

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1238147	LPIO-10057					yes	This proposal will cause Heswall, Pensby and Barnston to merge and to lose their separate identities, therefore violating a basic principle of the original establishment of the Green Belt. If this were to happen there would be a huge negative impact of urban regeneration in Birkenhead. I do not wish to comment on the disadvantages put forward in the proposal, as I am fundamentally opposed to any release of Green Belt land anywhere on Wirral.							
1246760	LPIO-10145	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	This idea would completely ruin the character of any area chosen. You won't achieve the target of 30% affordable housing in these areas - the properties will be too expensive. There will be no public transport/employment/amenities required by people seeking affordable housing in these areas. There is plenty of opportunity for large developments like this to go bust leaving the council tax payers with the bill.							
1241319	LPIO-10232	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes								
1241629	LPIO-10357	No	No	Yes		yes	There is no need for ANY green belt land to be released							
1246724	LPIO-10456	No	No	No	No	no								
1246778	LPIO-10527	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1246803	LPIO-10687	No	No	No	Yes									
1237930	LPIO-10847					yes	I DO NOT agree with the release of any Greenbelt.							
1240539	LPIO-109				Yes	yes	We live just off Storeton Lane/Station Road in Barnston. This road is the only traffic-bearing route that crosses the M53 between Clatterbridge and Arrowe Park, and at its other end is a broken junction - its connection with Barnston Road permits only one direction of traffic to flow at any one time. Further, there is no footpath for pedestrians at the blind, 50yd pinch-point. 30 years ago, when we moved here, the road was quiet. Now there are quarter mile tailbacks in both directions at every rush hour, and when the M53 is closed it backs up for over a mile. The Local plan has identified the land between Whitfield Lane and Barnston centre for development, and that around Gills Lane in Pensby (codes: 7.15, 7.16, 7.17, 7.18, 7.19). If built, this will add even more traffic and will only be workable if the broken junction problem is resolved. We remain far from convinced that the funding to fix this problem, to the point of supporting a further 3000 homes in the immediate vicinity, will be secured.							
1247120	LPIO-10961						Strongly object to the use of these parcels of land. This area should not be considered in any way for development.							
1247128	LPIO-11030					yes	The disadvantage is that potential Brown field and previously developed sites have been overlooked in many areas of the Wirral. It can be clearly seen and a proper accurate study should take place that is fit for purpose. I do not believe that there is a requirement to build at that location, if accurate research is done.							
1247129	LPIO-11043					yes	It isn't necessary, you must challenge the figure of 12,000 homes and reduce the need to be comfortably met by brown field sites.							
1247130	LPIO-11062					yes	I do not agree at all with the approach to release a single scale greenbelt in option 2B							
1243890	LPIO-1107	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Loss of greenbelt on such a huge scale is not sustainable.							
1247133	LPIO-11092					yes	I do not agree to the approach to release any greenbelt.							
1247135	LPIO-11110					yes	I do not agree at all to releasing any greenbelt.							
1245190	LPIO-11128					yes	While I understand that options for use of Green Belt land need to be considered in the development of this Local Plan, I believe that the case is not there for the need to actually use Green Belt land over the Plan period. I do not agree at all to release any single scale Green Belt land in Option 2b							
1247144	LPIO-11143					yes	The land shown is not acceptable for release. Option 2b should be removed from the issues & options document. There is no advantage to release of any greenbelt in option 2b							
1247146	LPIO-11159					yes	I do not agree to the approach to releasing any single urban extension from Greenbelt in option 2B at all!							
1244841	LPIO-1351	No	Yes	No	Yes	yes	It will destroy the green belt, farms and wildlife habitats forever. It will create a huge urban sprawl, which will have a massive impact on already over-crowded roads, and be a hugely disruptive construction site for years.							
1244969	LPIO-1633						No Green Belt release							
1238043	LPIO-1790	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	yes	Developers would be allowed by WBC to wriggle out of their commitment to affordable housing, by a subsequent assertion that the affordable housing would be unviable. This deception in plain sight seems to have become accepted practice in developments large and small. It should be banned, but stands as a disadvantage of this large site as the opportunity to provide a good proportion of affordable homes would be lost.							
1245060	LPIO-1842						I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b).							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1245105	LPIO-2107		Yes			yes	The impact on the area would be excessive. The roads in the area and in particular in the centre of Heswall and the junction between Barnston Road and Storeton Lane would not be able to deal with the increased traffic.							
1237991	LPIO-2292	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Building such a huge amount of houses would completely destroy the area. These fields act as a flood plain for Thingwall and Barnston, we have had unprecedented amounts of rainfall in the past month. The likelihood of flooding would increase dramatically if houses were built on this land especially as it hilly. How would local roads cope? Thingwall roundabout is already incredibly congested at peak times. Building so many houses would completely destroy a very pleasant part of the Wirral. Pensby and Thingwall would become one large town without any supporting amenities, eg. doctors, dentists, schools and local shopping centres. The whole area would become incredibly congested.							
1242185	LPIO-23912						Other disadvantages of Option 2B are that there are land assembly challenges and it yields the least number of houses. In our opinion it limits the choice of sites and location of development sites to the market. This lack of choice is particularly true of small and medium sized builders, contrary to NPPF Paragraph 68 that states "Small and medium sized sites can make an important contribution to meeting the housing requirement of an area and are often built-out relatively quickly. To promote the development of a good mix of sites Local Planning authorities should: a) identify, through the development plan and brownfield registers, land to accommodate at least 10% of their housing requirement on sites no larger than one hectare; unless it can be shown, through the preparation of relevant plan policies, that there are strong reasons why this 10% target cannot be achieved;" We believe that +10% of housing could be brought forward on smaller non-Green Belt sites.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006</a>				
1248749	LPIO-24877						Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845</a>				
1248769	LPIO-24999						Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659045</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684957</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659039</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659038</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684856</a>		
1248823	LPIO-25103						Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674317</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684865</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684849</a>				
1245083	LPIO-2521	No	No	No	No	no								
1248832	LPIO-25211					yes	Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684857</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659562</a>					

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248833	LPIO-25317						Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661125">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661125</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661100">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661100</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661124">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661124</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661129">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5661129</a>			
1248986	LPIO-25527						Additional disadvantages include: the impacts would be heavily concentrated and many; evidence of the promotion of all of the land has yet to be revealed therefore there should be question marks over deliverability; the development of this site would only respond to the needs of one settlement in the Borough and will prevent investment and the right housing across other urban settlements; the impact on the Green Belt would be far greater as it will lead to the merging of Barnston and Heswall and lead to the development on genuine open countryside which will be lost; the cumulative impacts of releasing one parcel will be far greater than those if a dispersed method was promoted; and the site would not be likely yield any housing within the first 5 years of the Plan.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662723</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770</a>				
1249070	LPIO-25671						Agree with the overall assessment of the disadvantages of a single urban extension, which would not assist in strengthening the vitality or addressing local housing needs within the other Urban Settlements, other than at Heswall. Our biggest concern is that this option seeks to provide almost all growth within an area which is highly constrained in terms of highways infrastructure and will not come forward until the last 5 years of the plan period owing to the significant highway improvements that are required.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684896">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684896</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5679650">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5679650</a>					
1249638	LPIO-26294						All of the disadvantages of Option 2B set out in the consultation document seem more than likely to arise and will cause difficulties for the delivery of this Option. The market will only ever be able to absorb so many homes in one location, which will reduce the pace of construction and delivery below what could be delivered across a number of sites distributed across the Borough. This in turn will mean that the impact of construction on surrounding neighbours will be prolonged for many, many years. The disadvantage relating to land assembly and the difficulties in bringing sites together indicates that there is doubt over the commerciality of this Option. Again, a huge disadvantage and barrier to progressing this as a serious option going forward. In conclusion we are of the view that no single large scale urban extension option will deliver the quantum of houses that are required in the Plan Period, regardless of the location given the concerns expressed in this representation as a whole. We do however agree that urban extensions offer the opportunity to meet the objectives of the NPPF and the Council around the delivery of a mix of homes and sustainable, well located developments. Our site, which has been masterplanned to provide 240 homes on the land at Saughall Massie Road and 145 on the Pump Lane site; a combined total of 385 homes, would contribute towards the dispersal of development across all areas of Wirral, helping to meet the borough's housing needs from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063</a>
1249638	LPIO-26323						All of the disadvantages of Option 2B set out in the consultation document seem more than likely to arise and will cause difficulties for the delivery of this Option. The market will only ever be able to absorb so many homes in one location, which will reduce the pace of construction and delivery below what could be delivered across a number of sites distributed across the Borough. This in turn will mean that the impact of construction on surrounding neighbours will be prolonged for many, many years. The disadvantage relating to land assembly and the difficulties in bringing sites together indicates that there is doubt over the commerciality of this Option. Again, a huge disadvantage and barrier to progressing this as a serious option going forward. In conclusion we are of the view that no single large scale urban extension option will deliver the quantum of houses that are required in the Plan Period, regardless of the location given the concerns expressed in this representation as a whole. We do however agree that urban extensions offer the opportunity to meet the objectives of the NPPF and the Council around the delivery of a mix of homes and sustainable, well located developments. SHLAA1774/1776 has been masterplanned to provide 190 homes, would contribute towards the dispersal of development across all areas of Wirral, helping to meet the borough's housing needs from both a quantitative and qualitative perspective.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5675735</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685061</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685064</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685062</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685066</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685065</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5685063</a>

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249746	LPIO-26401						We agree that the issues identified by the Council area all capable of being disadvantages according to the specifics of the individual site. To these should be added the longer average lead-in time for development to commence as site size increases, and the resultant limitation on diversity and choice within the housing market. The factors which affect the build-out rates of large scale housing sites are considered in the recent report Start to Finish (February 2020). The findings are based on the study of 97 large sites, together with smaller comparator sites and show that, for schemes of more than 500 dwellings, it can take between 5 and 8.4 years from the submission of the outline planning application for the first home to be delivered. In these circumstances, such sites would make no contribution to completions in the first five years. Whilst sites above 2,000 dwellings may have accelerated delivery in the longer term, such longer term sites also have greater lead-in times. Therefore, short term boosts in supply, where needed, are likely to also require a good mix of smaller sites. There can be little doubt that Wirral urgently requires such a short-term boost in supply.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683633">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683633</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683637">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683637</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683635">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683635</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683638">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683638</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683639">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683639</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683636">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683636</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683657">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5683657</a>
1245180	LPIO-2713						I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b).							
1237944	LPIO-2758	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1238835	LPIO-2828	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	There are absolutely no advantages to decimating our Greenbelt, particularly to satisfy a housing demand that simply does not exist. I do not agree with any approach to the release of any large Greenbelt in option 2b.							
1245287	LPIO-3113	No	No	Yes	Yes									
1245311	LPIO-3239	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Environmental impact, ongoing not just due to construction. 'Households' need to be fit for purpose given the needs of the future residents - public transport links / access to amenities. Costs to improve or build & service infrastructure would undoubtedly outweigh benefits. Where would the money come from? House prices would fall as supply increases. Council tax would need to be reviewed in line, decreased revenue for council. Affordable housing - how many & what cost? Majority of houses will be higher price / profit driven as this is where developers wish to invest as explained earlier in relation to 'viability'							
1241315	LPIO-3280	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b).							
1245416	LPIO-3374	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes									
1245448	LPIO-3551	No	No				I do not see the first 2 disadvantages as problematic as the impacts can be reduced by effective management of a phased strategic plan in consultation with the existing community.							
1238549	LPIO-357	No	Yes	No	Yes	no								
1245451	LPIO-3579	No	No	No	Yes									
1237827	LPIO-3791	No	Yes	Yes	No	yes	Any release of Green Belt may be more attractive to developers than some urban options. So this needs to be a option of last resort.							
1245288	LPIO-3851	No	No	No	Yes									
1245513	LPIO-4033	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The council is proposing an illegal approach to green belt development - no exceptional circumstances have been identified, unrestricted sprawl is being encouraged(!) in these plans, neighbouring towns and villages are merging together, high quality countryside with elevated views and public footpaths are being destroyed, special character of Heswall and/or Pensby is being removed by removing a large parcel of green belt land between towns and villages, Significant impact on all local amenities long term Significant impact on local infrastructure - including traffic generation Duration of the development and remediability is poor. Flood risks to surrounding dwellings and infrastructure. Dangerous roads surrounding the development Huge costs associated with utilities - unknown impact of new infrastructure required and land use associated with it. Landscape sensitivity Moderate to High High Agricultural value land being removed Site of Biological Importance Conservation Area Primary school capacity Removal of countryside to thousands of residents High environmental impacts No capacity in local services or amenities to support such an increase in population							
1245638	LPIO-4258	No	No	No	No	no								
1239029	LPIO-4342	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The loss of a large area of productive greenbelt and the creation of a large urban sprawl bringing Lower Heswall, Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston into one area with very little separation from Irby.							
1245501	LPIO-4408					yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option 2B							
1241065	LPIO-454	No	No	No	Yes	yes	With wrong infrastructure planning the site would increase the use of cars and worsen already busy country lanes							
1237667	LPIO-4562	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1244720	LPIO-4634		Yes		Yes	yes	It destroys habitat							
1245794	LPIO-4922	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Urban regeneration will not be achieved.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1241327	LPIO-4970	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes								
1244215	LPIO-5205	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1239571	LPIO-5263	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Additional households in the area proposed will strain transport access and other facilities especially in Higher Heswall.							
1245908	LPIO-5294	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The Council has failed miserably to get the development promised by Peel investments off the ground. They also are not heeding the new figure set by the Government regarding the number of new homes required. On the land in question are watercourses power cables valuable wildlife . The area around Barnston school is already congested and the school has no additional capacity. The A 540 is already a dangerous road.							
1240383	LPIO-5430	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	No Green belt release in any circumstance							
1246159	LPIO-5603	No	No	No	Yes	yes	Rail transport in the area is less frequent and less direct than elsewhere in Wirral - special consideration should be given to investment in rail services to enable any development here to happen sustainably, perhaps enabled by Merseyrail's new trains.							
1245073	LPIO-5632	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	This idea would completely ruin the character of any area chosen. You won't achieve the target of 30% affordable housing in these areas - the properties will be too expensive. There will be no public transport/employment/amenities required by people seeking affordable housing in these areas. There is plenty of opportunity for large developments like this to go bust leaving the council tax payers with the bill.							
1245984	LPIO-5729						We agree with the arguments for infrastructure and affordable housing however disagree that it would protect the integrity of the rest of the green belt as by using this parcel the green belt will already have been compromised and this sets a dangerous precedent for future development.							
1244896	LPIO-5794	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	We will NOT enter into a commentary on relative merits of GB Sites. ALL are unacceptable, unsustainable, unnecessary, wrongly located, destructive, unhealthy, polluting, unsuited to the housing required (smaller, starter, apartments, 'affordable' and NOT larger). There are NO advantages only disadvantages to ANY GB Options. The concept is flawed as GB cannot by Guidance and now strengthened Government Policy be considered when there are alternatives. Option 2B is a non-starter. WGSA has had legal and Planning advice to this effect. The notion in the GB Review, that Birkenhead alone on Wirral is a large built-up area and that extension of other areas would not constitute 'Sprawl', is nonsense. Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston comprise a large built-up area and Option 2B would increase the existing Sprawl by 25%. It would fail GB Purposes (a) Sprawl; (b) Merge distinct communities; (c) Countryside Encroachment; (d) Historic Character damaged (see Heritage Report); and (d) Assist Regeneration - an 'exceptional circumstance' on Wirral of national significance. The GB Review is flawed in methodology, interpretation of the Purposes of Green Belt and suggested outcomes which have not been subjected to Public Consultation. It also ignores the special case and 'exceptional circumstances' of Wirral, particularly as regards Purpose 5 and the long-standing need for and lack of extensive Regeneration - thwarted by past mistakes of allowing GB development and other Council actions/inaction (whichever Government was in power). There is simply NO NEED. See earlier Responses by ITPAS on GB Release and flawed GB Review, which give plenty of opportunity for legal and other challenge later as the Local Plan on the current basis is heading for failure without a further drastic change of direction by the hard-pressed but 'meekly performing' Council. Correct the 'Housing Need' and difficulties fall away.							
1246295	LPIO-5833	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The area is not convenient for commute to work in Liverpool or Chester, both of which are served better by trains on the Mersey side of Wirral, so will lead to increased traffic and congestion..							
1246342	LPIO-6020						Once there is a single urban extension into the Green Belt this could lead to a precedent. Any Green Belt release is unacceptable.							
1242751	LPIO-612						I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b).							
1238310	LPIO-6164	No	No	No	No	yes	The loss of greenbelt is not an advantage. Loss of greenbelt is not listed as a disadvantage There is no plan in the document for this site other than to provide houses. This is not a sustainable pattern of development. A disadvantage. It makes a contribution to housing need is not an advantage specific to Option 1b. Wirral waters should be the focus of the large single urban extension. Selecting an alternative large single site or any greenbelt site severely undermines the regeneration programme. A disadvantage. Arup report that this site lies in area 3 'strong' of the overall assessment of greenbelt strength. This site is in a strategically strong area. Its removal from the greenbelt weakens the overall strategic effect of the greenbelt. A disadvantage. The number of landowners has not been revealed to exhibit the land assembly difficulties. This is not specific to option1b many smaller sites have multiple owners. Many greenbelt sites exhibit this disadvantage over the 15500 urban sites listed in the document. Developers will be asked to meet the infrastructure charges on all development sites brownfield or greenbelt. This is not a disadvantage specific to option 1b. These costs are likely to be greater on all greenbelt sites compared to brownfield sites.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246161	LPIO-6234	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	WUTH believes that by focusing development in a single area, there may be additional pressure put on primary care that would need to be supported by investment in infrastructure and workforce. Specifically in agreement to the disadvantage of requirement for increased health infrastructure and workforce.							
1246352	LPIO-6292					yes	I have views - I do not agree with any Green Belt release in any shape or form. I do not agree with any Greenbelt release - either Option A, B or Hybrid.							
1239535	LPIO-6335						Whatever it takes, Wirral's Green Belt should be preserved for the following reasons. - Because of the developing climate crisis extreme rain fall is now the new norm. Therefore Green Spaces have to be preserved in order to act as soakaway areas for flood water. - Similarly, the Green Belt has to be preserved because of the current nature crisis, earth is losing species at a rate not seen since the dinosaurs were wiped out. Insect populations have plummeted, without these and other invertebrates soil will deteriorate to dust and pollination of food crops will fail. - Green Spaces including Green Belt, Parks, Parkland and Playing fields are essential for mental well-being, rates of mental health in the Wirral have increased dramatically over the last decade and show no signs of decreasing any time soon. Having access to or at least being close to green spaces has been proven to boost mental well-being.							
1246393	LPIO-6353						Dispersed - not fair on the existing residents in proposed area for that expanse of new development.							
1246415	LPIO-6452	No	No	No	No	no								
1246419	LPIO-6499					yes	Site ref. 7 - In parts Gills Lane is narrow and the junction with Barnston Road can be dangerous as there is no clear visibility. By building on the side of Gills Lane the increase in the number of vehicles would only add to the problems. All the primary schools in the area are at full capacity and more homes would require more places to be found and the possibility of a new school, the cost possibly borne by a council that is cash strapped. There would also be an increased demand on medical services in an area that is already very stretched. We feel it is doubtful that the infrastructure in the area would be able to cope with a large number of new homes. Do not agree that Thingwall Greenbelt has a weaker contribution and value. Local infrastructure would not cope with a large development. The demarcation between areas will disappear, changing the character of the area forever. The comments made to question 13 also apply to this question. Also Barnston is a conservation area and its character will change irrevocably, not for the better.							
1246420	LPIO-6515					yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale Greenbelt in Option 2b.							
1245086	LPIO-6614	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	It would destroy a large area of open countryside even if you think it performs weakly! It would have a severely detrimental effect on Heswall and Barnston. In fact I can see no advantages at all for this development. It is a dreadful plan & should be binned.							
1246435	LPIO-6633	No	No	No	No	yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b). Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document. How are an extra 2500 plus cars going to squeeze on to Storeton Lane in rush hour as people commute to Birkenhead/Liverpool? Both Barnston Road and Storeton Lane are already jam packed during rush hour due to the bottle neck at the top of Storeton Lane. Extra schools and a GP Surgery would also be required as all other surgeries in the area have patient lists that are full to capacity. This is a totally unfeasible option. I would oppose any release of greenbelt land but if I had a preference between the 2 options I would choose dispersed release of land as this would take pressure off on single area and development would be equally and fairly distributed. It would also mean existing infrastructure could be utilised without the necessity of building new schools', surgeries and roads.							
1245286	LPIO-6651	No	No	No	No		I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b). Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document. How are an extra 2500 plus cars going to squeeze on to Storeton Lane in rush hour as people commute to Birkenhead/Liverpool? Both Barnston Road and Storeton Lane are already jam packed during rush hour due to the bottle neck at the top of Storeton Lane. Extra schools and a GP Surgery would also be required as all other surgeries in the area have patient lists that are full to capacity. This is a totally unfeasible option. I would oppose any release of greenbelt land but if I had a preference between the 2 options I would choose dispersed release of land as this would take pressure off on single area and development would be equally and fairly distributed. It would also mean existing infrastructure could be utilised without the necessity of building new schools', surgeries and roads.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246438	LPIO-6668	No	No	No	No	yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b). Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document. How are an extra 2500 plus cars going to squeeze on to Storeton Lane in rush hour as people commute to Birkenhead/Liverpool? Both Barnston Road and Storeton Lane are already jam packed during rush hour due to the bottle neck at the top of Storeton Lane. Extra schools and a GP Surgery would also be required as all other surgeries in the area have patient lists that are full to capacity. This is a totally unfeasible option. I would oppose any release of greenbelt land but if I had a preference between the 2 options I would choose dispersed release of land as this would take pressure off on single area and development would be equally and fairly distributed. It would also mean existing infrastructure could be utilised without the necessity of building new schools, surgeries and roads.							
1241910	LPIO-6686	No	No	No	No		I do NOT agree with the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option 2b. this must be taken OUT of the issues and options document. "Weakly" and "Strongly" performing greenbelt are LUDICROUS definitions. "Weakly" performing greenbelt is still greenbelt and should NOT be touched. There should be NO green belt land released AT ALL, for the sake of climate change, our wildlife and the wellbeing of Wirral people. Also, farms should be retained in their entirety for the sake of national food/dairy production.							
1246441	LPIO-6725						I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b). Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document. How are an extra 2500 plus cars going to squeeze on to Storeton Lane in rush hour as people commute to Birkenhead/Liverpool? Both Barnston Road and Storeton Lane are already jam packed during rush hour due to the bottle neck at the top of Storeton Lane. Extra schools and a GP Surgery would also be required as all other surgeries in the area have patient lists that are full to capacity. This is a totally unfeasible option. I would oppose any release of greenbelt land but if I had a preference between the 2 options I would choose dispersed release of land as this would take pressure off on single area and development would be equally and fairly distributed. It would also mean existing infrastructure could be utilised without the necessity of building new schools, surgeries and roads.							
1246445	LPIO-6753						It might take longer to achieve, but you can't always go for a 'quick fix' solution when the impact on Wirral will be so great. Take longer & get it right.							
1246447	LPIO-6774						I strongly disagree with the approach to release any single scale Greenbelt land in option 2B. Greenbelt land must not be released. There is Brownfield land available.							
1246452	LPIO-6791						The maps show parcels of land that are not acceptable for release. I strongly disagree with the approach to release a single urban extension from the Greenbelt under option 2B. I do not agree with the release of any Greenbelt land, whilst there is unused Brownfield land available.							
1246348	LPIO-6881	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The quality of life for everyone would be badly affected - loss of farmland, trees, traffic would be a nightmare. The loss would be too great. People are using this area in substantial numbers due to the coronavirus. Everything else has been taken from us. Thank god for these open spaces.							
1241096	LPIO-6905	Yes	Yes		Yes	yes	It would mean that financial resources are not available to develop and support areas around Birkenhead and the docklands which are most in need of financial input.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684262">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684262</a>						
1246482	LPIO-7034	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1246456	LPIO-7074						Loss of Green Belt. Increased traffic on all roads, (Barnston Rd, Pensby Rd, Whitfield Lane, Whitehouse Lane, Gills Lane, loss of farmland (much needed after Brexit!) Much infrastructure needed e.g. schools, medical surgeries etc. Loss of view for many who brought their houses for the open aspect afforded. Loss of wildlife. No advantages! Many disadvantages.							
1246486	LPIO-7105						I do not agree at all with the approach to release any single scale Greenbelt, option 2b.							
1246501	LPIO-7171						I do not agree at all to release any single scale Greenbelt in option 2b.							
1244604	LPIO-7223						AGAIN I REPEAT. I do not believe any Green Belt Land should even form part of the local plan.							
1246515	LPIO-7253						Adamant View - NO GREEN BELT SHOULD BE RELIED UPON - EVEN AS A CONTINGENCY.							
1246518	LPIO-7278						Do not think GREEN BELT should be included under any circumstances.							
1246524	LPIO-7337						Don't just think about ticking the governments' box to build more houses, think instead of the intolerable strain on local services, roads, healthcare and schools.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246545	LPIO-7408						The impact on the Local Area would be devastating, both in the building phase and afterwards facility wise. The local facilities would not support such a development.							
1237978	LPIO-7426						If a single site is chosen and subsequently the demand for housing does not materialise, a large area of Green Belt will have been despoiled for ever. The development of such a large single area would have detrimental effects on the environment. It would give faster run off of water to surrounding streams and potentially increase the risk of flooding.							
1246549	LPIO-7443						If the government figures are WRONG we will not need to build a big concentration of houses.							
1240653	LPIO-7554	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The local plan is based on a limited, preferably zero, requirement for homes to be built on greenbelt land. However, this approach necessitates the maximum possible release.							
1241770	LPIO-7556	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes		As the whole aim of the local plan is to build solely on brownfield sites, if this large parcel of land is released there will be no opportunity to limit the number of properties built should they not be required. Once a developer has acquired this piece of land they will fill it whether the houses are required or not.							
1243342	LPIO-777	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes									
1240903	LPIO-7915	No	No	No	No	yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b).							
1240932	LPIO-8317	No	No	No	No		Whilst Leverhulme supports the release of its landholdings as an urban extension and broadly agrees with the Council's assessment of the advantages of releasing a Single Urban Extension as part of Green Belt land release, we disagree with the disadvantages listed. All parcels of the Single Urban Extension option identified by the Council (Parcels 7.15-7.18 of the Council's Green Belt Review 2019) is land under Leverhulme's control and as such we can confirm that land assembly is not an issue in this case, contrary to the Council's summary. A large urban extension of this kind would inevitably be built-out as a number of outlets and from different access points with a comprehensively phased and planned construction timetable agreed in partnership with the Council and secured as part of a planning permission. As outlined in our Vision Document, we have created an initial concept masterplan of the site to demonstrate how land in this area could be planned in a comprehensive, placemaking-led approach to create a series of new neighbourhoods. Such an approach can successfully bring forward a large site in a shorter timescale. Leverhulme would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682689">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682689</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682697</a>	<a href="https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701">https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701</a>				
1246612	LPIO-8330	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	This is totally flawed as there is no reason to build on any greenbelt and so there are no advantages. It is also based upon flawed figures and is much more than the region requires it will also waste and investment and divert this away from where is needed in Birkenhead							
1246550	LPIO-8398						I do not agree at all with the approach to release any single scale greenbelt, in option (2b).							
1237748	LPIO-8511	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single urban extension into Green Belt in option (2b). The advantages are not compelling. The traffic pinch point in the centre of Heswall cannot accommodate any greater traffic flows and other infrastructure issues all of which are not easily resolved.							
1241852	LPIO-8553	No	No	No	No	no								
1243888	LPIO-8556	No	No	No	No		Significant investment in supporting infrastructure will be required wherever houses are to be built. It is wrong to assume existing developments can actually just absorb the service, infrastructure and amenity needs of new residents without heavy investment. This is no more true of 2b than 2a. Some small sites in these areas and elsewhere in Wirral have taken years to complete development. The size of the site does not matter as much as the willingness of those involved to proceed.							
1243448	LPIO-875					yes	Green belt/field sites should never be developed.							
1246631	LPIO-8833	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	The character of a sizeable portion of rural Wirral would be transformed for the worse.							
1245034	LPIO-8841	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	no								
1246666	LPIO-9015						I do not agree at all at the approach to release any single scale greenbelt in option (2b). Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document. How are an extra 2500 plus cars going to squeeze on to Storeton Lane in rush hour as people commute to Birkenhead/Liverpool? Both Barnston Road and Storeton Lane are already jam packed during rush hour due to the bottle neck at the top of Storeton Lane. Extra schools and a GP Surgery would also be required as all other surgeries in the area have patient lists that are full to capacity. This is a totally unfeasible option. I would oppose any release of greenbelt land but if I had a preference between the 2 options I would choose dispersed release of land as this would take pressure off on single area and development would be equally and fairly distributed. It would also mean existing infrastructure could be utilised without the necessity of building new schools, surgeries and roads.							



Person ID	ID	Question 4.17d - It will take longer to develop homes on a larger site.	Question 4.17d - The impact of construction would be prolonged.	Question 4.17d - Comprehensive land assembly may be more difficult to achieve.	Question 4.17d - Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure.	Question 4.17e - Are there any other disadvantages?	Question 4.17f - Please set out any additional disadvantages or comments below:	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246670	LPIO-9073						Disadvantages : Do not agree it will take longer to develop homes as it is likely houses will be developed in stages and released to the market.							
1239377	LPIO-9099						I do not agree with the release of any parcel of green belt identified in Option 2B.							
1246671	LPIO-9120						The fields often flood which is a potential risk to the new houses & surrounding area. The local roads will not be able to cope with the extra traffic. There will be significant additional costs to the council to provide a better infrastructure.							
1246672	LPIO-9160					yes								
1246678	LPIO-9338	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	All Green Belt should be protected and building should be concentrated on regenerating the run down areas of the Borough.							
1241495	LPIO-9433	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	A large area like this would impact significantly on the wildlife in that area. It would be a large encroachment into the countryside in effect urbanising a large tract of land having a detrimental impact on the wildlife, particularly badgers, which currently lives there. It is difficult to see how the impact of releasing this large area of land can be offset. This land in question has never been developed and is not currently served well by local services so any development would necessitate new infrastructure.							
1246712	LPIO-9596	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	Please see the attached statement for our full case.							
1246720	LPIO-9749	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	In response to Q 4.17 we disagree with the council's approach to the release of very large urban extensions from the Green Belt as they would not provide the dispersal, variety and mix of housing across the district to meet local needs contrary to providing the choice and competition of land (paragraph 73 of the Framework).							
1246693	LPIO-9754						The Council seems intent on trying to justify the approach of releasing greenbelt - with the highly inflated standard calculation, the lack of evidence around economic growth, the lumping together of settlements (2.5). If the Council was being honest with the facts and figures it is clear that release of greenbelt is not required and the majority of Wirral residents do not agree with it. I DO NOT AGREE AT ALL at the approach of releasing any single scale greenbelt in option (2b)							
1237724	LPIO-9850	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	yes	Going ahead with this would as previously stated ruin the character of the area but during a period of prolonged development would ruin the lives of all in the neighbourhood due to noise, traffic etc.							
1245994	LPIO-9990	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	yes	This idea would completely ruin the character of any area chosen. You won't achieve the target of 30% affordable housing in these areas - the properties will be too expensive. There will be no public transport/employment/amenities required by people seeking affordable housing in these areas. There is plenty of opportunity for large developments like this to go bust leaving the council tax payers with the bill.							