Person ID	ID	Question 4.9 - Are there any other urban sites which you think should be allocated for future	Question 4.9a - Important: Please also submit these sites through the separate 'Call for Sites' consultation event.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
		employment development?								
1246724	LPIO-10406	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							
			SHLAA 0755 – Vittoria Studios should not be an exclusively residential allocation. Over 3,300 dwellings are expected to be delivered in years 6 to 15 at both Sky City							
1248825	LPIO-10676	yes	and Vittoria Studios, with 30,000 sqm of retail, leisure and community uses (Use Classes A1 – 5, D1 and D2) in a form which will support the new residential and working population. C.30,000 sqm of commercial floorspace will also be delivered. Both sites are capable of accommodating the stated quantum of dwellings and commercial floorspace within the parameters of the East Float Outline Permission.	https://wirral- consult.objective.co .uk/file/5684264						
1246242	LPIO-10777		This is totally unnecessary and obviously a question a developer will look to answer with glee.							
1243890	LPIO-1099	no								
1247196	LPIO-11574	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247214	LPIO-12401	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247492	LPIO-12500	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1240843	LPIO-12664	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247578	LPIO-12862	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247510	LPIO-12986	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246335	LPIO-13117	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246853	LPIO-13378	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246852	LPIO-13500	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1243700	LPIO-1363	no	Here is the word "urban" again! Green Belt and Green Space land should not be allocated for future employment development unless the development meets the present tests for building on Green Belt.							
1247746	LPIO-13655	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1242183	LPIO-13973	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247218	LPIO-14067	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247219	LPIO-14172	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247220	LPIO-14272	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247222	LPIO-14402	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247226	LPIO-14489	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247245	LPIO-14580	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246827	LPIO-14708	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247246	LPIO-15327	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247248	LPIO-15439	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247251	LPIO-15545	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247252	LPIO-15637	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247252	LPIO-15638	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247274	LPIO-15734	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247275	LPIO-15847	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247936	LPIO-15989	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247287	LPIO-16203	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247344	LPIO-16290	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247349	LPIO-16378	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247353	LPIO-16466	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247354	LPIO-16554	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247935	LPIO-16651	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							
1247434	LPIO-16657	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247436	LPIO-16767	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.9 - Are there any other urban sites which you think should be allocated for future employment development?	Question 4.9a - Important: Please also submit these sites through the separate 'Call for Sites' consultation event.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247437	LPIO-16898	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247439	LPIO-16899	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247441	LPIO-17065	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247960	LPIO-17186	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247962	LPIO-17273	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247966	LPIO-17378	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247971	LPIO-17483	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1241726	LPIO-17577	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247979	LPIO-17694	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247980	LPIO-17695	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1245502	LPIO-17868	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247541	LPIO-17967	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247539	LPIO-18076	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1247996	LPIO-18226	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1237857	LPIO-18228		I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							
1246851	LPIO-21160	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246918	LPIO-21294	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246924	LPIO-21295	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246928	LPIO-21296	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246920	LPIO-21533	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246926	LPIO-21534	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1238835	LPIO-2234	no	No, I would not like to suggest any further sites for development. I believe that you have more than enough brownfield land available on which to deliver the actual number of houses required.							
1248794	LPIO-23835		The vision document for the Hind Street Strategic Mixed Use site (attached) provides an illustration of how a mix of uses might be achieved on land to the north of Hind Street, including a site that is considered to be appropriate to relocate current operations and provide it an opportunity to flourish in the future. To support expansion an alternative location is sought within the Hind Street Mixed Use site that provides the opportunity to have main road frontage within the masterplan and to complement the mixed use aims and the Council's vision. Future business requirements will include a Car showroom, Grade A offices, Mechanics workshop, Car sales display pitch, secure vehicle holding and rental area, electric charging points and other new vehicle technologies. We are also firmly committed to investing in a long term skilled and semi-skilled workforce.	https://wirral- consult.objective.cc .uk/file/5684986						
1242185	LPIO-23904		We will respond to the call for sites consultation, however the capacity of the group to survey all of Wirral for additional sites is limited. We do want more sites to be added to the Brownfield Register to reflect the real situation of former industrial and port economic activity. We believe that the growth rates set out in the Liverpool City Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment (SHELMA) 2018, on which the amount of employment land is being based, are much too high for the reasons set out in our response to Q4.8. We forwarded information on roughly 60 hectares of land from a rudimentary glance at Wirral's former industrial sites.	https://wirral- consult.objective.cc uk/file/5659121	https://wirral- consult.objective.co uk/file/5684263	https://wirral- consult.objective.co uk/file/5657006				
1244826	LPIO-2412	no								
1248825	LPIO-24619		The Cammell Laird site is located within the Commercial Core area of Birkenhead to the south of Wirral Waters. The majority of the site is in active use as a ship building and ship repairing facility and has benefited from £2 million of investment. Surplus land within the site does exist and it is anticipated that this could be used for a range of port and maritime related purposes. A particular opportunity suited to Cammell Laird is offshore wind engineering.	https://wirral- consult.objective.co .uk/file/5684264						
1248825	LPIO-24620		The area between Dock Road and the A59 is an established employment area, with a number of existing businesses but a number of vacant development plots. The opportunity exists to rationalise this area and make more efficient use of the existing developed land which, given its proximity to the M53 and existing employment uses is unsuited to other non-employment uses, whilst bringing forward plots that are undeveloped for beneficial development. This can make a significant contribution to meeting the employment land requirements of the Borough but at this stage has not been explored by the Borough in seeking to meet its employment land needs. Being in existing employment use, this land is evidently more suited to accommodate the additional employment development needs of the Borough.	https://wirral- consult.objective.cc .uk/file/5684264						
1246458	LPIO-25723	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246459	LPIO-25724	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1245180	LPIO-2683	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							

Person ID	ID	Question 4.9 - Are there any other urban sites which you think should be allocated for future employment development?	Question 4.9a - Important: Please also submit these sites through the separate 'Call for Sites' consultation event.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237944	LPIO-2718	no								
1245159	LPIO-2978	yes	Ashton Court on Banks Road, West Kirby							
1241315	LPIO-3272	no								
1237827 1245498	LPIO-3785	no yes	Pensby High school (half the site is unused - please see previous comments) Council golf courses - lack of demand, save on running costs using the revenue elsewhere and achieve a large capital receipt for WBC (please see previous comments)							
1245501	LPIO-4021	no	As per my previous answer, this type of question seems to be aimed at the developers rather than residents. Imagine if hundreds of people in the employ of unscrupulous developers were to sit at their desktop computers, happily identifying green field sites and agricultural land as potential sites for development, surely this would be a dishonest activity, and therefore this question must be deleted or ignore in the final review.							
1240939	LPIO-4125	no								
1245638	LPIO-4239	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							
1244215	LPIO-4532	yes	As a general comment, within the context of Town Centre regeneration, I would support development of mixed housing and employment sites, in particular for start-ups/flexible use office spaces, in town centres such as Heswall, West Kirby, Hoylake, to diversify the social and economic profiles.							
1244720	LPIO-4626	no								
1237696	LPIO-4702	no								
1244629	LPIO-4749	no								
1244896	LPIO-4795	yes	We will respond to the call for sites consultation, however the capacity of the group to survey all of Wirral for additional sites is limited. WGSA is concerned that the Liverpool City Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment (SHELMA), 2018 has been relied upon to identify the amount of employment land (see Issues and Options Paragraph 4.35 footnote 50.) An important point is that the SHELMA document produced by GL Hearn has not been independently tested, and only recently updated. There has been evidence from independent experts who have critically reviewed the SHELMA in association with the preparation of St Helens and West Lancashire Local Plans that the SHELMA is flawed. In the case of St Helens, expert demographer (commissioned by St Helens Green Belt Association) showed rather than the Submission Local Plan identifying a need for 9,234 new dwellings (at an average of at least 486 new dwellings per year), it should be reduced to a maximum of 7,245 dwellings within the Plan period from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2035. And, on the opinion of expert economist Dr Athey, the employment projections should be further adjusted downwards to reflect up to date data and realistic assumptions, relating to the current economic realities, then it follows the housing requirement also needs to be adjusted downwards. Both evidence serious flaws in the data, analysis, assumptions, which lead to conclusions that inflated beyond reality. In short the SHELMA is flawed growth rates are too high.							
1244896	LPIO-4878	yes	Further Answer as first submission was not recorded fully and accurately: We will respond to the call for sites consultation, however the capacity of the group to survey all of Wirral for additional sites is limited. WGSA is concerned that the Liverpool City Strategic Housing and Employment Land Market Assessment (SHELMA), 2018 has been relied upon to identify the amount of employment land (see Issues and Options Paragraph 4.35 footnote 50.) An important point is that the SHELMA document produced by GL Hearn has not been independently tested, and only recently updated. There has been evidence from independent experts who have critically reviewed the SHELMA in association with the preparation of St Helens and West Lancashire Local Plans that the SHELMA is flawed. In the case of St Helens, expert demographer (commissioned by St Helens Green Belt Association) showed rather than the Submission Local Plan identifying a need for 9,234 new dwellings (at an average of at least 486 new dwellings per year), it should be reduced to a maximum of 7,245 dwellings within the Plan period from 1 April 2020 to 31 March 2035. And, on the opinion of expert economist Dr Athey, the employment projections should be further adjusted downwards to reflect up to date data and realistic assumptions, relating to the current economic realities, then it follows the housing requirement also needs to be adjusted downwards. Both evidence serious flaws in the data, analysis, assumptions, which lead to conclusions that inflated beyond reality. In short the SHELMA is flawed growth rates are too high.							
1245713	LPIO-5055	no								
1242751	LPIO-604	no	I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.		1					
1246402	LPIO-6422	no								
1246348	LPIO-6868	no	None need be if the true housing needs are met which is a fraction of what the council states.							
1246488	LPIO-7129	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development							
1246594	LPIO-7799	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.							
1240903	LPIO-7895	no	I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.							
1246605	LPIO-8141	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.		1					
1237882	LPIO-8340	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development until all clarifications as requested in this response have been answered.		1					
1244670	LPIO-8442	no	I would not like to suggest any further sites for development.		1					
1243448	LPIO-867	no								

Person ID	ID	Question 4.9 - Are there any other urban sites which you think should be allocated for future employment development?	Question 4.9a - Important: Please also submit these sites through the separate 'Call for Sites' consultation event.	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246598 Hoylake Vision	LPIO-8686	yes	Ellerman Lines site within the context of NDP Masterplan area CL2 and potentially, a Wildfowl and Wetlands Centre. Although the site has been adopted into Greenbelt, its proximity to the adjacent residential and industrial areas, and its strategic importance should be considered.							
1239377	LPIO-8991	no	It appears that the Liverpool City SHELMA from 2018 has been used to identify the amount of employment land, but this report has not been independently tested and only recently updated. There is also the question of the flawed SHELMA used in conjunction with the creation of At Helens and West Lancs Local Plans. This data was independently reviewed by experts and found to be unrealistic with employment projections. Therefore, I would say in light of the various SHELMA documents being inaccurate, it would be unwise to try and identify any further urban sites for consideration with future employment development.							
1240872	LPIO-9022	yes	Any Site West of the MS3 to reduce the burden on the East side of the MS3							
1246678	LPIO-9314	no								
1246624	LPIO-9333	no								