high protection from development (NPPF 175). It and some of the adjoining land are Core Biodiversity Area and therefore should be protected. Any development on a Core Biodiversity Area is likely to require such high amounts of mitigation as to be unviable. There is a small traditional orchard on the edge of the area next to Eastham Country Park, currently in poor condition, but potentially restorable and a Priority habitat. More development in this parcel, even outside the Country Park, would increase the public pressure on Eastham Country Park (=Eastham Woods LWS), which is already a honey-pot site for Wirral people. Buffering of the Woods by at least a 50m wide buffer of natural regeneration, SuDS and a substantial contribution to a fund to manage the woods better, would be required to achieve biodiversity net gain.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24767			Parcel 5.1 Leasowe Lighthouse-R.Birkett. We object to development in this area because of the proximity to the North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA/Ramsar and therefore the likelihood of yet more disturbance to the wintering birds from walkers and dogs. The fields themselves are possibly Supporting Habitat to the SPA, with birds roosting there in some seasons. The Lighthouse area is POS with historic importance. Protection for the area needs to be applied at least until the LCR Recreation study on the Habitat Sites is concluded. A Habitats Regulations Assessment would be needed.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24768			Parcel 5.3 Moreton Hill golf centre and adjacent land south of the Birkett. We object to development on this land because Great Crested Newts are recorded from the ponds by Lingham Lane, most recent record 2013. Given the golf centre occupies a lot of the land, and is tipped land of dubious suitability for building, it is doubtful whether suitable mitigation for the newts would leave much land available for development. The land drains to the R. Birkett, and thus would require SuDS and a substantial buffer along the Birket. The land is flat and drainage is poor.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24769			Parcel 5.11 (SP001) South of Saughall Massie Road, east of Pump Lane, includes Jenny's Wood POS. Housing development on this parcel would raise a number of wildlife concerns. We would object unless these were satisfied. Great Crested Newts have been recorded in the last decade around the Three Lanes End hamlet. All ponds would have to be checked for them, and suitable terrestrial and aquatic habitat preserved/constructed. Development would need a Sustainable Drainage system to maintain existing pond water levels – when the estate to the south was built, the resultant drop in soil water table led to loss of a number of ponds. Wintering waders and gulls from the Dee Estuary and North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA and Ramsar sites use this area at times for roosting and feeding. Further study is needed, but it may prove to be functionally-linked land, in which case built development would not be appropriate. Nesting birds also need study but may be significant. Greasby and Arrove Brook would need buffer zones on both banks, at least 50m wide, to protect from pollution and disturbance. This is an important river corridor from central Wirral all the way to the Birket system, including Meols Meadows SSSI.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24770			Parcel 5.13 East of Frankby, south of Frankby Road. We have wildlife concerns about development on this parcel. Greasby Brook runs through it, and would need a 50m buffer either side and SuDS to avoid pollution and scouring. Greasby Brook joins the Arrove Brook and runs alongside Meols Meadows SSSI, frequently flooding it. Meols Meadows are flood-plain meadows, but polluted water would harm the SSSI ecosystem. Badgers have an active sett in Frankby cemetery and may use this area for foraging. Wirral's badger population struggles to keep numbers level, because of habitat loss, roadkill and illegal persecution, and therefore needs protection from further losses							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24771			Parcel 6.1 North of Park Lane Meols. We object to any development on North Wirral Coastal Park, which in this area is a LWS (Leasowe Common), consisting of remnant sand dunes and slacks with a good flora and fauna including rare mining bees. We object to development on adjacent areas because trampling is already a problem on the Coastal Park, and increased usage would be harmful to wildlife. Domestic pets, light, noise and other pollution from housing would also impact on the Park. We object to development in this area because of the proximity to the North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA/Ramsar and therefore the likelihood of yet more disturbance to the wintering birds from walkers and dogs. The fields themselves are possibly Supporting Habitat to the SPA, with birds roosting there in some seasons. Protection for the area needs to be applied at least until the LCR Recreation study on the Habitat Sites is concluded. If this area was proposed for development a Habitat Regulations Assessment would be needed.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24772			Parcel 6.6 South of Manor Road station to R. Birket. The fields are possibly Supporting Habitat to the SPA, with birds roosting there in some seasons. Protection for the area needs to be applied at least until bird surveys and the LCR Recreation study on the Habitat Sites is concluded. The area is poorly-drained, but much has been used as farmland in the past and could be again. The R. Birket runs along the south side of the parcel. Flood risk lower down the Birket catchment is an issue. The river is a relatively clean stream with some wildlife. Extensive SuDS and a 50m buffer to the river would be needed.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24773			Parcel 6.11 North of Hilbre High School. Newton Brook would need a buffer zone, and SuDS would be needed because this is a headwater of the Birket system and there are flooding implications downstream. The Hoylake Langfields area just north of Saughall Massie Road is a Supporting Habitat for the Dee Estuary: possible impacts on that would need assessment. No overall objection, but a detailed planning brief would be needed to make development "no net loss" to biodiversity or the wider environment.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24774			Parcel 6.16 West of Telegraph Road and south of Caldly Road, including playing fields. Great Crested Newts were found in ponds on the edge of this site when the Caldly Grammar School playing fields were built. The school did considerable work to safeguard and boost that population. Therefore it is very likely that they are still there, and would require extensive terrestrial habitat and SuDS to maintain water levels in the ponds. We would object to building here as the record of maintaining GCN long-term in built sites is not good.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24775			Parcel 6.19 "100% developed" scrap west of Shore Road, vulnerable to coastal erosion. Adjacent to Dee Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar. The clay cliffs here are not protected by any designation, but need to be checked for wildlife importance. Unsuitable for building.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24776			Parcel 6.20 Includes Cubbins Green, which is included in the Wirral Way LWS: we object to building on the LWS because of loss to wildlife. There is some tipped ground.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24777			Parcel 7.1 Between Broad Lane Heswall and Wirral Way. Probable foraging ground for protected species? Adjacent to Wirral Way, but that is not particularly sensitive habitat.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24778			Parcels 7.2-7.5 SP092,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,104,105,110. Parcels along Dee Estuary coast between Banks Road and Cottage Lane Gayton. These fields are used by wintering birds from the Dee Estuary such as curlews, snipe, lapwing and black-tailed godwits. As such they should qualify as Functionally-linked land to the SPA. We therefore support the retention of these areas as open field and object to proposals to build on them. If this area was proposed for development a Habitat Regulations Assessment would be needed. The Review notes that these are adjacent to Dee Estuary SSSI but does not note that this is also SPA,SAC and Ramsar, so has a very high degree of protection. We object to development in this area because of the increased disturbance from lights, noise, pets and people to the estuary, particularly its wintering birds. Drainage would risk pollution to the estuary. This group of sites, with very limited existing housing, makes up an important wildlife corridor along the Dee shore. Development on a currently-undeveloped coast is protected by policies in the draft Local Plan. Such development should "require a coastal location". Housing does not require a coastal location. Badgers forage in parts of this parcel and have a sett on the Wittering Lane LWS which would need a substantial buffer and protected foraging areas and routes. Altogether the amount of mitigation and compensation needed would make these small sites unviable for development.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24779			Parcel 7.10 A little piece of woodland along Boathouse Lane. Adjacent to LWS east of Boathouse Lane? Could be foraging ground for protected species.							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24780			Parcel 7.11 (SP071) Land at Chester Road Triangle between railway, A540 and rear of Barnston Primary School. We are not aware of any wildlife concerns on this land, but note several ponds are marked on the map. Around a quarter of the land is high quality agricultural land: the NPPF refers to the need to retain the "best and most versatile agricultural land"[170].							
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-24781			Parcel 7.26 (SP059E) Rear of Irby Hall We object to development on this land because it lies adjacent to Backford Road Pond LWS, which supports an important population of Great Crested Newts. GCN are a legally protected species. Apart from our surveys each decade, the presence of these newts has been confirmed during the planning process for land south of Townsend Avenue (refused at appeal last year), and also by regular reports of GCN being found in gardens of the housing on either side. The most recent photo we have, taken only a few weeks ago, was of one found in a garden on Dawlish Road. GCN need substantial terrestrial areas in addition to the breeding pond. The current convention is to allow 250m round the breeding pond, which covers most of this parcel. Gardens do not form reliable habitat for GCN, as too much depends on how they are managed. The current population does use some gardens, but also has the farmland to forage in. There would also be a serious risk that building on this parcel would lower the soil water table and lead to permanent drying out of what is a fairly shallow pond. Occasional drying out, as in this summer, is not harmful, as it prevents fish colonisation while only losing one breeding season for the newts, but more frequent drying would harm the population. Other wildlife reported from the area includes Hedgehogs and Owls.							
1241495	LPIO-24797 1 of 3	no		4.19 Eastham Country Park and Leverhulme Sports fields I object to any development on Eastham Country Park including Eastham Woods LWS which is part ancient woodland. Development would require extensive mitigation including a buffer zone around the woods. It is difficult to see how and where "net gains for biodiversity" would be achieved. 5.1 Leasowe Lighthouse I object to development here because of a high risk of disturbance to birds on the North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA/RAMSAR, The site is used for wintering & roosting birds. It also serves as an important recreational area. The lighthouse is of historical importance. 5.2 Moreton - golf driving range I am not aware of any wildlife concerns but there are ponds on the site which would need assessing. If there are Great Crested Newts then areas would have to be set aside for their protection. The River Birket flows adjacent to this site and would require a buffer zone. 5.10 Saughall Massie - small triangle of land at road junctions - no comment 5.11 SP001 south of Saughall Massie Road, east of Pump Lane I object to development here. These fields are important roosting and feeding areas for wintering birds. There are also several ponds on the site which would need protection from disturbance and pollution. Both the Greasby Brook and Arrowe Brook run through the site and would need buffering to protect them from disturbance and from increased risk of pollution. Together they form an important river corridor from central Wirral. A public footpath also runs across the site. The site is also important as it separates the communities of Greasby and Saughall Massie. 5.13 east of Frankby, south of Frankby Road. I object to development here. There is an active badger sett in Frankby Cemetery and this area is used for foraging. The Greasby Brook runs through the site and would need buffering to protect it from disturbance and pollution. 6.1 north of Park Lane Meols I object to development in this area because of its proximity to the North Wirral Foreshore SSSI/SPA/Ramsar and the potential risk of disturbance to the wintering and roosting birds. 6.6 south of Manor Road station to River Birket.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1241495	LPIO-24797 2 of 3	no		This site consists of agricultural land including market gardens. The fields may be used by wintering and roosting birds. The River Birket runs along the south side of the site and would require a buffer zone. Due to the railway line access would have to be onto Heron Road which is already a busy, narrow road with poor visibility. 6.11 north of Hilbre High School. This site consists of agricultural land. Building on agricultural land is contrary to NPPF. The fields may be used by wintering and roosting birds. The Newton Brook flows through the site and would need a buffer zone. 6.16 west of Telegraph Road and south of Caldly Road This site includes school playing fields. There are also ponds on the site which historically held Great Crested Newts, and so would need assessing. 6.19 west of Shore Road This site is adjacent to Dee Estuary SPA/SAC/Ramsar. This site is probably unsuitable for development as the cliffs are unstable and vulnerable to erosion. 6.20 Caldly - Includes Cubbins Green & Wirral Way LWS: I object to development on this site as it is adjacent to the Dee Estuary SPA/SAC/RAMSAR. It also includes Cubbins Green part of the Wirral Way LWS. 7.1 Lower Heswall - Between Banks Road and The White House (including Wirral Way). I strongly object to development on this parcel of land. The site is sandwiched between the Dee Estuary SSSI/SPA/SAC/RAMSAR and the Wirral Way LWS where there is a long established active badger sett. The surrounding fields, historically used for food production but now predominantly used for horse grazing and stabling, provide important foraging for the badgers. This site, including the Wirral Way, provides an extremely important wildlife corridor. The sett would need a substantial buffer zone and foraging areas and dispersal routes would need protecting. It is important green space and an area enjoyed by many for recreation whether on foot, on bike or on horseback. People come here to escape suburbia to spend quality time in the peace and quiet of the countryside.							
1241495	LPIO-24797 3 of 3	no		Development here would be an encroachment on the countryside. It is currently a calm and tranquil area and should be retained as such. 7.2-7.5 (SP092,96,97,98,99,100,101,102,103,104,105,110). Lower Heswall/Gayton -between Banks Road & Cottage Lane. These sites are situated immediately adjacent to the Dee Estuary SSSI/SPA/SAC/RAMSAR and between the estuary and the Wirral Way LWS. I object to the release of these parcels of land for development. There are two long established badger setts located in these sites. The Wittering Lane LWS sett (7.2) and the second Wirral Way LWS badger sett (7.5) are both located here. The surrounding fields provide important foraging for the badgers. The fields are also important for wintering and roosting birds from the Dee Estuary. Development in this area would result in disturbance due to increase in human activity with subsequent noise and light pollution and would have a detrimental impact on the wildlife. There is also a risk of potential pollution of the Dee Estuary. These sites also provide an extremely important wildlife corridor. Both setts would need a substantial buffer and foraging areas and dispersal routes would need protecting. Cumulatively the sites are an important green space. The land is currently used as agricultural land and it should remain so. Building on agricultural land is contrary to NPPF. The area is enjoyed by many for recreation whether on foot, on bike or on horseback. People come here to escape suburbia to spend quality time in the peace and quiet of the countryside. Development here would be an encroachment on the countryside. It is a quiet and tranquil area and should remain so.							
1241495	LPIO-24798			7.10 Boathouse Lane. No objection 7.26 SP059E Rear of Irby Hall I object to development on this parcel of land. There is an outlying sett in a hedgerow to the rear of Pensby High School. In addition the land serves as valuable badger foraging area. Badgers frequently cross Telegraph Road (A540) as is judged by the number of road casualties along this stretch of road. The land also acts as a dispersal route for badgers. The current green space links up with Parcel 7.27 and Harrock Wood and beyond. Should this parcel be released for development there would be a break in connectivity and Parcel 7.27 including Harrock Wood would become isolated. The site also includes Backford Road Pond LWS, designated for its important population of Great Crested Newts. In addition to the pond Great Crested Newts also require a substantial area of "dry" land. Together the badgers and Great Crested Newts would require substantial mitigation including large buffer zones and protection of foraging area and dispersal routes. The land is currently used as agricultural land and it should remain so. Building on agricultural land would be contrary to NPPF. Development here would be an encroachment on the countryside. In addition the landscape of this area merits protection. The scenery and view travelling north along this stretch of the A540 is perhaps the best on Wirral							
1248749	LPIO-24872			We consider that there are further Green Belt sites appropriate for development which have been overlooked because they have been assessed as part of a larger strategic parcel rather than as an individual site. An extra step should have been implemented to assessed sites being actively promoted by a developer, to ensure that assessments would only be taking place on deliverable sites. Further site-specific work needs to be undertaken on sites being actively promoted to be able to complete the evidence base and to properly discount and include the appropriate sites for Green Belt release. This should be done as part of a new consultation which collates all of the information that the Council have received, as we feel that a lot of the information that has been put forward on independent sites has either been overlooked or not properly assessed as part of this Regulation 18 consultation.	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 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248769	LPIO-24994			We consider that there are further Green Belt sites appropriate for development which have been overlooked because they have been assessed as part of a larger strategic parcel rather than as an individual site. An extra step should have been implemented to assessed sites being actively promoted by a developer, to ensure that assessments would only be taking place on deliverable sites. Further site-specific work needs to be undertaken on sites being actively promoted to be able to complete the evidence base and to properly discount and include the appropriate sites for Green Belt release. This should be done as part of a new consultation which collates all of the information that the Council have received, as we feel that a lot of the information that has been put forward on independent sites has either been overlooked or not properly assessed as part of this Regulation 18 consultation.	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/5659028	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684956		
1248823	LPIO-25097			We consider that there are further Green Belt sites appropriate for development which have been overlooked because they have been assessed as part of a larger strategic parcel rather than as an individual site. An extra step should have been implemented to assessed sites being actively promoted by a developer, to ensure that assessments would only be taking place on deliverable sites. Further site-specific work needs to be undertaken on sites being actively promoted to be able to complete the evidence base and to properly discount and include the appropriate sites for Green Belt release. This should be done as part of a new consultation which collates all of the information that the Council have received, as we feel that a lot of the information that has been put forward on independent sites has either been overlooked or not properly assessed as part of this Regulation 18 consultation.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849				
1245083	LPIO-2517	no									
1248525	LPIO-25190			Parcel 4.17 - SHLAA1928 Land East of Ferry Road, Eastham (SHLAA 1928) is a candidate residential allocation (potentially along with other uses) for inclusion in the emerging WLP, which can contribute to WMBC's local housing needs, including affordable or specialist housing. Our separate 'Call for Sites' submission provides details of the site. The site is a deliverable and developable opportunity in accordance with PPG. The site is demonstrated to make a limited contribution to Green Belt when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. As such and, given its suitability for development, it is a candidate for further consideration to sustainably accommodate growth.							
1248525	LPIO-25191			Parcel 4.17 - SHLAA1929 Land East of Ferry Road, Eastham (SHLAA 1929) is a candidate residential allocation (potentially along with other uses) for inclusion in the emerging WLP, which can contribute to WMBC's local housing needs, including affordable or specialist housing. Our separate 'Call for Sites' submission provides details of the site. The site is a deliverable and developable opportunity in accordance with PPG. The site is demonstrated to make a limited contribution to Green Belt when assessed against the purposes of the Green Belt. As such and, given its suitability for development, it is a candidate for further consideration to sustainably accommodate growth.							
1248832	LPIO-25204			We consider that there are further Green Belt sites appropriate for development which have been overlooked because they have been assessed as part of a larger strategic parcel rather than as an individual site. An extra step should have been implemented to assessed sites being actively promoted by a developer, to ensure that assessments would only be taking place on deliverable sites. Further site-specific work needs to be undertaken on sites being actively promoted to be able to complete the evidence base and to properly discount and include the appropriate sites for Green Belt release. This should be done as part of a new consultation which collates all of the information that the Council have received, as we feel that a lot of the information that has been put forward on independent sites has either been overlooked or not properly assessed as part of this Regulation 18 consultation.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562					
1248832	LPIO-25205			Parcel 5.13 (SHLAA 4048): Further appraisals and assessments for the land at SHLAA 4048, to the south west of Greasby are included in the attached documents. Ecological improvements, new green infrastructure and improved connections to recreation and the wider countryside can be provided, in line with Planning Practice Guidance. Further Flood Risk Assessment work shows the site would have minimal impact on climate change policies and should be supported for release under the sequential test as proposed. Our addendum to the previous landscape appraisal, shows how the site could be released from the Green Belt for mixed use development, including care provision and residential use, to meet needs identified in the Council's SHMA. The site, which is set away from visually prominent areas, is relatively well located to accommodate development in comparison to other sites on the periphery of Greasby and other villages. The existing road and ribbon development to the eastern site boundary, the existing road and development along the southern boundary and Greasby Brook, that defines the western boundary could form robust new boundaries to the Green Belt. The nature of the area and existing development create enclosure around the site, which would reduce the likely perceived impact on the landscape. A variety of local services and amenities are available within a reasonable walk or cycle ride of the site. A masterplan and mitigation recommendations for the site are attached, which could deliver up to 350 dwellings, which will mainly form part of a healthcare development. Market housing will be provided to assist with funding the healthcare development. The affordable housing contribution will be approximately 32% over the entire scheme. Development could be delivered within 24 months.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562					

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249100	LPIO-25907 1 of 2			Green Belt Parcel 5.11 (SHLAA 3003), to the north of Greasby, is not only suitable for Green Belt release but can be delivered in full within the early years of the plan period, within the settlement area of Mid Wirral which is currently seeing very little growth. The Site can deliver open market and affordable housing of a type, quality and quantity that will make a significant contribution to the needs of the Borough. Our attachments demonstrate that there is no reason why SHLAA 3003 should not be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development and that the MEAS recommendation to not progress the Site is completely unfounded. The Site currently serves little function as countryside, has limited openness and its loss would not be unacceptable. Part of the site is already previously developed and Saughall Massie Road or alternatively, Greasby Brook and Arrowe Brook further south, could be used to define the Green Belt boundary. Development would avoid Flood Zone 2 and 3a and 3b. The southern part of the site, south of Greasby Brook, does not constitute functionally-linked habitat and access would be prohibited to areas close to Greasby Brook and the northern field, to respond to feedback from MEAS in relation to the use of these areas by wintering birds, which should be reflected in the site selection process. Based on the evidence provided, MEAS would be fully justified in reducing the overall score for this site to 'green'.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/14	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/12	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684/898	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684/949	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/09	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684/951	
1249100	LPIO-25907 2 of 2			Green Belt Parcel 5.11 (SHLAA 3003), to the north of Greasby, is not only suitable for Green Belt release but can be delivered in full within the early years of the plan period, within the settlement area of Mid Wirral which is currently seeing very little growth. The Site can deliver open market and affordable housing of a type, quality and quantity that will make a significant contribution to the needs of the Borough. Our attachments demonstrate that there is no reason why SHLAA 3003 should not be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development and that the MEAS recommendation to not progress the Site is completely unfounded. The Site currently serves little function as countryside, has limited openness and its loss would not be unacceptable. Part of the site is already previously developed and Saughall Massie Road or alternatively, Greasby Brook and Arrowe Brook further south, could be used to define the Green Belt boundary. Development would avoid Flood Zone 2 and 3a and 3b. The southern part of the site, south of Greasby Brook, does not constitute functionally-linked habitat and access would be prohibited to areas close to Greasby Brook and the northern field, to respond to feedback from MEAS in relation to the use of these areas by wintering birds, which should be reflected in the site selection process. Based on the evidence provided, MEAS would be fully justified in reducing the overall score for this site to 'green'.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/10	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684/895	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/08	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/11	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/13	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/16	
1249100	LPIO-25907 3 of 3			Green Belt Parcel 5.11 (SHLAA 3003), to the north of Greasby, is not only suitable for Green Belt release but can be delivered in full within the early years of the plan period, within the settlement area of Mid Wirral which is currently seeing very little growth. The Site can deliver open market and affordable housing of a type, quality and quantity that will make a significant contribution to the needs of the Borough. Our attachments demonstrate that there is no reason why SHLAA 3003 should not be allocated within the Local Plan for residential development and that the MEAS recommendation to not progress the Site is completely unfounded. The Site currently serves little function as countryside, has limited openness and its loss would not be unacceptable. Part of the site is already previously developed and Saughall Massie Road or alternatively, Greasby Brook and Arrowe Brook further south, could be used to define the Green Belt boundary. Development would avoid Flood Zone 2 and 3a and 3b. The southern part of the site, south of Greasby Brook, does not constitute functionally-linked habitat and access would be prohibited to areas close to Greasby Brook and the northern field, to respond to feedback from MEAS in relation to the use of these areas by wintering birds, which should be reflected in the site selection process. Based on the evidence provided, MEAS would be fully justified in reducing the overall score for this site to 'green'.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56775/07						
1249271	LPIO-26125 1 of 4			SHLAA 4068, at Meols straddles two Green Belt assessment Parcels. The Green Belt Review 2019 identifies the majority of site within Green Belt Parcel 6.6, which abuts the existing urban area, as making a "Weak Contribution" to the Green Belt and any development in this area would not appear any more prominent than the existing residential areas off Heron Road. The smaller southernmost part of the Site, south of the Birket, forms part of the wider Green Belt Parcel 6.5, which also extends further south outside the site, is identified as making a "Strong Contribution". The Concept Masterplan within the attached Development Framework document shows how the site could deliver between 300-350 dwellings. Not all the site is proposed for development, with much of the existing wooded area and the land within Parcel 6.5 retained as part of the Site's Green Infrastructure and Biodiversity network. No other housing sites are proposed at Meols, other than 25 dwellings at Kingsmead School (SHLAA 4071), which does not propose to deliver any affordable housing. All the remaining Green Belt options are less suitable and the site must be considered in the context of a significant and pressing need for new housing, throughout Wirral, and the need for greenfield sites to come forward at Meols.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56774/92	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56782/39	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56782/47	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684/889	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56782/41	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56782/48	

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7	
1249743	LPIO-26364 1 of 2			SHLAA 1942 makes a 'weak' contribution to purpose 1, 2 and 3 of including land in the Green Belt; no contribution to purpose 4; and we believe that purpose 5 should be excluded from the GBR assessment. These findings are backed up by the attached detailed technical assessments we have commissioned in 2018. These reports considered the impact that development of the Site may have on local green space, access and highway matters, compatibility with surrounding uses, potential for contamination, flood risk, biodiversity and trees, impact on heritage assets, site ownership, accessibility, landscape character and agricultural land quality. No fundamental technical constraints were identified in respect of the Site. Given these characteristics and its weak contribution to the Green Belt, the Site should be released from the Green Belt to meet the identified residual housing requirement in Wirral. The Site is suitable, available and deliverable and lies immediately adjacent to the existing Bebington urban area, extending to 11.06 hectares. It comprises agricultural fields and is triangular in shape, bounded by Brimstage Road to the north, Old Clatterbridge Road to the south and the M53 to the west. Individual fields are defined by a combination of hedgerows and wire fences. The Site benefits further from direct access via Brimstage Road to the north and an existing field access from Old Clatterbridge Road, to the south. The Bebington urban area lies to the immediate east of the Site, with residential properties bounding the eastern boundary of the Site. The Site is adjacent to the suburban centre of Moss Hey and is well served by public transport, with a number of regular bus services operating from bus stops within 400 metres of the Site. Additionally, Spital train station is located approximately 1.65 kilometres walking distance to the east of the Site. The attached Development Statement clearly demonstrates that the Site is available, suitable and achievable and can therefore be considered deliverable. Furthermore our evidence demonstrates that a wide variety of community facilities, shops and services are present within 500- 1500m walking distance of the Site. A masterplan has already been produced, which we consider fully meets the requirements of the NPPF and The National Design Guide in respect of both making effective use of land and achieving well-designed places.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684858							
1249743	LPIO-26364 2 of 2			The attached Development Statement provides further details in this respect and the Development Area and Development Trajectory table for the Site demonstrates that a mix of densities of between 30dph and 35dph could be pursued on the Site depending upon the council's housing requirements, which will be determined from the updated SHMA. SHLAA1942 presents an ideal opportunity to develop a new neighbourhood of high-quality living in a 'Tier 1' Urban Conurbation to the east of the Borough. The Site is in a sustainable and desirable location and could be a 'flagship' project for Wirral in improving the quality of housing stock in a prominent gateway location. A planning application for the first phase of c320 homes could be submitted promptly by us to the Council following allocation of the local plan. A development of c320 units would provide accelerated delivery of the high-quality aspirational housing that the Borough needs, as it is envisaged that two sale outlets would be available on site. The Development Trajectory provided in the attached Development Statement demonstrates this. The proposed masterplan envisages a density of up to 35 dph. This is 50% higher than the average density of development achieved across other Greenfield sites in the Borough between 2017 -2019. The Site therefore presents a good opportunity for a more efficient use of land than has been seen elsewhere in the Borough in recent years, whilst still providing us, a known high quality developer, with a good mix of 2 ,3, 4 bedroom homes to take to the market. This mix of houses will meet the clear need set out in January 2020 SHMA, which found that over the plan period Wirral should be bringing forward 24.1% 2 beds, 43.5% 3 bed houses and 23.9% 4 bedroom houses. The Site will provide attractive and well-built family homes as part of a sustainable and tranquil environment, integrated with new green infrastructure. The imposition of a minimum density requirement is not supported. The policy would not ensure sufficient flexibility within the plan which could further impede upon the delivery of much needed housing within the Borough. In addition, it could risk the over reliance upon the development of high-density units, which although may help the Council meet housing targets, would not actually meet housing needs or demand within the Brough, further stagnating the housing market.								
1249746	LPIO-26398 1 of 2			We wish to promote land for residential development at Vineyard Farm SHLAA1930 which is to the south of Bebington. The site has capacity for up to 500 dwellings across development parcels totalling 11.9 hectares, as shown on the Development Framework Plan contained within the attached Vision Document. The site is unique in that it is already owned by us, meaning that there are no issues of multiple ownerships or agreeing land values under the terms of an option to hinder delivery. The intention is to provide a choice of housing to meet the differing needs across five development parcels. Vehicular access would be taken from Poulton Road, with a series of footpath and cycle connections to integrate the development into the local area. An attenuation basin would be provided for sustainable drainage (SUDS). The site is of a size and nature to accommodate a full range of house sizes and types and an absence of viability constraints means that it will be possible to provide a policy-compliant level of affordable housing. The attached Vision Document sets out the opportunities and constraints which have been taken into account in the indicative masterplan, and includes our assessment of economic, social and environmental sustainability. A Heritage Desk-Based Assessment has been produced since the publication of the Vision Document and is attached. The Development Framework Plan shows that land in the vicinity of Vineyard Farm would remain open so as to protect the setting of heritage assets. We have assessed deliverability within the attached Vision Document. Our evidence has demonstrated that land at Vineyard Farm is capable of accommodating some 500 dwellings and that there are no technical or environmental reasons why this cannot be achieved. As the landowner with no site purchase to negotiate and in the absence of significant or abnormal constraints, we intend to make an early start on site. Vineyard Farm would therefore make a significant contribution to five year housing land supply. The scale of the site means that it would continue to contribute completions in years 5 to 10 of the plan period, helping to ensure continuity in housing supply. The Issues and Options Consultation states that all of the weakly performing parcels have been screened against existing evidence as listed within the document.	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	

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249746	LPIO-26398 2 of 2			<p>However, some of this evidence is at a very basic level and cannot be properly relied upon in a rigorous site selection process. MEAS RAG Screening Overall Summary for SHLAA1930: Red. The red screening is based on a single reason, Archaeology, which is flawed. MEAS Screening Ecology: Red - this is factually incorrect, the screening outcome is Amber. MEAS Screening Archaeology: Red - the implication of this is that a Desk Based Assessment/Site Evaluation is required prior to allocation. However, this is a 23.6 hectare site, and it was fundamentally irrational to put a red mark against it when the recommended evaluation had not yet been carried out and there is ample scope within a site of this scale to achieve residential development whilst protecting the setting of the listed buildings. Strategic Flood Risk Assessment 2019: the first negative, part of the summary relates to a larger parcel of Green Belt land previously considered (SP043) and refers to areas unsuitable for development, and so is not applicable to the site being promoted. Transport and Accessibility Review, Red: Undeliverable without significant improvements – not costed: This is an earlier version of the document which is now included in the Evidence Base and dated as 2020. Our Addendum concludes that Infrastructure improvements including new footways and street lighting will be required, as is the case with every other greenfield site. Similarly, off-site mitigation works in relation to capacity of the local highway network are likely to be required for any scheme of this size, whether greenfield or brownfield. Merseytravel RAG, Red: Remote from transport network, would need new highway layout and bus service: The fact that the site might currently be more than 400m from public transport does not mean that it is 'remote', which would be a surreal judgement for a site 1km from a railway station with bus services. Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2019 Areas with Moderate to High Sensitivity: This covers the original Green Belt parcel considered for development (SP043) and is not restricted to SHLAA1930. Other Known constraints: SHLAA1930 does not include: Local Nature Reserve, Site of Special Scientific Interest, Site of Biological Interest, Ancient Woodland or a Biodiversity Action Plan Habitat. An existing Public Right of Way within the site is within a proposed to be located within a landscaped buffer and would not be directly affected.</p>							
1249782	LPIO-26428 1 of 2			<p>The Raby Hall Road site is not only suitable for Green Belt release but can be delivered in full within the early years of the plan period, within the settlement area of Bromborough and Eastham which is currently seeing very little growth. The site, along with the wider Eastham release can deliver open market and affordable housing of a type, quality and quantity that will make a significant contribution to the needs of the Borough. As demonstrated earlier in these representations, there is no reason why the site should not be allocated within the Draft Local Plan for residential development. The site comprises of approximately 4ha of previously developed land and is bordered to the north by Raby Hall Road, to the east and south by Bromborough Golf Club and to the west by the M53 Motorway. The site is located approximately 0.5 KM to the south-west of Raby Mere, which can be accessed within a 7-minute walk. Whilst located within the designated Green Belt, the site benefits from being previously developed land. The site has been landfilled as a result of activities of the current landowners, ourselves. Paragraph 138 of the 2019 NPPF outlines how where it has been concluded that it is necessary to release Green Belt land for development, plans should give first consideration to land which has been previously developed and/or is well served by public transport. The previously developed nature of this site is therefore advantageous from a Green Belt release perspective. The site is in a sustainable location in proximity to schools, local shops and facilities and Clatterbridge Hospital. Of particular note, Bromborough Railway Station can be accessed within a 20-minute walk. Train services operating at Bromborough Railway Station provide direct access to Liverpool and Chester, at an operational frequency of one service every 15 minutes. The full sustainability credentials of the site, in relation to existing local facilities and services, is outlined in the Vision Document contained at Appendix 1. The site is not subject to any constraints which would prevent it coming forward, because: The site benefits from an existing access point off Raby Hall Road, which is suitable to accommodate residential development; The site is located entirely within Flood Zone 1 (lowest probability of Flood Risk); There are no heritage assets on or near the site; There are no protected trees on the site; The site is not in existing agricultural/countryside use- rather it is previously developed land; The site is not subject to any statutory environmental designations.</p>	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683892						
1249782	LPIO-26428 2 of 2			<p>The Dibbinsdale SSSI is located 0.8km to the north of the site at its nearest point, however development of this site will not have a direct impact on the SSSI and indirect impacts can be mitigated if required subject to consultation with Natural England; and Any noise issues arising from the M53 to the west can be readily mitigated, through the relevant acoustic design process at the detailed design stage. The Masterplan Vision Document contained at Appendix 1 d (attached) demonstrates how the site can be developed. Ultimately, the site could deliver: Up to 150 dwellings; A mixture of both market and affordable housing of a varied mix and type; Centrally located amenity green space, for the enjoyment of both future residents of the site as well as existing residents form the local area; Maintained access to the neighbouring Bromborough Golf Course and its associated recreational benefits; and Significant socio-economic benefits by providing increased housing choice and stimulating job creation and economic investment. The Vision Document contained at Appendix 1 (see attachment) demonstrates that the site is entirely suitable, deliverable and available for residential development. The site has a willing landowner, who would look to deliver the site within the early years of the plan period. The site benefits from being previously developed land in the Green Belt, which is sequentially preferable as outlined in paragraph 138 of the 2019 NPPF. Accordingly, the site represents a suitable candidate for release from the Green Belt and should be allocated for housing in the emerging Local Plan. Furthermore, it is also important to note that the site is located within a wider land parcel that has been identified and assessed as a potential sustainable urban expansion area. Namely, the site is located within the Eastham expansion area, the location of which is shown in the attachment. Eastham was assessed as one of only two sustainable urban expansion areas by the Council under Spatial Option 2B. Ultimately the Council has concluded that the Heswall expansion area is their preferred option, however we raise a number of concerns with this in subsequent chapters of these Representations and in particular highlight how Eastham is equally, if not better, placed to accommodate higher levels of growth.</p>							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249219	LPIO-26469			We totally disagree with the definition of weakly performing Green Belt areas. (See answer to question 2.16). Areas designated as 'weakly performing' are clearly NOT with respect to the purposes of Green Belt as given in the NPPF. In addition, the Council's stated housing figure requirement of 12000 dwellings over the plan period is far too high. Use of a more realistic figure would negate the need to consider releasing any Green Belt for building. Any release would also hinder regeneration	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677529	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677528					
1246736	LPIO-26565	yes		Yes – Eastham Village Conservation Area should be considered for release for the reasons set out in response to question 2.16.							
1240932	LPIO-26607	yes	4.11 and 4.12	Yes. There are a number of other weakly performing land parcels that we consider should be released from the Green Belt. Parcels 4.11 and 4.12 from the Council's Green Belt Review 2019 are classified as performing weakly and we agree with this conclusion. Our attached Vision Document provides further information on these sites and the opportunities they could provide for residential development.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				
1240932	LPIO-26608	yes	SHLAA3094/0649/0648 – West of Raby Drive	15.28has, 229 dwellings. See further site information and analysis of constraints and opportunities in the attached Vision Document.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				
1240932	LPIO-26609	yes	SHLAA1948 – West of Plymyard Dale	101.38has, 1,552 dwellings. See further site information and analysis of constraints and opportunities in the attached Vision Document.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				
1237961	LPIO-26691	yes		The only Option we can only agree and support is one that is based upon Option 2A which we shall call "Option 2A+". It is the only sustainable and spatially sound option and needs to be enhanced through the release of this site along with other additional land, where sites are actually proven to be deliverable and developable, unlike the other options presented.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685069	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685068					
1245180	LPIO-2709	no									
1245058	LPIO-2729	no									
1237546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-2853	no			https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5676771						
1245159	LPIO-2989	no									
1238645	LPIO-3120	no									
1245311	LPIO-3234	no									
1241315	LPIO-3276	no									
1245346	LPIO-3422	no									
1245437	LPIO-3516	no									
1238549	LPIO-354	yes	7.26	This may be suitable depending on final density, the land is adjacent to existing housing and previously used as a nursery and would not damage the nature of the area overall.							
1245451	LPIO-3559	no									
1237827	LPIO-3788	no									
1245288	LPIO-3844	no									
1245498	LPIO-3951	no									
1240939	LPIO-4130	no									
1245638	LPIO-4247	yes	All Greenbelt	No, I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt land. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1239029	LPIO-4340	no									
1245501	LPIO-4397	yes		As the question path on the web page will not allow me to disagree and leave a comment, I must select YES, in order to leave my opinion. Apart from this leaving any results from this question invalid, and YES answers should be considered as not-significant due to the error in the web page, I wish to confirm that I do not wish for any green parcels of land to be utilised for development. However you have decided to designate green areas as weakly performing parcels of land (you fail to explain all criteria in the selection) supposed weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt and open spaces that must not be developed.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.13 - Do you think that any of the other weakly performing parcels identified in the Green Belt Review should be considered for release to meet any residual housing or employment requirements?	Question 4.13a - Arup Parcel Reference	Question 4.13b - Please explain why the parcel(s) should be considered for release. Ideally please upload a plan or sketch showing location.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1245086	LPIO-6610	no									
1237647	LPIO-678	no									
1246348	LPIO-6874	no									
1241025	LPIO-6885	no									
1241096	LPIO-6902	no			https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5664262	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661944					
1246482	LPIO-7030	no									
1246488	LPIO-7151	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1246505	LPIO-7349	yes		The land opposite Townsend Avenue, Irby and bounded by Telegraph Road. See comments earlier							
1241958	LPIO-742	no									
1240653	LPIO-7543	no									
1241770	LPIO-7544	no									
1246592	LPIO-7739	no									
1240903	LPIO-7761	no									
1246431	LPIO-7785	no									
1246594	LPIO-7807	no		I totally disagree with any release of greenbelt. Weakly performing parcels are still greenbelt, open spaces and should NOT be touched.							
1245690	LPIO-7913	no									
1246596	LPIO-8036	no									
1246523	LPIO-8044	no									
1246605	LPIO-8146	no									
1240932	LPIO-8307	yes	Arup parcel references 4.11, 4.12, 4.3, 5.14A, 7.22, 15. Also SP037 and Green Belt parcel 65 (please refer to accompanying representations, Vision Document and Barnes Walker Green Belt report for locations and assessments)	Yes. There are a number of other weakly performing land parcels that Leverhulme considers should be released from the Green Belt. Given the considerable residual housing need outlined in our representations, we consider that release of these sites should be in addition to the other sites supported by Leverhulme, taken from the sites listed by the Council in their development options 2A and 2B. Parcels 4.11 and 4.12 from the Council's Green Belt Review 2019 are classified as performing weakly and Leverhulme agrees with this conclusion. The accompanying Vision Document provides further information on these sites and the opportunities they could provide for residential development. Furthermore, Barnes Walker's report prepared to accompany these representations, Response to the Methodology and Findings of the Arup Green Belt Review 2019, concludes that a number of Green Belt parcels which the Arup report considers to make a moderate contribution actually make a weak contribution to the purposes of the Green Belt. These parcels include Leverhulme land at: 1. north of Red Hill Road, Storeton (Parcel 4.3, SP036); 2. west of Brimstage Lane, Storeton (SP037) 3. east of Brimstage Lane, Storeton (Part of Parcel 15, SP041); 4. east of Glenwood Drive, Irby (Parcel 7.22, SP019B); 5. east of Rigby Drive, Greasby (Part of Parcel 5.14, SP010A, SHLAA site 0879); and 6. south of Thornton Hough (Green Belt parcel 65 within washed over village). Therefore Leverhulme recommends that these parcels should therefore remain in or be included within the Council's site selection process. The accompanying Vision Document also provides further information on these sites and the opportunities they provide for residential development, including a Table at page 38 summarising all the land parcels Leverhulme wish to promote through the emerging Local Plan.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683689	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701				
1246612	LPIO-8320	yes		You are asking the wrong question here for 2 reasons Firstly how can any greenbelt be weak?? Your methodology is so seriously flawed it is inexcusable! Secondly, and more importantly, you do not need, and should not even remotely consider, any greenbelt development at all!!							
1237882	LPIO-8367	no									
1237748	LPIO-8506	no									
1237832	LPIO-8612	no									
1246598 Hoylake Vision	LPIO-8692	yes		Ellerman Lines site in the context of NDP masterplan policy CL1, a reconfiguration of the carr lane Estate and potential Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre							

