

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10107

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their rural character and be contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10117

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

There is a climate change emergency no green belt should be built on as it mitigates against climate change, produces food and supports the health and wellbeing of the people and provides a refuge for wildlife

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

This development would significantly increase traffic and pollution in the area and there are no public transport links nearby. The houses on this development would be car dependent

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10137

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3n Other reasons

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10177

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I object to ANY development on ANY of Wirral's greenbelt land.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10308 (Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

While considering option 2B (but also 2A) the council has failed to take into account constraints other than the 5 functions of the green belt. Decisions based upon the categorisation of potential development land into either strong or weak green belt performance does not consider other environmental issues (such as statutory and non-statutory designations and ecological networks). This is totally unacceptable as these constraints should be given equal or higher weighting, as clearly set out in the NPPF. Indeed, unlike the Green Belt specifically, protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment is listed in one of the three key objectives of the NPPF (objective c environment, paragraph 8 NPPF). It is absolutely critical that these wider environmental constraints are considered in parallel to green belt performance. Without this the Local Plan could be considered unsound. Unfortunately this situation has occurred partly because the Green Infrastructure review and Ecological Network study are still incomplete. These studies should be used to inform strategic planning and not to be commissioned as an afterthought. The Cheshire Wildlife Trust is seriously concerned that the decision process is ill-informed and not evidence based. We can illustrate this by the information we have uploaded as supporting evidence. These examples demonstrate serious environmental constraints which should have been flagged as being of paramount importance by the Interim Sustainability Appraisal. The

Interim Sustainability Appraisal relies on a flawed assumption that impacts to these sites could be mitigated on other green belt land. This is entirely without basis as measurable Biodiversity Net Gain relies on the long term management of habitat by a suitable habitat provider. It cannot be assumed that Biodiversity Net Gain can be achieved on privately owned land by landowners who have little or no expertise in managing wildlife habitat. Environmental constraints for specific sites – 2B Dispersed Green Belt Release option: 7.16 and 7.17 These parcels lie adjacent to Barnstondale Local Wildlife Site and ancient woodland. Without significant buffering of at least 50m there is potential for significant impacts especially through disturbance and pollution of the Prenton Brook. Light pollution could negatively impact the bat population that uses the brook for foraging. Furthermore parcel 7.18 (SP061) is known to be important for BoCC red listed birds including lapwing, herring gull, skylark, linnet, house sparrow and Schedule 1 listed barn owl. Wintering curlew is also found here suggesting that the fields may be functionally linked to the internationally designated sites. A HRA assessment would be required.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5861582>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10447

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10599

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The only disadvantage of this approach is the substantial period of time that larger urban extension settlements have a very long lead-in period to delivery, that means that it would not contribute to the early year's supply required in the plan. Accordingly, it would need to be used in conjunction with a strategy that would see a good number of smaller edge of settlement/urban extension sites in order to alleviate the current undersupply and backlog.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10783

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

There should NOT be any options. There is NO NEED TO BUILD ON GREEN BELT. FACT. Why have Mott MacDonald been consulted to assess and produce a Single Urban Extension to develop Green Belt land bordered by Heswall, Pensby & Thingwall? Creating 2584 unnecessary dwellings and ruining the individual villages & habitat. What cost was this to the Council and when was it instigated? When and who decided that this consultation should go ahead? (1) What cost was this assessment to the Council? (2) When and who decided that this consultation should If Mott MacDonald were appointed the following day on the 14th January and able to produce the assessment by Monday the 20th January, then they have worked with great speed and alacrity. Possibly in hindsight the Council would have been better advised to employ them to produce the the Local Plan which has taken nearly 20 years to produce and still is a fudged, inaccurate, misleading document. Further questions now arise from your response: (3) Have the Council requested assessments for other areas of Green Belt on the Wirral? (4) If this is the case, when were they requested and again at what cost to the Council? We note you say 'the Council's preferred option is urban regeneration seeking to avoid Green Belt'. If the Council and its Planners adhered to it's own Compendium of Statistics 2019 which has already cost the Council dearly, then there will be no need to build on Green Belt. Thus saving the additional costs of imposing Regulation 18 and therefore scrapping Option 2B. We believe the Council need to reassess their figures based on local projections as well as government national housing targets. You and all planners know that once Green Belt is developed it is lost to all future generations. Please think long and hard when making decisions. Please act honestly and serve the community to their best interests.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10798

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Emphasis should be on the regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. There function of the Green Belt to prevent the merging of neighbouring towns appears appropriate in the case of the different characteristics of Barnston & Heswall

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Emphasis should be on the regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. There function of the Green Belt to prevent the merging of neighbouring towns appears appropriate in the case of the different characteristics of Barnston & Heswall.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Emphasis should be on the regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. There function of the Green Belt to prevent the merging of neighbouring towns appears appropriate in the case of the different characteristics of Barnston & Heswall.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-108

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Storeton Lane/Station Road in Barnston 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.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10814

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

This would be a disaster to the area, huge problems with infrastructure, services and access. Definitely a 'NO'

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

This would be a disaster to the area, huge problems with infrastructure, services and access. Definitely a 'NO'

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11349

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

It will destroy the open belt creating huge urban scrawl. It will have an impact on already overcrowded roads with increased global emissions from the added traffic

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

It will have an impact on already overcrowded roads with increased global emissions from the added traffic

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Where are the services of doctors, dentists Hospital and social care to come from in an already overworked system?

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

It will destroy the open belt creating huge urban sprawl.

Q3n Other reasons

We would be interested to know who is to buy this land to make a profit from this housing.? The existing population of Barnston and Heswall certainly will not. As existing ratepayers we are likely to have our rates Increased and also the saleable value of our homes will be affected. We see the Council in applying the least point of resistance to dump these overspill housing plans Where are the jobs to come from to enable many of the new housing residents to pay or rent the stock.? It is probable that many will be vulnerable people. People already on benefit and unfit to keep their homes in repair. There will be a degree of anti social behaviour and who will be policing this area?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11367

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing to you to express my views on the proposed council's plans and my Objection to Option 2B single Urban Extension West of Barnston Road Heswall. Should this option go ahead it will destroy the Green Belt , farms and wildlife habitats forever. The council need to identify more developable/deliverable Brownfield Sites and secure available funding. Reclassify land classified for other uses and that had lain unused for years and is suitable should be reclassified for housing

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I am writing to you to express my views on the proposed council's plans and my Objection to Option 2B single Urban Extension West of Barnston Road Heswall. Should this option go ahead it will destroy the Green Belt , farms and wildlife habitats forever.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11378

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am absolutely horrified that you are trying to build on single urban extension West of Barnston Road Heswall - Option 2B. Ruining the green belt is disgusting to the farms and wildlife habitats. You should know better. This is a time for climate action not climate destruction.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Ruining the green belt is disgusting to the farms and wildlife habitats. You should know better. This is a time for climate action not climate destruction.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11382

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I wish to register my opposition to the proposal to build on green belt land especially that to the West of Barnston Road, Heswall. If this goes ahead it will have a disastrous effect on the local environment - the loss of mature trees, farmland, wildlife habitat, a public right of way and the loss of separate identities of Barnston Village and Heswall. I am against building on any green belt land. With regard to trees, there are many young trees growing in the existing hedgerows which, if left undisturbed will grow to maturity -so necessary in this time of global warming, which affects all of us.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I am against building on any green belt land. With regard to trees, there are many young trees growing in the existing hedgerows which, if left undisturbed will grow to maturity -so necessary in this time of global warming, which affects all of us.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11391

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am horrified at the proposal (option 2B) to build a town of 2,500 houses up the West side of Barnston road. This would a hideous urban sprawl creating massive bottlenecks in the traffic along Barnston Road. I urge you to reject option 28 - for the sake of our wild plants, animals and birds; of our air quality; of our village and its historic landscapes. If they go, they are lost forever. It would a legacy that would shame Wirral council forever, too.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

There is already a queue of cars every morning that stretches back from Storeton Lane way past Carnsdale Farm: frustrated drivers trying to get to work, either queuing to turn right into Storeton Lane, or else caught behind others who are doing so. There is already an air pollution problem in Storeton Lane, with the number of idling cars during each rush hour. Add the cars from another 2,500 houses (at least 5,000 cars) and Barnston will look like the M56 does at 8 a.m. No-one who lives in the conservation area of Barnston would find this acceptable : the lanes here are too narrow to cope. People need housing near towns where they can work, or near railway stations so they commute to work in an environmentally-friendly way. Building houses on the fields in Barnston will not meet those needs: it will drive an explosion of car journeys for

commuting, shopping, school run - every domestic need will generate a car journey. The result will be congestion, frustration and pollution.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

I urge you to reject option 28 - for the sake of our wild plants, animals and birds; of our air quality; of our village and its historic landscapes. If they go, they are lost forever. It would be a legacy that would shame Wirral council forever, too.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I urge you to reject option 28 - for the sake of our wild plants, animals and birds; of our air quality; of our village and its historic landscapes. If they go, they are lost forever. It would a legacy that would shame Wirral council forever, too.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11392

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

It has come to our attention that there is a proposal under the above option for a possible 2,500 dwellings to be built on current green belt land to the west of Barnston Road. This is an enormous number of dwellings on the one site and would wreck the current green belt nature of the area. We would like to urge the Council to consider its plans for so much new housing, and we would particularly like to object to any new housing on the green belt west of Barnston Road

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

This is an enormous number of new housing bearing in mind that whenever new housing sites are developed, no additional infrastructure such as new schools, doctors, surgeries, hospitals etc are ever built to go with the new housing, so putting additional strain on existing facilities.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Surely brown field sites should be used up first for new housing before destroying the Wirral green belts. And do we need so many new dwellings? As we understand it, the land we are referring to is just one of a number of green belt sites the Council is considering allowing building of up 12,000 dwellings on.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11476

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Biodiversity. Destroying such a vast swathe of countryside - trees, hedgerows, fields, ponds- will have a significant detrimental impact on wildlife and birds.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Other roads in the area will be inundated e.g. Whitehouse Lane, Acre Lane (which is currently used as a drag strip) and Brimstage road all of which are totally unsuitable for heavy commuter traffic. The pollution generated by these additional vehicles, many of which will be slow moving/stationary in queues during peak hours will be hazardous to residents.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Schools. How many kids will there be in 2,600 households? Where will they all go to school? Doctors & Dentists. Local surgeries are already stretched with approx. 2 weeks wait for an appointment. Introducing a further 6,000 people into this area will mean the surgeries simply will not be able to cope. Hospital. Arrow Park will be in a similar situation as above.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Barnston Road often floods in places during heavy rain. Concreting over countryside will considerably exacerbate this.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Agriculture. Barnston had 4 farms - now 3. The Western Urban Extension would wipe out these 3. These farms, as well as enhancing the landscape, produce food which is likely to become ever more important. Proposing to concrete over this valuable land is crazy.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

No doubt most of the above objections can be overcome, but at what cost in both financial terms and in the quality of life?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11494

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This land in Barnston is good quality farming land and now we have left the E.U. we need more than ever to be able to produce our own food, yet here are you intending to cover it in bricks and mortar because it is easier and more attractive to the developers than to use the vast amounts of brown field sites available. Do you know what that means? The soil is the best method for soaking up carbon. This winter has been extremely wet -where will all the flood water drain to if the fields are not there? You will be wiping out vast amounts of wild life -birds, insects, animals all of which are already being compressed into areas that make their survival difficult. I watched three skein of wild geese, over a thousand, flying over the fields last week. This area has become their haven -what right have you to decide you will kill off their/our Green Belt?

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Two and a half thousand houses means a minimum of five thousand cars.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

What about the infrastructure, doctors , schools, hospitals, the pollution? You claim to have green credentials. Do you know what that means?

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This winter has been extremely wet -where will all the flood water drain to if the fields are not there? You will be wiping out vast amounts of wild life -birds, insects, animals all of which are already being compressed into areas that make their survival difficult. I watched three skein of wild geese, over a thousand, flying over the fields last week. This area has become their haven -what right have you to decide you will kill off their/our Green Belt?

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11528

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

If there has to be a need for Greenbelt release, I would prefer the option of a single site development . This would minimise the need for multiple infrastructure redevelopment and retain as far as possible the integrity of Greenbelt. It also would mean that social housing needs could be concentrated in one area and ensured to be suitable . Amenities could be provided and transport provision made. Any access development could be planned and provided.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

If there has to be a need for Greenbelt release, I would prefer the option of a single site development . This would minimise the need for multiple infrastructure redevelopment and retain as far as possible the integrity of Greenbelt. It also would mean that social housing needs could be concentrated in one area and ensured to be suitable . Amenities could be provided and transport provision made. Any access development could be planned and provided.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11580

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11787

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12373

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I wish to object to Option 2B. I do not believe that Wirral's housing need is anything like the 12,000 new homes suggested by WBC and I certainly don't think our green belt should be used to build them on.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I wish to object to Option 2B. I do not believe that Wirral's housing need is anything like the 12,000 new homes suggested by WBC and I certainly don't think our green belt should be used to build them on.

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12407

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12506

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am also disappointed that the plans do not take into consideration the loss to the people of Heswall, Pensby and Barnston of green, open spaces and the destruction of wildlife habitats.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Some time ago I wrote to the Council and specific councillors to express my fears that any such large numbers of additional dwellings would have a detrimental effect on roads which are already narrow, clogged with traffic causing huge parking problems such as double parking and parking on pavements and which are already poorly maintained with potholes!

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

I am also disappointed that the plans do not take into consideration the loss to the people of Heswall, Pensby and Barnston of green, open spaces and the destruction of wildlife habitats.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12507

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12602

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The land west of Barnston Road, Heswall strongly contributes towards the 5 key purposes of green belt as defined within the NPPF and therefore must be protected. Fundamentally, we must protect our greenbelt for future generations. If this is not protected I will certainly not be voting for the existing council at the next local election.

Q3n Other reasons

I do not believe the 12,000 'housing requirement' is correct and understand that both Liverpool and Manchester universities have calculated a figure of no more than 5,000. This negates the need for any development on green field land.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12603

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The sites you should use are the Brownfield sites, such as the docks and old factories there are plenty of those around. What attracts people to Wirral is tourism, walks, days out, beautiful scenery and lovely landscapes. I feel if you go ahead and build on the Greenbelt sites Wirral will become a large urban sprawl, there won't be anything nice about Wirral anymore, it will be like a "Concrete Jungle". Brownfield sites should be built on first, we don't need all this additional housing. Where are all these people going to find work? There isn't a lot of employment here, Champions and other places have closed down, there will come a point where there will be a lot of unemployed people all just hanging around

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12670

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12767

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I would like to register my objection to the Barnston Road plan option 2B The traffic in the area is already extreme and dangerous.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Drainage and sewerage is already overloaded. School places are oversubscribed.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12801

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I am sending my objection to the planning of using the above to be used for housing. There are plenty of Brownfield sites available. If this goes ahead more traffic on overcrowded roads, and of course more pollution. This development is not needed!

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12868

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12938

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I would also like to note in view of Option 2B. It will allow 2,500 dwellings (we do not need) & create an urban sprawl, massive impact on over crowded roads & traffic black spots. Gills Lane would need to be widened. There are two power boxes at the end leading onto Barnston Road which would need to be moved costing millions of pounds. It would eradicate farmland we need. In view of the recent catastrophe of corona virus we MUST learn to keep all the Green Spaces we have and maybe create more. To give us the oxygen we need, and the space from urbanisation to walk and breathe freely.

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12992

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13069

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The number of houses concentrated in one area proposed to be built if Option 2b is adopted is alarming, 2,600 homes! The infrastructure barely copes with the number of homes in this area at present. In your transport document you have put in roads within the proposed development but have given no thought to what happens to these cars when they join the present road network. How do you propose the increased number of cars will:-

- navigate the narrowness of Barnston Dip?
- negotiate the bottleneck at the junction of Barnston Road/Station Road?
- impact on the area around Heswall School as well as traversing another bottleneck in the area, Whitfield Lane?
- access the M53? The existing road structure would mean Whitehouse Lane and Acre Lane become even more of a 'rat run' for cars to access Brimstage Road and the motorway.
- cope with the inadequacies of Brimstage Road as a main route to the motorway

- Reduce the existing congestion? The A540 already accommodates a significant number of vehicles (the Average Annual Daily Flow was 11,737 vehicles in 2018 according D of T, at peak times there are long tailbacks. The road is also identified as an Accident Route and articulated lorries are banned from it. The pollution impact on the area with an extra 3000+ cars (a conservative estimate) pumping out emissions. Both Pensby Road and Barnston Road are major routes for emergency vehicles. Infact, they are major access and exit points to and from Cheshire to other parts of the Wirral. Existing bus and train routes from Heswall are inadequate and would not in their present state reduce the number of cars on the road.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

2,600 homes concentrated in one area puts a great strain on schools, doctors, dentists.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

As well as on draining and sewage systems. Barnston Dell already suffers from drainage and sewage issues. The existing systems cannot cope.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13075

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I am writing to express my concern about the proposed development of our green belt particularly Option 2B It is clear that there is no need to destroy the environment in this way for future generations. Many parts of N&E Wirral have been allowed to fall into decline with insufficient investment to allow high quality affordable housing, in safe, well serviced communities. Large areas of brownfield sites have been left undeveloped and unused. This is a perfect opportunity to invest in these communities, improve housing, transport, policing and leisure facilities - including more green spaces and tree planting! The plans to build large 3-4 bedroom houses on farm land and in green spaces at a time when we should be focusing on affordable housing, local food production and countryside management seems not just short sighted but more like- landowners and developers profiting from non-specific government guidelines that should be interpreted locally and reflect local needs. I realise it is more cost effective and profitable for builders to develop greenbelt land, building top end housing, but is this interpreting the government policy of "building more houses for those most in need" honestly? I do not think so. The areas of green space around us are there for everyone to enjoy - public access allowing for the whole community to benefit from the physical and mental advantages of nature. This point has been brought home forcefully in the past weeks of social distancing when families and individuals have been able to get out for walks in the fields that are available to all. I believe that if this council allows building to take place on our green belt, they will have done huge damage to our community for generations that follow. Please think again. There are other options and much more honest and farsighted solutions.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13126

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13259

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Single Urban Extension-West of Barnston Road, Heswall Option 2B I am writing again to reiterate my concerns over this proposed plan. I wrote some time ago to express my fears that such a large number of dwellings would have a detrimental effect on the roads which are already narrow, clogged with traffic causing huge parking problems such as double parking, parking on pavements and impacting road surfaces which are poorly maintained with pot holes.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13276

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

My main concern is any proposals to build on Green Belt. I see that the Council has identified areas of Green Belt for potential development and that there are 2 proposals being put forward, 2A, a Dispersed Release and 2B, a concentrated approach on a single large area. I felt appalled at the prospect of building on farmland in the Barnston area (2B), and I sincerely hope that the council will not be encouraged to adopt this proposal. The second option is less destructive, yet once again open farmland and green areas are targeted and therefore this option also represents a huge loss of green open space which should be strenuously avoided. Although 2A appears to be less invasive on the Wirral landscape I would ask the Council to use all their endeavours to avoid either option and to defend our Green Belt. It is the Green Belt, farmland and green open

spaces which enrich our social environments, and even if not everyone on the Wirral has an open aspect from their own house no one has to go far to enjoy the open countryside, and this includes all the many visitors to the Wirral from across the country. Having a pleasant environment is not simply aesthetic. The benefits of access to open space for our physical and mental well being are well known, and we should not make planning decisions which adversely affect people. Loss of our Green Belt would have a deleterious impact on all Wirral residents. As well as these considerations I would remind the council that we are being encouraged, on a global scale, to increase our green spaces and woodland in an effort to fight the climate crisis. Surely this point should be taken very seriously and is therefore another strong argument against the building on any green belt.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

My main concern is any proposals to build on Green Belt. I see that the Council has identified areas of Green Belt for potential development and that there are 2 proposals being put forward, 2A, a Dispersed Release and 2B, a concentrated approach on a single large area. I felt appalled at the prospect of building on farmland in the Barnston area (2B), and I sincerely hope that the council will not be encouraged to adopt this proposal. The second option is less destructive, yet once again open farmland and green areas are targeted and therefore this option also represents a huge loss of green open space which should be strenuously avoided. Although 2A appears to be less invasive on the Wirral landscape I would ask the Council to use all their endeavours to avoid either option and to defend our Green Belt. It is the Green Belt, farmland and green open spaces which enrich our social environments, and even if not everyone on the Wirral has an open aspect from their own house no one has to go far to enjoy the open countryside, and this includes all the many visitors to the Wirral from across the country. Having a pleasant environment is not simply aesthetic. The benefits of access to open space for our physical and mental well being are well known, and we should not make planning decisions which adversely affect people. Loss of our Green Belt would have a deleterious impact on all Wirral residents. As well as these considerations I would remind the council that we are being encouraged, on a global scale, to increase our green spaces and woodland in an effort to fight the climate crisis. Surely this point should be taken very seriously and is therefore another strong argument against the building on any green belt.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13330

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

We write to register our objection especially to Option 2b: Single urban extension west of Barnston Road, Heswall. One of the lessons to be learnt from the coronavirus outbreak is that the security of home produced food is vital to the well being of the British people in difficult and challenging times. Clean air and wildlife habitat are so important to us, yet threatened by global warming. Vast scale tree-planting programmes are needed as is the protection of precious wildlife. The destruction of Wirral green belt goes against all the principles of environmental protection.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

It will have a massive impact on already overcrowded roads and traffic black spots.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The proposed c2500 new dwellings west of Barnston Road will create an urban sprawl with no separation of traditional communities.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

In addition, many millions of pounds will be required to deal with already inadequate drains and sewerage. It will create a hugely disruptive construction site for many years.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13349

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

As you can see from our address, we are very much affected by your proposed planning. We have a very enviable view overlooking the beautiful greenbelt, we never stop appreciating how with the changing seasons the landscape and wildlife can offer so much pleasure. As you already know this is a proposed site for extensive housing (Option 2B). If this option goes ahead it will apparently give space for 2,584 dwellings!!! As you can imagine we are horrified, not only at the amount of houses but also to the destruction of the greenbelt, farms and wildlife habitats!

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

This will have a massive impact on the already overcrowded roads in this area.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Traditional communities will be lost and the area will be just a massive urban sprawl. It makes us and our neighbours feel sick at the thought of such monstrous destruction.

We will NOT accept a plan including ANY greenbelt release as there is no necessity for it! We demand that our local Councillors must insist on revisiting the Housing Delivery Test with more reasonable delivery targets and thereby rid itself of the unnecessary "buffer" penalty, which threatens our precious greenbelt.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13384

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13506

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13648

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

We need to OPPOSE OPTION 2B. If this option goes ahead it will destroy our green belt forever and our farms and wildlife!

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

It will also have a massive impact on already crowded roads and traffic blackspot. It will require a HUGE amount of money to deal with already inadequate drainage and sewerage.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The construction site will be so disruptive for many years . Surely our farming, green belt area, must remain ?? (Especially now we are not in the EU)

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The construction site will be so disruptive for many years . Surely our farming, green belt area, must remain ?? (Especially now we are not in the EU)

Q3n Other reasons

This will also allow around 2500 more houses which, in turn, would create a huge urban sprawl.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13661

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13718

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

I support a single urban extension

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1377

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This large tract of largely good agricultural land is important because it has separated the built up areas of Pensby, Heswall and Barnston. From Whitfield Lane it is possible to see the skyline of Liverpool (including the cathedral). This will be lost if developed. The area is important for its biodiversity and heritage assets, creates a rain catchment area preventing flooding of local highways, is a home for wildlife, helps with carbon capture and is an asset to the air quality of the borough. A public footpath crosses from Whitfield Lane to Barnston Church which although retained will walk you through housing settlements instead of green fields.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The transport assessment of the area is nothing short of ludicrous, a complete reassessment must be made based on real data and real time observation of the whole area encompassing Thingwall, Pensby, Heswall, Barnston Village, and Barnston settlement. Barnston Road, Pensby Road, Brimstage Road and Storeton Lane could not cope with any significant increase in traffic. An additional 2600+ new dwellings in the area is not a vision, it's a nightmare. The transport assessment describing the rail link at Heswall Station as a key amenity could be sold to a stand up comedian and used in

his/her repertoire of jokes. The comedian wouldn't actually need any more jokes for his/her performance. The facilities of the station are two rain shelters holding no more than six sardines each, the passenger exit onto Brimstage Road will cause fatalities because there are visual impairments to traffic, no footpaths or road crossing. The cost of upgrading the line, rolling stock and timetable will cost a small fortune but will Network Rail, the franchisee or the Welsh assembly pay for it? To make the site deliverable is estimated to cost £10 m, money which will not be forthcoming unless WBC can extract it from the City Region in the highways bidding war with the other member councils. The whole scheme is a nonsense. Forget this site as option 2B will not pass a Planning Inspectors scrutiny, the same goes for the site option in 2A in respect of this site. It might give the Inspector a good laugh for free though.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The fields on this site separate the built up areas of Thingwall, Pensby, Heswall, Barnston Village and Barnston settlement. Liverpool skyline (particularly the Cathedral) is visible from Whitfield Lane. The public footpath crossing the site crosses fields to Barnston Church, this will not be used after development as who wants to walk through housing estates. The site offers local residents and passers a view of the pastoral nature that Wirral once was and the opportunity and a chance to stand and experience nature in its true state.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2B if undertaken will transform the whole area into an urban settlement, something that the option document says that WBC doesn't want to do is not part of the vision.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The Wirral Intelligence Unit gives the population of Heswall at 19700 (2017 figure). This development anticipates a further 2600 dwellings which could increase that population by a further 6000 people. No part of the infrastructure in the area could absorb an increase of this magnitude.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Barnston Village (recorded in the Domesday Records) Conservation Area is located next to the southern boundary. One does not need to imagine the impact this development would have on the areas heritage. Prior to modern farming techniques the fields showed evidence of plough and furrow ridges indicating earlier settlements on the site. Development would lead to a destruction of this history.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

My earlier comments reflect the effect this development would have on the infrastructure

Q3h Flood Risk

My earlier comments reflect that this area is a rain catchment area and as such helps in the prevention of flooding in the area.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

The site boundary is manufactured to give a wrong assessment of the site.

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

No green belt land should be developed.

Q3k Development Viability

The expense of the development (10m going north + rail service improvement £30m ?) should rule this site out as a viable development.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Agricultural land will be an

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13799

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13854

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13908

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13980

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13995

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The loss of so much agricultural land is environmentally unwise. The plan mentions tree planting when you are planning to remove trees.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

It would create featureless urban sprawl and the concomitant increase in traffic would cause traffic gridlock, deterioration in air quality and increased accidents. Barnston Road already has notices alerting drivers to the excessive numbers of accidents. Barnston is designated 'a protected area'. It seems poor protection to surround it with extensive new housing. It will greatly increase the traffic through Barnston where the turn into Storeton Lane already causes significant tailbacks. The traffic in the centre of Heswall and outside Tesco is often at a standstill. Parking is already insufficient in Heswall. This is where people live and should be able to lead their day to day lives without undue pressure and anxiety caused by over-population. I live on Barnston Road and dread the idea of living adjacent to building sites for years - dirt, noise, heavy vehicle traffic, diversions to lay utilities etc. At a time when we are considering downsizing to free up a family home, who will buy a house surrounded by building sites? Option 2B would result in new house residents

getting into their cars to drive off the Peninsular to find work. - not environmentally friendly! Heswall is a dormitory area not an employment area.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Existing brownfield sites should be used as in the preferred Option 1.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Wirral is beautiful and friendly place to live. It has grown incrementally from villages, each with its own character and community. Any plan should build on this to give future generations the best possible environment to grow and prosper. OPTION 2B. For the above reason I am strongly against the Single Urban Extension. It is disproportionate to plan for an increase of 2,500 houses in this small area. It would irreparably damage the communities of Pensby, Heswall, Barnston and Thingwall.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14074

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14089

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I wish to express my concern for your proposed development Option 2B. If this option proceeds we will lose the green belt, farms and wildlife which contribute so vitally to the local environment and ecosystem. This area is precious and in this day and age, everything should be done to prevent further damage to the environment.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The knock on effects of additional traffic will cause more pollution, provide further accident potential, and will require significant investment to maintain the infrastructure.

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Any developments should be concentrated on brown field sites and unused land that can be reclassified for housing development. In summary I will not accept a plan including any green belt release

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

In this area of Wirral, we have minimal need of additional housing. We have a large number of growing families including small children, and any construction in the area will be very disruptive and cause massive noise and atmospheric pollution. Any developments should be concentrated on brown field sites and unused land that can be reclassified for housing development. In summary I will not accept a plan including any green belt release.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14108

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I would like to register my opposition in the strongest possible terms to Option B. Single urban extension of west of Barnston Road, Heswall. If this extension goes ahead it will destroy the green belt, the farms and wildlife habitat forever. It will allow c2500 more dwellings, create a huge urban sprawl with no separation of traditional communities:

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

will have a massive impact on already overcrowded roads and traffic blackspots;

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

will require many millions of pounds to deal with already inadequate sewerage and drainage and will mean a hugely disruptive construction site for years!!

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14138

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

There is no need what so ever for a House Building scheme West of Barnston Road Wirral. There are plenty of Brown Sites where land is available for a great deal of redevelopment and that is where houses or other residential property should be located. Central Government is proposing that there should be a 33% reduction in proposed housing development using up Green Field land. For above reasons and many other reasons The West of Barmston Road Council proposal is not the sort of thing the people of Wirral want. It is therefore the responsibility of Elected Councillors to do what voters want. It is likely that the suggested need for as much building is necessary to satisfy what is required. Wirral Borough Council NEEDS TO RE-DRAW the plan to cover need for Building to the required extent and to ensure it uses the re-development of former industrial or other commercial land.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14142

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing to you in disgust as talks take place to build on further Green Belt Release. Over past years more and more of our Green Belt is being overtaken with 'Bricks and Mortar' More of our trees and plants demolished, wildlife affected, making our area a concrete jungle instead of the nice residential area where we chose to live with our families.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Many areas in: West South, Birkenhead and Wallasey have numerous derelict buildings and unused properties taking up valuable land that could be built on. Demolishing these sites and building new houses where old houses once stood would prevent taking away precious Green Belt Land.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Building on Green Belt is destroying our surroundings A construction is already in progress on Brimstage Road to build flats. Further construction on Milner Road has recently been completed for flats, this equates to two sites on this particular road that has been built upon. I am forwarding my views and would like to officially object to any plans to take away any Green Belt of Barnston Road Heswall. WBC state that 12,000 new homes are required, however there has been NIL population growth for years!

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14143

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Building site there would cause local disruption for months, even years. Would the attractive undulating land have to be flattened? Certainly there would be great and lengthy upheaval for drainage, sewers, water and energy supplies, internet provision etc. Since a development on this scale would resemble a small town in its own right, there would have to be very thoughtful planning in order for a development on this site to look vaguely attractive, and there would have to be provision for shops, a school, medical facilities, recreational spaces etc. What about the farms in the area and the local wildlife and the clean air? This is a vital lung - irreplaceable. Wirral delights in being known as the 'Leisure Peninsula'! Well, a gradually shrinking one with less and less space for leisure pursuits. At the end of the day, do we really need ALL these houses in this area??? Apparently there has been no population growth here for many years. Certainly the number of Wirral employers and therefore jobs have reduced too. What a tragedy if we were to allow such a beautiful lung and natural division between residential areas to be ruined forever. What a legacy for our grandchildren! It would require very careful planning in order for it not to be an eyesore and would need lots of expensive provision eg: recreational spaces, facilities such as shops, GP access, school as well as 2 and 3 bedroomed houses, since it would be the size of a small town in its own right.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Since there are so few major employers on Wirral one assumes that most of the residents would be working in Liverpool anyway ... imagine the massive traffic chaos that would be caused when a possible 2000+ vehicles headed into Barnston Road and towards Arrowe Park roundabout!! This is already a congested route at rush hours and very busy at the best of times.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

It would totally spoil a historic area and engulf the picturesque old farming village and church of Barnston so that it would be totally consumed and completely lose its identity.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

If Green Belt absolutely HAD to be used, I would prefer it to be by way of infilling, and by small groups of houses being built in a variety of places, which would at least avoid the decimation of a huge expanse of Green Belt. Unfortunately a builder may think

differently from the point of view of his costs! At the end of the day, do we really need ALL these houses in this area???

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14178

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14245

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Please note our opposition to Option 2B of the plan. The proposal to allow c2500 more dwellings on the green belt would have a considerable effect on 1) Already over-crowded roads and traffic black spots e.g. Barnston Road/ Station Road, Thingwall Road, Clatterbridge Roundabout and the M53 Motorway.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposal to allow c2500 more dwellings on the green belt would have a considerable effect on 2) Already inadequate drainage and sewerage, costing a fortune to address .3) Disruptive construction over many years. It has been proved that the population of the Wirral has not increased over recent decades and there is no need for the Council to continue with this myth the between c2500- 5000 new dwellings are needed on the Wirral.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14279

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14324

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Barnston Road (A551) is an accident blackspot as shown by the road signs at each end thereof. Any house building around this point would add significant amounts of traffic to an already dangerous road. Any body seriously considering building in this area should consider the possibility of a fatal accident caused thereby.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Thingwall is of course the site of the Viking parliament. The 2 areas remain separate and distinct. Barnston remains a village as shown on the road signs on Barnston Road and Storeton Lane and is described in the Domesday Book.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposed development is in the shadow of a 100 year old reservoir. As the statute and subsequent caselaw says anyone who builds at or near such a reservoir does so at their peril. Under the Reservoirs Act 1975 as amended by the Water Act 2003 the Local Authority reported under the heading of Wirral Strategic Risk Assessment "Crosshill Reservoir could be a potential source of flooding to properties in Thingwall and also around Barnston Dell, including a private hospital. However, this is an asset of United Utilities and will be maintained to a high standard and a catastrophic failure is unlikely. This turns out to be a false hope. UU is also responsible for the sewers passing through Barnston Dell and we have irrefutable evidence that UU are not to be trusted. It took 5 years of meetings and pressure culminating in the intervention of Esther McVey our then MP to force UU to admit that the sewers were their responsibility and a further 5 years to make them carry out the repairs. In short the sewers had collapsed leaving sink holes and polluted rivers and streams. These sewers are again polluting and near collapse but UU refuse to do anything. Their predecessors in title regularly inspected and repaired. UU do neither. Any building in this area would need a wholly new sewerage system at a cost of many millions.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

There are 4 farms in Barnston all are under threat from building upon any of these areas. The Council purports to support agriculture as does the Government. Any building on any of these sites would make that farm unviable, which by definition is an encroachment on the countryside

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The proposed or any housing development in this area offends against each of the 5 purposes of green belt set out in the legislation and all subsequent case law. Settlement Area is a Wirral Borough Council construct and has no relevance to Green Belt. A view of Barnston from Google Maps shows that it is a rural village surrounded by farmland. All the land parcels under threat in Barnston are in farmland. Any building of houses within these threatened areas amounts to an extension of the sprawl of large built up areas. Any building of houses within these areas would have the effect of merging towns into one another, e.g. Barnston and Pensby, Barnston and Heswall, Barnston and Thingwall. Once established Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified (National Planning Policy Framework July 2018 para. 136) What is capable of amounting to Exceptional Circumstances is a matter of law. The mere process of preparing a new local plan is not an exceptional circumstance. (Gallagher Estates and anor. v Solihull MBC 2014).



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14333

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I particularly object to the proposed Option 2B presented in respect of the mooted urban extension on land west of Barton Road, Heswall which is untenable in the circumstances and would be to the clear detriment of future generations. The same is also unsustainable given the local amenities. A decision on this issue will heavily impact who I vote for at future elections.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14366

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing to lodge my OBJECTION to all potential building on green belt land on Wirral, with particular reference to those large sites earmarked in and around the Irby/Pensby/Thurstaston area. It has been proved that the government figure of 12000 houses is grossly inflated for this area and should be adjusted to avoid any such building being necessary. This is an area of natural beauty visited by many in the region for countryside views, walking, beach visits, dog walking & general outdoor well-being and should be kept as it is for these leisure pursuits.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The local services are already extremely busy and new schools, doctors surgeries etc would have to be built if proposed building occurred. The area would be an urban sprawl and completely ruined for local residents.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

In addition, these distinct villages should remain as such to preserve the viking heritage of the Wirral - a subject of much interest & importance to all.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

There are many suitable brownfield sites which should be built on first- affordable homes in affordable areas. Please take these views into consideration as they are the views of most of the local residents in this area who are extremely concerned for the future of the Wirral.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14369

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

- It would have disastrous effects on wildlife in the area removing a massive habitat
- Pollution and noise pollution with greatly increase due to the high density of housing

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Traffic would be increased dramatically and the routes in and out of the area will be badly congested

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

However, of the two proposals made by WBC, (2A and 2B) I strongly object to 2B (the proposed development on SP062, 7.15,7.16,7.17) on the grounds of:

- This development would merge Heswall, Pensby and Barnston into one area.
- It would remove all the green space from our area.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

- It will introduce gross overcrowding in the area
- There are not enough facilities to cope with this influx of people in one area, Doctors, Dentists, schools

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The option to use 6 smaller plots of land is far more sustainable (option 2A) as it evenly distributes all the factors above between different communities which will be able to absorb to additional population. Please ensure that my feedback is registered.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14408

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14495

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14586

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14714

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14844

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14911

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14953

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

In the case of area 2B, 2500 new homes would require very substantial new roads and modifications to existing ones. In such an area the houses that developers would seek to build would be not the type that is sorely needed, i.e. affordable ones but high value ones.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14954

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I am very concerned about the existing transport infrastructure not being able to cope with the additional vehicles that will inevitably be created. As well as the impact on the environmental factors in the area with the extra cars, plus the additional fuel usage and waste generated by the properties.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I strongly believe it is far better to reclassify and invest in regenerating brown field areas to improve and create attractive affordable living areas. I really want the green belt to be preserved now and for future generations, whether it is used for food production or to provide the fresh outdoor space for us all to enjoy and promote health and wellbeing.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I wanted the opportunity to raise objection to the proposal to build on the green belt site located between Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston. I live in Nappsway, Heswall with our outlook backing onto these the fields across to Barnston. One of the main reasons for moving to this property 10 years ago was the outlook to the open

green space. On a personal level, building on this plot would completely ruin our outlook. I currently commute to Manchester for work, being able to have visible green space is very important to me. If the plan to build the proposed approx 2500 houses in this one location, I am really concerned this would merge these town and hamlet areas leading to mass block of housing.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15333

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15448

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15551

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15644

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15743

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15860

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-15998

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16146

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The proposal to release Green Belt land, in particular Option 2B Single Urban Extension, makes no economic sense whatsoever. The existing infrastructure would require major improvements and new access roads to support a new development at a considerable cost to us all and the potential for at least 5,000 more vehicles on our roads. Hardly conducive to the Council's pledge to reduce our carbon footprint in the war against Global Warming. The Wirral has always been a green and pleasant place to live with beautiful open spaces for us all to enjoy, being it through walking, sporting activities or in pursuit of Nature enjoying the many varieties of birds and wildlife that exist in our lovely countryside. It is particularly essential for our physical and mental well-being especially now during these challenging times.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16168

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

I am writing to submit my objections to any proposal for the release of Green Belt land for the purpose of development within the Local Plan. In particular, the suggested plan (Option 2B) to build one single urban extension to accommodate the total planned increase in housing, thereby turning a rural area into an urban area is, frankly, bewildering when there are alternatives. It would also mean that Irby village and Pensby would merge without any noticeable boundary. It strikes me as irresponsible that one area would be expected to bear the brunt of the whole of the Wirral 's upcoming housing needs for the next 15 years.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16209

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16297

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1631

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

As 4.14

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

as 4.14

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

as 4.14

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

as 4.14

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

as 4.14

Q3f Impact on Heritage

as 4.14

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

as 4.14

Q3h Flood Risk

as 4.14

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Only 50% developable on first assessment. After full assessment road network proposed will fail because of feeding grounds for European protected species. What a waste of food producing land

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

as 4.14

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16384

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16472

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16560

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16664

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16773

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16910

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16911

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17071

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17192

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17279

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17385

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17489

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17586

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17706

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17707

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17805

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1786

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Environmentally all green belt should be preserved.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

This particular green belt separates Heswall from Pensby and Barnston

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Increased run off of storm water will impact on surrounding areas. This is a disadvantage of a one site approach, especially with the increase in rainfall and storms predicted.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

If a one site solution is adopted and the need for new houses does not materialise, the whole area is despoiled for no advantage to Wirral.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

See previous comment Green belt lost with no real housing pressure.

Q3n Other reasons

As before, the housing need figures are a fantasy. They are discredited by consultants engaged by WBC and by other experts. Committing a large site on these inflated figures would be wrong.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17875

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17882

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The Council accepts that there is powerful and credible evidence which demands a re-think as there is no need to develop any Greenbelt. Please note the following facts that support no Greenbelt development. If the Greenbelt is built on the following will happen: Not one of the five criteria are met ref: NPPF. Criterion 1: Urban Sprawl • Irrefutably, there will be urban sprawl if the villages of Barnston, Heswall, Irby, Pensby and Thingwall combine.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

In addition, schools will not meet demand in Area 2B. The vast majority of the schools in the Green Belt areas are full to their net capacity and all of the schools in Area 2B are full in most year groups if not all. Many are over-subscribed in KS2. There is little or no room for extending the schools to maintain the necessary outdoor areas to meet the needs of the curriculum and Government recommendations. Ref: Wirral Local Authority Primary Admissions Policy data. The LA cannot break the class size law, except for exceptional reasons, so there will be children having to travel beyond the two-mile recommended limit to access education. This will put more cars on the road at peak times. Safe walking routes to school, already under-used in Area 2B as many parents drop the children off in their cars on their way to work, will be further than two miles. There is a distinctly different pattern of children getting to school in different parts of the Borough. Area 2B has a high number of professional working parents who take the children to school in their cars. Many parents in the areas of brown field do not have this working pattern so the impact would be significantly less.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

I return to my point, that once the Green Belt is lost it has gone for ever in terms of generations to come. In Area 2B alone, we would bury and lose:

- 16 hectares of Town Field in Barnston
- Archaeological remains which could be further discovered at any time e.g. Thingwall – an old Norse Assembly Ground. The metal detectors are a regular feature in the local fields.
- Also potential ridge and furrow and earthwork discoveries will be lost.
- The public footpaths that are a feature of the villages

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

CRITERION 5: DRAINAGE and SEWAGE (REF: AREA 2B) This is woefully old and compromised and would not sustain the development of further housing in Area 2B. It would cost a developer many millions to provide upgraded facilities. As it is at present, the following is already causing residents concern:

BARNSTONDALE :

- Was formed in the Ice Age and drains most of central Wirral
- The present bridge was built in 1875
- A sewer was constructed in c1900 and enlarged in the 11960s
- The streams drain SP062, SP061 and Thingwall
- 3 feet sink holes required attention in 2015
- Current/over time lack of maintenance and inspection of the stream for blockage
- Lack of inspection over time of the sewer
- Inspection shafts erode into the streams
- Sewage related discharge is evident in Prenton Brook

THINGWALL RESERVOIR:

- Major erosion caused by discharges from Thingwall Reservoir (Opened c 1918) are evident and the flow from the reservoir exceeds specific limits.
- The reservoir has major construction defects (discovered in 2017) and the weir is now rendered useless.

BARNSTON STORM TANKS

- Sewer from the tanks overflows into a stream – locally regarded as a serious health risk
- The sewer is now nearly full to capacity.

Q3h Flood Risk

- Serious flooding during high tides and heavy rain occur
- Brimstage Brook is liable to flooding
- Regular flooding under the railway bridge in Whitehouse lane
- Regular flooding in the field adjacent to Barnston Road

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I return to my point, that once the Green Belt is lost it has gone for ever in terms of generations to come. In Area 2B alone, we would bury and lose:

- 16 hectares of Town Field in Barnston
- Archaeological remains which could be further discovered at any time e.g. Thingwall – an old Norse Assembly Ground. The metal detectors are a regular feature in the local fields.
- Also potential ridge and furrow and earthwork discoveries will be lost.
- The public footpaths that are a feature of the villages

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-17974

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18007

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

If all the new homes can't be built on brownfield then I support option 2B (single Urban extension).

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18082

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18153

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I want to see new carbon zero homes built on brownfield sites (Option 1) with green spaces incorporated into them and also access to GP capacity, school places, leisure facilities considered for residents. If not all the new homes can be built on brownfield then I support option 2B (single Urban extension).

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18237

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18247

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18369

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I write to object in the strongest terms to the plans for the open fields between Heswall and Barnston . This is without even beginning to consider the impact on local wildlife and natural environment

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I write to object in the strongest terms to the plans for the open fields between Heswall and Barnston . This beautiful part of the local environment is crucial to the character of this rural area and merging the areas of housing from Gills Lane to Whitfield lane will produce traffic of a dangerous level in every direction; Gills Lane, along Brimstage Road towards the motorway, through Barnston Dale and through the already difficult junction with Storeton Lane. Pensby Road is already very busy also, and to add more traffic past Thingwall Primary cannot be safe.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

I write to object in the strongest terms to the plans for the open fields between Heswall and Barnston . There are absolutely no circumstances that the mass building of a huge estate on these fields could be undertaken without years of chaos during the building,, and years of misery afterwards

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I write to object in the strongest terms to the plans for the open fields between Heswall and Barnston . Nor is there any way that houses built there could be deemed truly affordable, thus failing to meet the brief on any level.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18371

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I believe the road improvements required for this development would cause significant disruption locally in the short term, while the huge increase in residents will have massive long term impact, putting strain on local resources, increasing traffic significantly and changing the feel of the area forever. I ask that you consider all options and avoid developing on the greenbelt.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The proposed plans would effectively merge these towns losing the unique character of each and significantly alter the atmosphere of the area. The huge increase in residents would result in much heavier traffic and put significant strain on local services

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I am writing to you to strongly oppose development on the Barnston, Heswall and Pensby site. (Development site SP0061, SP062, SP062A,). I believe the Council have identified that this site could be released from Green Belt as part of the Local Plan, if they cannot find enough Brownfield sites to satisfy their target of 12000 new homes which I believe is over inflated. I am absolutely opposed to the building on greenbelt land and believe this should be avoided if at all possible. I ask that you consider all options and avoid developing on the greenbelt.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18373

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am a resident of Whitehouse Lane and the land at the top of our road is one of the sites being considered for development. The land is a natural habitat for wildlife.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The road is busy already and an increase in cars would cause chaos. The decision to identify this site as a potential opportunity to develop simply has not been thought through. The huge rise in vehicles using the already busy roads would be catastrophic for the area

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Infrastructure is not supportive for this development.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Studies have shown that there is enough housing in Birkenhead and or brownfield sites that would be suitable for housing. Why build on beautiful historic green belt when the sites are available already. There are thousands of derelict properties in and around Birkenhead, why not renovate these.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

If this development was to go ahead I would consider moving to another borough. This is how strongly I feel about this situation. This development would be horrendous on so many levels and must not happen. As a resident I use these beautiful open spaces to walk and I take tremendous pride in my local area, and area which will be spoilt forever if this development happens, which it must not.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18381

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This would destroy the natural habit of many of our wild animals and birds.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

This would create a sprawling estate which would... cause chaos on an already over-used lane, namely Gills Lane

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

With reference to the proposed plan to possibly use Option 2b Single Urban Extension, I wish to lodge an objection to the use of land in between Thingwall and Barston to build a total of 2584 homes. This would create a sprawling estate which would totally obliterate the villages of both Tingwall and Barnston.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

With reference to the proposed plan to possibly use Option 2b Single Urban Extension, I wish to lodge an objection to the use of land in between Thingwall and Barston to build a total of 2584 homes. This would create a sprawling estate which would totally

obliterate the villages of both Thingwall and Barnston and cause chaos on an already over-used lane, namely Gills Lane

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

In the current climate we have all come to know and value our open green spaces and to even consider releasing them for building is unthinkable when there are sufficient Brown Field sites available to accommodate the actual number of homes needed.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18395

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18449

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18504

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18559

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18633

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18634

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18755

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18756

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18847

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18913

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18998

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18999

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19089

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19143

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19198

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19255

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19311

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19367

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19442

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19444

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19636

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1965

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The development of c2500 homes will result in a significant increase on the population, c7500 people which is approximately 60% of the current population of Heswall. This will completely alter and change the Heswall area from a small town to an urban sprawl. All other options should be explored before this option is even considered.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Green belt is vital to maintain the environment of Wirral

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19690

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1974

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

It has been shown that building on Green Belt is totally unnecessary and a more realistic housing need figure will mean that all the required housing can be accommodated on brown belt land

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

There should be no options to build on Green belt. it has been shown to be totally unnecessary.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19745

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19808

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1986

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

No greenbelt should be released, this is quality farmland.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

all greenbelt is there for a reason .

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19874

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19935

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-19991

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20045

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20104

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20164

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20223

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20279

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20335

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20391

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20445

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20583

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20584

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20623

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20624

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20715

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20785

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20786

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20893

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

If not all the new homes can be built on brownfield then I support option 2B (single Urban extension).

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2092

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The loss of greenbelt will have a clear and unnecessary detrimental impact on the environment, both in the loss of the natural environment and in the excessive strain placed on unsuitable transport links.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The roads around Heswall and Barnston are already at capacity. The M53 junctions 4 and 5 are very busy. It is likely that the large green belt development would bring in a large number of car using commuters, as the public transport links in the area are poor

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Heswall and Barnston are distinct areas and this would cause them to be merged into a single block. The scale of the expansion would drastically and permanently change the area in a very short time

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The scale of the expansion would mean local services would not be able to meet demand.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The roads schools etc would not be able to cope. I cannot see how this could be remedied without further building on greenfield.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

As above

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20935

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20989

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21045

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21099

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21166

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21312

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21313

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21314

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21545

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21546

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21695

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21696

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21803

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21804

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21911

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-21912

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22012

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22084

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22085

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22196

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22197

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22306

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22307

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22414

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22415

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22469

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

If not all the new homes can be built on brownfield then I support option 2B (single Urban extension).

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22609

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22610

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22649

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22650

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22782

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22783

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22980

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22981

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23003

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

If not all the new homes can be built on brownfield then I support option 2B (single Urban extension).

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23059

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23060

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23167

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23168

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23209

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I object wholeheartedly to the building of any property in the Barnston, Pensby and Heswall area

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23255

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing this email to express that I'm hugely concerned about the proposed plans to build 2584 on this land for a number of reasons. Firstly, there is a number of wildlife living in these areas and disturbing the land will destroy their habitat. Badgers, Foxes, pheasants and numerous species of birds to name but a few.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

An extra 5000 cars on the road is estimated, and this fills me with dread. Backing out of my drive in Gills Lane is already dangerous enough with the number of cars using the lane currently. Not to mention that quite a number of the residents of Marfield Lane are retired or elderly and the upset of this over a number of years should not be underestimated. Why would you choose this land over brownfield sites? Why do 12000 extra homes need to be built? This area of the Wirral needs to keep its green spaces, they're part of the history and appeal of the area. Take them away and you ruin Barnston, Heswall and Pensby. I am originally from North Wales and I chose to locate to this part of the Wirral for its green spaces! I find myself wondering why would I want to live here if they were taken away? Please reconsider.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

And with the best will in the world. My husband and I worked extremely hard to purchase our dream property that was not overlooked, in a nice area and renovate it. 2584 houses in this area would be so detrimental to the house prices in the area. There will be hundreds of homes affected but I'm thinking of the the houses backing onto the fields in my immediate area: Gill's lane, Marlfield lane. The disruption and noise is also a worry, I have very small children and one on the way and the proposal to re-route Gills Lane would be highly upsetting and noisy over a number of months I imagine.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Removing this green space when it may be needed for farming and agriculture post Covid-19 seems irresponsible and totally unnecessary.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This area of the Wirral needs to keep its green spaces, they're part of the history and appeal of the area. Take them away and you ruin Barnston, Heswall and Pensby. I am originally from North Wales and I chose to locate to this part of the Wirral for its green spaces! I find myself wondering why would I want to live here if they were taken away? Please reconsider.

Q3n Other reasons

Why would you choose this land over brownfield sites? Why do 12000 extra homes need to be built?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23261

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I live in the area which would hugely affected by the proposed use of the Green Belt for extensive house building. I walk through the land between Heswall and Barnston village recreationally these days. I have lived in Barnston village. This area would be pointlessly destroyed under the proposal. It is neither necessary nor wise. So I am writing to formally submit my objections to any proposal for the release of Green Belt land for the purpose of development.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23307

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23308

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23309

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2340

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23469 (Wirral Wildlife)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

5.3.13 Option 2B has not considered the effects on farmland birds, not on the local badger population, whose best population is immediately downstream of the area projected for release. Roadkill is a major cause of death for Wirral badgers, whose population is stable but not increasing, so extra traffic is a threat. Alternative badger habitat is not available.

5.4 Climate Change Adaptation only considers flooding and not any other effects of climate change. This is inadequate. See 2.1.4 above.

5.5 Climate Change Mitigation does not consider carbon storage in soils and vegetation – see 2.1.4 above.

5.10.3 “However, the weakly performing Green Belt parcels mostly consist of best and most versatile land, so a degree of negative effects are likely. At the level of growth involved, it is likely that at least 120ha of BMV land would be affected, with the majority being Grade 3a. There would probably be some Grade 2 land involved though. Therefore, a significant negative effect is predicted.

5.10.4 The effects for Option 2B would lead to an overlap with approximately 70ha of grade 3b land, which is a significant negative effect." Quite – this point has not been emphasised enough in the Issues and Options.

5.16 OVERALL ASSESSMENTS Because of the above, we consider that the overall effects on Biodiversity of Option 2A and Option 2B are worse than the report says, and the opportunities for mitigation less good than assumed. There is over-reliance on "improving" Green Belt areas for birds and other wildlife. If birds are displaced, where would they go? Even if net biodiversity gain is achieved on developed sites, how can any improvements for biodiversity in the remaining Green Belt be secured? Habitat creation is not easy on fertile agricultural soils. Because the Ecological Networks and Green Infrastructure studies are not complete, linkages and networks have not been taken fully into account. Isolation of habitats e.g. Harrocks Wood, is not considered. Similarly effects on climate change mitigation and adaptation for Options 2A/2B do not adequately take into account the loss of soil carbon stores, food production and ecosystem services, and relies too heavily on net gain in development, so that effects are likely to be worse than predicted. The various factors cannot be considered as equal. Given the climate emergency and ecological emergency, effects on those factors need to be given most weight. All effects would be easier to mitigate with less overall development. Does the Standard Method of calculating housing need represent "sustainable development"? It will be necessary for central Government to justify the sustainability of the housing numbers proposed by the standard method, in view of Wirral's low population growth rate, high environmental and physical constraints, and the reduced demand predicted by the 2018 ONS housing demand figures.

HABITATS REGULATIONS APPRAISAL (INTERIM) Wirral Wildlife recognise that a detailed study of the effects on Habitats sites has been done. All the recommendations in Chapter 6 must be included in the Regulation 19 Local Plan if the Plan is to be "sound". We will be particularly checking that items in sections 6.6,6.11,6.13 and 6.17 are in appropriate policies and supporting text, and that design guidelines include the relevant precautions to safeguard important bird populations. It would be of great benefit (section 6.13) to developers and planners if more work is done before the plan is finished to identify better which areas act as Supporting Habitats, as has been done in Wales.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Does the Standard Method of calculating housing need represent “sustainable development”? It will be necessary for central Government to justify the sustainability of the housing numbers proposed by the standard method, in view of Wirral’s low population growth rate, high environmental and physical constraints, and the reduced demand predicted by the 2018 ONS housing demand figures.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23474

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

On page 34 under the Water Resources section of Spatial Options report reference is made to the Welsh Water WwTw in Heswall. On page 35 under the section "Settlement area 7 – Heswall" the report states that "Option 2B could involve urban expansion to Heswall at a scale that would be likely to have effects upon the water treatment network". This could be taken to mean that there might be an effect on the Heswall WwTw 'Headroom'. The area of land described as 'Single urban extension- Heswall' and shown as "drawing number figure 3" lies within the catchment area for the United Utilities Birkenhead WwTw and so any "effects" would have to relate to the Birkenhead WwTw

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23489

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I wish to object to the planned housing to be built on Heswall's greenbelt. The greenbelt is essential for wildlife and people's mental health.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23494

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The Cheshire Wildlife Trust object to building on this land, citing effects on nature conservation and the presence of badgers and an array of bird species throughout Barnston.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Further to this, there is real concern among constituents that Option 2B, Single Urban Extension, development on the site to the west of Barnston Road, would entirely change the character of the area, merging distinct and traditional communities into an urban sprawl.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23521

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

From a local perspective the prospect of losing green belt (Option 2B) 'on my doorstep' is appalling, not only on an aesthetic level but in terms of the pressure on infrastructure is of deep concern. The local road system in Heswall is not designed to cater for a huge expansion in housing and its accompanying traffic.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Furthermore WBC has not yet identified sufficient 'Brownfield' sites to avoid Green Belt Release. These are areas which could be regenerated in the north and east of the Peninsula to produce well-serviced 'green' communities with affordable housing.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We need to preserve the existing Green Belt for secure food production, tree planting, cleaner air, health and welfare, wildlife habitats, enhancing heritage assets, enjoyment of fabulous views and walks and the leisure and tourist economy. Underpinning all of this is the essential role open 'green' spaces contribute to everyone's mental well being. For future generations an alternative to building on green belt sites must be

identified. There is an alternative. It is up to WBC to find a resolution which doesn't damage the unique characteristics of the Wirral peninsular.

Q3n Other reasons

Having grown up in Heswall surrounded by fantastic green spaces I am naturally concerned about the proposed risk to local green belt sites and the confused information provided by WBC for their justification to build 12,000 new homes for which they have not been instructed to. With nil population growth for years on the Wirral independent research by Liverpool and Manchester Universities at best suggest between 2,500 to 6,000 new homes are required. Even the most recent Queen's Speech suggested a 33% reduction in the national housing target. This is not being pursued by WBC.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23537

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I am writing to express my deep concern about the proposed development of our green belt in Wirral and particularly Option 2B - West of Barnston Road. It is clear that there is no need to destroy the environment in this way for future generations. Studies at Liverpool and Manchester University have shown that only 2,500 - 6,000 new homes are needed in Wirral and they should be affordable housing in areas where they are needed most.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23538

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The plans to build large 3-4 bedroom houses on farm land and in green spaces at a time when we should be focusing on affordable housing, local food production and countryside management seems not just short sighted but more like profiteering - landowners and developers profiting from non specific general government guidelines that should be interpreted locally and reflect local needs. I realise it is much more cost effective and profitable for builders to develop green belt land, building top end housing, but is this interpreting the government policy of "building more houses for those most in need" honestly? I do not think so. The areas of green space around us

are there for everyone to enjoy - public access allowing for the whole community to benefit from the physical and mental advantages of nature. This point has been brought home forcefully in the past weeks of social distancing when families and individuals have been able to get out for walks in the green spaces that are available to all. I believe that if this council allows building to take place on our green belt, they will have done huge damage to our community for the generations that follow. Please think again. There are other options and much more honest and farsighted solutions.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23543

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Building on the Green Belt in Barnston (option 2a, 2b) will result in more pollution, a detrimental impact on the environment

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Building on the Green Belt in Barnston (option 2a, 2b) will result a poorer quality of living for the residents.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Building on the Green Belt in Barnston (option 2a, 2b) will result in less land to grow our own food.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Wirral is failing in it's duty of care if it proceeds with trying to build on the Green Belt not just for the current residents but for generations to come. I have been a resident of Barnston for over 20 years and actively involved in local community groups. I trust my views will be registered and considered.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23557

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

As a local resident of Heswall, I am writing to formally submit my objections to any proposal for the release of Green Belt land for the purpose of development, particularly house-building, and submit for your further consideration and records my reasoning as to why I believe this to be both unnecessary and detrimental. Particularly Option 2b (single urban extension of 2584 houses on fields between Barnston and Heswall)

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23565

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

We should be investing in the Green Belt as a positive measure of tackling Climate Change and improving the quality of life of all local residents, most particularly those who live in urban areas. We are fortunate to have Green Belt within the Borough and we need to protect and cherish it.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Now, more than ever, we need Green Fields to mitigate against climate change, produce food and for people's health and well being. The Barnston Road site will mean a significant increase of cars in the area, increasing traffic and pollution.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

It was created specifically to direct development into run-down areas and to prevent further decline: the need for Regeneration remains as evident as ever. Building houses in Green Belt would directly reduce still further the viability of housing in the north and east of the Peninsula, delaying their rejuvenation and improved quality of life. Wirral is the fastest growing visitor destination in the Liverpool City Region and the economic benefits of a Green Belt which creates the landscape background for so many of the visitor attractions must be recognised.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Tourism and Leisure are vital to Wirral's Local Economy and Green Belt plays a major role. We cannot afford to lose any. Rather than releasing land from the Green Belt, the

social, environmental and economic arguments would all suggest that we should be investing in the management of this Green Space. Priority should be given to the regeneration of the existing urban areas and to protection of farmland and wildlife; and this should be reflected in Planning Policy and the Local Plan by ensuring the continued protection of the Green Belt. I intend sending copies of this letter to my local Councillors and MP for their information. In conclusion, I firmly believe that there should be no building on the green belt anywhere! The Council should reduce their target and concentrate on bringing forward housing on brownfield sites such as Wirral Waters (which already has planning permission for 13000 homes)

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23568

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

From a local perspective the prospect of losing green belt (Option 2B) as the pressure on infrastructure is of deep concern. The local road system in Heswall is not designed to cater for a huge expansion in housing and its accompanying traffic.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The impact on local services and amenities will be immense and the nature and appeal of Heswall as a small town will be catastrophically changed forever. Furthermore, my immediate locale will become a disruptive building site for years.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We need to preserve the existing Green Belt for secure food production, tree planting, cleaner air, health and welfare, wildlife habitats, enhancing heritage assets, enjoyment of fabulous views and walks and the leisure and tourist economy. Underpinning all of this is the essential role open 'green' spaces contribute to everyone's mental well being. I completely disagree with the proposal to build on the green belt site.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2357

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Heswall is already progressing from having been a semi-rural area into an urban sprawl, with wholly inadequate facilities. The destruction of this green belt area would exacerbate this, and create unacceptable hazards particularly in Barnston village which by nature of the lie of the land has a road system which is under intolerable strain. Furthermore, public transport facilities are now wholly inadequate. Furthermore, surface water drainage and possibly main sewerage are already under strain and might become unviable if development on green belt of the scope envisaged were to take place (c.2500 dwellings or 4000 people)

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

See environmental reasons, and particularly consider that there is no practicable way of providing Barnston village with any relief from the insoluble traffic bottleneck which it creates. Given that public transport is disappearing from the area, private vehicles would have to fill the void, and a further influx of say 2500 cars would worsen the problems markedly.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Medical facilities in the Heswall area are already inadequate . There is little retail provision in the area. Schools are now inadequate for the existing population. All of these deficiencies would be worsened by any increase in population

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Food production is vital and may become moreso given the exit from the European Union . There is a very active and viable farm in Barnston and its loss would be deleterious to both food supply and to local amenity

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

No proven need for development on this scale. Heswall is already running the risk of overpopulation by reason of the conversion of large numbers of houses into multiple flats

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23573

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

As a resident of the Wirral I wish to submit my comments on the proposed local plan via email. I object to all proposed building on Green belt as outlined in options 2a and 2b, as areas of green belt provide many benefits to health, providing space to walk, views, space for plants, trees and agriculture to contribute to clean air and safe run off/ absorption of excess rainwater and varied habitats for wildlife. Additional housing on green belt would greatly increase traffic on roads and lanes that are already subject to accidents and congestion.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23606

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing this email to express that I'm very concerned about the proposed plans to build 2584 houses on this land for a number of reasons. Firstly, there is a number of wild animals living in these areas and disturbing the land will destroy their habitat. Badgers, Foxes, pheasants and numerous species of birds to name but a few

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Secondly, removing this green space when it may be needed for farming and agriculture post Covid-19 seems irresponsible and totally unnecessary

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Lastly, the disruption and noise is also a worry, I have very small children with one on the way and the proposal to re-route Gills Lane would be highly upsetting and noisy over a number of months (even years) I imagine. We heard that an extra 5000 cars on the road is estimated. How worrying for families living in the area. Why would you choose this land over brownfield sites?

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This area of the Wirral needs to keep its green spaces, they're part of the history and appeal of the area. Take them away and you ruin Barnston, Heswall and Pensby. We are originally from North Wales and chose to locate to this part of the Wirral for its green spaces! Please reconsider these plans.

Q3n Other reasons

Thirdly, these plans will without a doubt cause a huge amount of worry to all homeowners in the area. As this undoubtedly will affect house prices dramatically. We have worked hard to purchase our home in this area.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23609

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Why do 12000 extra homes need to be built?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23781

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Increase traffic generation in a single location, including considerably increased level of noise and air pollution in a single location;

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

A very lengthy period of construction, impacting on the amenity of existing and future residents of the identified site in question and its surrounding areas;

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The continued overlooking of other towns and villages in West Wirral which are equally in need of new housing and investment in jobs, services and facilities and education over the next 15 years;

Q3k Development Viability

The delivery of a large urban extension would take a significant amount of time to come forward, requiring a comprehensive masterplan with the need for significant infrastructure investment and upgrades prior to commencement and occupation; It would not contribute to the five-year housing land supply, for which there is an identified shortfall of brownfield sites; There would be issues associated with land assembly to be addressed, as well as matters relating to land value equalisation and potential ransom positions, all of which could impact on timescales and delivery

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The loss of over 140 hectares of agricultural land in one single location in West Wirral, together with a considerable landscape impact/change and loss of the natural environment / Green Belt in a single location.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Objects to this Option on the basis that Option 2A would more closely align with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. This Option would result in the coalescence of the separate settlements of between Thingwall, Pensby and Heswall

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23784 (Highways England)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Option 2B involves releasing Green Belt as a Single Urban Extension (around the Heswall area) and Highways England would have concerns on the impact of this in terms of the proximity of this site to the M53 and the residual impacts from the potential pressures on the local highway infrastructure; noting the Council have identified a disadvantage being "Significant investment is likely to be required in supporting necessary infrastructure." The proximity of the sites to the SRN and any changes in visibility, landscaping or potential increased risks of flooding on the M53 are the main concerns for Highways England. The Wirral Local Plan Spatial Options Modelling Report 2019 considers the transport impacts in further detail and this approach is welcomed at this stage and has been reviewed under our evidence base submissions.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23857

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We disagree with the Council's approach to the release of very large urban extensions from the Green Belt, under Option 2B, 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).

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23865

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Option 2b This is a high risk and environmentally less favourable model due to major new infrastructure demands instead of enhancements to existing to accommodate increased demand. Very little delivery would be seen in the first 5 years.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Option 2b This is a high risk and environmentally less favourable model due to major new infrastructure demands instead of enhancements to existing to accommodate increased demand. Very little delivery would be seen in the first 5 years.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23910

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

No exceptional circumstances exist, or at least are evidenced, in line with the NPPF, which justify the inclusion of Green Belt development options in this Local Plan. This is not a sustainable location for development and the harm to Wirral's Green Belt would be profoundly against the national interest of Green Belt designation. We are confident that this option would be found unsound at examination. We believe it was premature to list Green Belt sites without public comment and progression of important issues such as the impact of developing the particular parcels and impacts on heritage assets, leading to misleading conclusions about 'weakly performing' Green Belt land. The Council has not justified the need for any Green Belt release to achieve a required level of development, adequately considered alternative sites or properly completed the duty to cooperate.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24028

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Parcels 7.3 and 7.4 should be considered for release before the parcels identified for release under Option 2B. Indeed, our land at Dee coast, Heswall is a credible alternative site for a large scale urban extension. However our land has a distinct advantage compared to other large sites in that it is in six discrete parcels of land which could be developed independently thereby accelerating delivery. To confirm, we can demonstrate an excellent track record in delivery and these sites could form part of five year housing supply by being able to deliver housing quickly at the beginning of the Plan period.

Q3k Development Viability

We have concerns over the ability of a single urban extension of circa 2,500 homes to the east of Heswall to deliver 2,500 homes by 31 March 2035. There are no details in the emerging Local Plan on this possible development in terms of lead-in time to the delivery of the first dwellings and how 2,500 dwellings will be delivered on this site by 31 March 2035 but it is noted that there are significant infrastructure improvements required to Gills Lane and the southern area also needs a new east-west link which would certainly delay delivery. We would therefore argue this strategy is insufficiently flexible to allow for changes in circumstances and small and medium sized sites should also be allocated. Given that a single urban extension of 2,500 dwellings accounts for 21% of the 12,000 dwellings required in the Borough over the 2020 – 2035 Plan Period it is essential that robust lead-in time and delivery rate information is available for scrutiny. There are a wealth of studies that the Council could draw upon to supplement site-specific information for urban extensions in order to determine realistic and

robust lead-in times and likely delivery rates, including by Hourigan Connolly (2014), Savills (2014) and Lichfields (2016 and 2020), for which further detail is contained in our attached submission. Using Lichfields latest assessment, the first homes wouldn't materialise until circa August 2031. Even if 160 dwellings per annum (Lichfields' average delivery rate on sites of 2,000 units plus) could be achieved from August 2031 that would result in only 573 dwellings being delivered in the Plan period some 1,927 short of the 2,500 expected.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684824>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24184 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

All United Utilities assets and associated easements will need to be afforded due regard in the masterplanning process and may impact on deliverability dependent on their location within the site. We request early involvement in any site masterplanning process. Please direct developers to our free pre-application service to discuss their schemes and highlight any potential issues. We cannot stress highly enough the importance of contacting us as early as possible.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24186 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Typically Green Belt areas have little existing infrastructure. Therefore any growth needs to be carefully planned. Greenfield sites may have limited or no supporting water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure assets. They may be adjacent to existing infrastructure assets that are located on the fringe/limits of the existing water supply and/or sewage infrastructure networks which are of a small diameter and can have limited capacity.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24193 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

United Utilities would encourage information on anticipated delivery rates as soon as it becomes available.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24194 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Although the sites identified for potential Green Belt release are close to existing infrastructure assets, they are located on the fringe/limits of existing water supply and/or sewerage infrastructure networks that are generally of a size that reflect their greenfield location. The current infrastructure may have limited capacity to support the planned growth. A co-ordinated approach to infrastructure by collaborating with United Utilities will result in providing assets required to support the planned growth and to ensure new infrastructure provision does not cause any unexpected delays to housing delivery. We recommend that you include a policy to ensure that the delivery

of development will be co-ordinated with the timing for delivery of any necessary infrastructure improvements. The Local Plan should ensure future applicants provide evidence of early dialogue between developers and infrastructure providers to identify the infrastructure needs arising from new development and to ensure that these are addressed through building design, utility networks and connections in time to serve Green Belt release sites. Most importantly, the Local Plan should ensure applicants prepare an infrastructure phasing and delivery strategy for all strategic sites, especially if the Local Plan seeks to go with Option 2B. An infrastructure strategy should be prepared for all significant allocations to identify when and where build out will be delivered by different developers or in phases. This strategy must demonstrate coordination between any phases of development. We would recommend the following wording: "A comprehensive, site wide Infrastructure Strategy shall be submitted as part of any planning application for any strategic allocation. The Strategy shall demonstrate communication with infrastructure providers and outline how each phase interacts with other phases. When necessary, the Strategy must be updated to reflect any changing circumstances between each phase(s). The entire allocation shall only be carried out in accordance with the most recent site wide Infrastructure Strategy. Any associated strategies, such as for foul and surface water drainage, must be consistent with the updated site wide Infrastructure Strategy."



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24195 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

United Utilities would like to outline a preference for the site selection process having regard to the availability of alternatives to the public sewer for the discharge of surface water. Such alternatives include local watercourses/land drains, which are preferable to the discharge of the public combined sewer for the discharge of surface water. Sites that have more sustainable options than the combined sewer for the discharge of surface water should be preferred as site allocations are being finalised.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24196 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Some of the potential allocations are within defined groundwater Source Protection Zones 1 or 2. Early engagement with the Environment Agency and United Utilities is strongly recommended, so that effective masterplanning can be undertaken. The details of GWSPZs can be viewed on the website of the Environment Agency. United Utilities' strong preference is for development to take place outside of any Environment Agency designated Source Protection Zone 1.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24197 (United Utilities)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

United Utilities are concerned about any large site allocation which is in multiple ownership. Our experience is the achievement of sustainable development can be compromised by developers/applicants working independently. We encourage early contact with all landowners/site promoters to challenge those landowners on how they intend to work together, preferably as part of a legally binding framework or masterplan. Raising this point at this early stage is in the best interest of achieving challenging housing delivery targets from allocated sites in the most sustainable and coordinated manner. We recommend all large allocations are delivered in the most sustainable way by being underpinned by infrastructure strategies and are happy to engage to discuss this further.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2424

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24258

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Increase traffic generation in a single location, including considerably increased level of noise and air pollution in a single location.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

A very lengthy period of construction, impacting on the amenity of existing and future residents of the identified site in question and its surrounding areas

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The continued overlooking of other towns and villages in West Wirral which are equally in need of new housing and investment in jobs, services and facilities and education over the next 15 year;

Q3k Development Viability

The delivery of a large urban extension would take a significant amount of time to come forward, requiring a comprehensive masterplan with the need for significant infrastructure investment and upgrades prior to commencement and occupation; It would not contribute to the five-year housing land supply, for which there is an identified shortfall of brownfield sites by the Council's own admission; There would be issues associated with land assembly to be addressed, as well as matters relating to land value equalisation, potential ransom positions all of which could impact on timescales and delivery

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The loss of over 140 hectares of agricultural land in one single location in West Wirral, together with a considerable landscape impact/change and loss of the natural environment / Green Belt in a single location.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Objects to Option 2B on the basis that Option 2A would more closely align with the objective of contributing to the achievement of sustainable development as set out in the NPPF. The development of the land in question would result in the coalescence of the separate settlements of between Thingwall, Pensby and Heswall.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24294

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Do not support the idea of any green belt release. I do not agree with a single larger urban extension.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24450 (Environment Agency)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Any sites released from Green Belt to accommodate development will need to consider the natural environment including all Green and Blue infrastructure. Furthermore a requirement for development to actively improve such features (such as mitigating/reducing flood risk, habitat creation etc.) should be firmly established for any allocation.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24557(Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

While considering option 2A and 2B the council has failed to take into account constraints other than the 5 functions of the green belt. Decisions based upon the categorisation of potential development land into either strong or weak green belt performance does not consider other environmental issues (such as statutory and non-statutory designations and ecological networks). This is totally unacceptable as these constraints should be given equal or higher weighting, as clearly set out in the NPPF. Indeed, unlike the Green Belt specifically, protecting and enhancing the natural and historic environment is listed in one of the three key objectives of the NPPF (objective c environment, paragraph 8 NPPF). It is absolutely critical that these wider environmental constraints are considered in parallel to green belt performance. Without this the Local Plan could be considered unsound. Unfortunately this situation has occurred partly because the Green Infrastructure review and Ecological Network study are still incomplete. These studies should be used to inform strategic planning

and not to be commissioned as an afterthought. We are seriously concerned that the decision process is ill-informed and not evidence based. We can illustrate this by the information we have uploaded as supporting evidence. These examples demonstrate serious environmental constraints which should have been flagged as being of paramount importance by the Interim Sustainability Appraisal. The Interim Sustainability Appraisal relies on a flawed assumption that impacts to these sites could be mitigated on other green belt land. This is entirely without basis as measurable Biodiversity Net Gain relies on the long term management of habitat by a suitable habitat provider. It cannot be assumed that Biodiversity Net Gain can be achieved on privately owned land by landowners who have little or no expertise in managing wildlife habitat.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24588

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We disagree with the Council's approach to the release of the very large urban extension from the Green Belt, under Option 2B, as it 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). It would be unsuitable and inappropriate for release as it performs a strong Green Belt function.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24875

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land.

Q3n Other reasons

Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24997

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land.

Q3n Other reasons

Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25100

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall. We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land. Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified. The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2513

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

We should not be building on Greenbelt. It contradicts climate emergency legislation, climate change strategy for Wirral which the Council has signed up to.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25208

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall. We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land. Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified.

The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25315

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land. Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25381

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Our main concern about a single urban extension is that all growth will be directed to Heswall, in an area which is highly constrained in terms of highways infrastructure. Three of the parcels are identified as having moderate to high landscape sensitivity; three have a 'red' scoring for archaeology and an overall 'red' scoring; and three are identified as being delivered in years 10+ of the plan period, which means that roughly half of the homes expected to come forward within this option will not come forward until the last 5 years of the plan period. We do not think this is a suitable way to plan for the housing needs within the Borough, whether that at Heswall or elsewhere, especially given Wirral's recent poor delivery performance.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25512

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The Council's Transport & Accessibility Review 2020 shows that this site is not accessible and presents a long-term solution for housing delivery. Most homes are considered deliverable from 10 years requiring improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The proposals would have a significant impact on the infrastructure and resources of Heswall.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We consider the contribution of the whole of this site to the 5 Green Belt purposes is still strong due to its size and proximity to far reaching Green Belt land.

Q3n Other reasons

Our analysis shows a further shortfall of at least 1,600 dwellings, in addition to the 2,500 identified.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25583

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Given the Council's poor performance in terms of housing delivery we seriously question the ability of a single large urban extension to deliver anywhere near the number of homes needed. Our main concern about a single urban extension is that all growth will be directed to Heswall, which we do not think is a suitable way to plan for the housing needs within the Borough, whether that at Heswall or elsewhere, especially given Wirral's recent poor delivery performance. Three parcels are identified as having moderate to high landscape sensitivity; three are identified as by MEAS as having a 'red' scoring for archaeology and an overall 'red' scoring; and three are identified as

being delivered in years 10+ of the plan period. This option also seeks to provide almost all growth within an area which is highly constrained in terms of highways infrastructure and roughly half of the homes expected to come forward within this option will not come forward until the last 5 years of the plan period owing to the significant highways improvements that are required, including improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road. Other Green Belt sites within the Borough, which are not been proposed for release, can be delivered in the short term in the first five years of the plan period and have low, low to moderate and moderate landscape sensitivity.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25623

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The Draft Plan does not wish to build on the Green Belt at all, but there are alternative contingency plans in case some new housing requires land there. One of these plans involves one or two large-scale developments. If this scenario occurs: Public transport should be available for the first day of occupation so that residents do not feel they have to buy a car especially to live there. The service could be provided by a bus route passing through the development, so it could earn good money from people living outside the development. It is an advantage of the development that should be publicised. Cycling provision should be made not only in the new development, but in

the adjacent area(s). It should at least provide a route to a Local Centre, as defined in the Local Plan, in the old development, unless the new development is large enough to have one, which is unlikely when occupation is started. This route should not be the only one in the old development: ideally there would be a complete local network, so that the new residents would be able to reach most places there; failing that, there should be a plan for such a network; but if not, one should be planned, preferably with the developer financially responsible for making the plan and possibly installing some of the infrastructure. Provision for parking by shops and other amenities is needed to give cyclists confidence that they can conduct personal business locally. Cycle stands need to be well sited: under cover if possible; on level ground; well spaced apart; and with space beyond the stands, which support the bicycle frames. The development should also be made with possible further developments in mind. One could abut the currently planned development on any side, and a connection between the two would be needed, especially for active travel, to avoid journeys on a long roundabout route. So at least spaces in the periphery should be left for such connections. If a connection is to provide for cars, it needs to be designed for active travel as elsewhere in the development.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25670

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Our main concern about a single urban extension is that all growth will be directed to Heswall, which we do not think is a suitable way to plan for the housing needs within the Borough, whether that at Heswall or elsewhere, especially given Wirral's recent poor delivery performance.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25735

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25736

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2582

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area**

Protected green belt

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25909

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Given the Council's poor performance in terms of housing delivery we seriously question the ability of a single large urban extension to deliver anywhere near the number of homes needed. Our main concern is that all growth will be directed to Heswall, which we do not think is a suitable way to plan for the housing needs within the Borough, whether that at Heswall or elsewhere, especially given Wirral's recent poor delivery performance.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25910

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Three parcels are identified as having moderate to high landscape sensitivity; three are identified as by MEAS as having a 'red' scoring for archaeology and an overall 'red' scoring; and three are identified as being delivered in years 10+ of the plan period. This option also seeks to provide almost all growth within an area which is highly constrained in terms of highways infrastructure and roughly half of the homes expected to come forward within this option will not come forward until the last 5 years of the plan period owing to the significant highways improvements that are required, including improvements to Gill Lane and a new east-west link road. Other Green Belt sites within the Borough, which are not been proposed for release, can be delivered in the short term in the first five years of the plan period and have low, low to moderate and moderate landscape sensitivity.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25916

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I a resident of Wirral, strongly oppose building on greenbelt, farmland etc. I do not want the irreplaceable greenbelt disposed of, especially now with the environment prospects in danger. The loss of wildlife, birds of prey including owls & bats etc. is unthinkable, also the hedgerows that have been replanted in the last few years. The loss of mature trees, planting saplings does not help for years. Its only the mature trees that help the environment as you know.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

The chancellor said in his budget speech only consider brownfield sites. Listen to what the people who live in the area want, that is who you represent.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Also now we have the spread of this Corona virus (Covid 19) does it not seem sensible to postpone the deadline of 23rd March for the present? We the elderly, especially the elderly need more time for our meetings, as advised we are keeping safe & not spreading the virus. Could Peel Holdings not do more at Wirral Waters, that would help considerably ease the pressure. Consider also that our own children have left the area to find suitable work. There are already a great number of people travelling out of the area to work either in Liverpool, Manchester and several other areas. The statistics do not add up.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25931

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We do not support a single urban extension option in isolation. A substantial number of sites dispersed around the Borough is needed.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25982

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We do not support a single urban extension option in isolation. A substantial number of sites dispersed around the Borough is needed.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26033

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We do not support a single urban extension option in isolation. A substantial number of sites dispersed around the Borough is needed.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26066

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We do not support a single urban extension option in isolation. A substantial number of sites dispersed around the Borough is needed.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26108

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

2b. It is an unfortunate coincidence that the review should have resulted in what developers may consider the ideal -one large parcel of digger ready sites, minimising costs and maximising profit. The release of the parcels comprising 2b should not be countenanced, recognising that, once gone, this prime area of the Green Belt, cannot be recovered. The wooded and rural road approaches to the Conservation area of Barnston are the context for its designation and this should be a key factor leading to the rejection of Options 2a and 2b in the final plan consideration of the Wirral Borough Council

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26127

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The Local Plan appears to limit the size of any single urban extension based on the scale of the 'residual need' which has not been able to be met within the urban area. There are other spatial planning reasons, beyond simply meeting an overarching level of development, which the Council needs to take into account in allocating development to deliver a sustainable future for the Borough's settlements and their communities. The allocation of one strategic urban extension, which has been limited in size on the basis of the scale of the 'residual need', will not maintain the economic, social and environmental health of the Borough (and its constituent settlements) as a whole. We object to the implication that the allocation of development towards other sustainable urban settlements would impact negatively on their sustainability. Sustainable settlements require development to maintain their vitality and viability.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26153

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The allocation of one strategic urban extension will not meet the spatial planning objectives of maintaining the economic, social and environmental health of the Borough (and its constituent settlements) as a whole. The infrastructure required is significant, expensive and can delay development from coming forward. Coupled with the uncertainties around the timescales for the delivery of large urban sites within the Urban Conurbation, this approach may result in housing not being delivered within the first part of the Plan period, which is not a justified or robust approach to meeting housing needs.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26178

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The Local Plan appears to limit the size of any single urban extension based on the scale of the 'residual need' which has not been able to be met within the urban area. There are other spatial planning reasons, beyond simply meeting an overarching level of development, which the Council needs to take into account in allocating development to deliver a sustainable future for the Borough's settlements and their communities. The allocation of one strategic urban extension, which has been limited in size on the basis of the scale of the 'residual need', will not maintain the economic, social and environmental health of the Borough (and its constituent settlements) as a whole. We object to the implication that the allocation of development towards other sustainable urban settlements would impact negatively on their sustainability. Sustainable settlements require development to maintain their vitality and viability.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26255

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

In addition to conflicting with the basic principles set out above, the plot is alongside the busy Barnston Road (A551) and close to Barnston Dip, a notoriously dangerous and congested area.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The idea to build a very substantial number of houses in this area is extremely ill founded. Even a small number of houses would present problems for all residents.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26292

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

It would appear that the only rationale behind the selection of this site as an urban extension is with reference to the Green Belt Review. 'General Area 6' (as identified in the GBR) is the only GA considered to make a 'weak' contribution to the Green Belt. We believe that the methodology and subsequent findings of that piece of work are flawed, so to rely upon this evidence to justify the selection of this site under Option 2B is questionable. Notwithstanding this, we are firmly of the view that Option 2A and a dispersed approach to Green Belt approach should be taken if the Vision and Objections of the WLP are to be realised in respect of meeting housing needs for the whole of the Borough.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26321

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

It would appear that the only rationale behind the selection of this site as an urban extension is with reference to the Green Belt Review. 'General Area 6' (as identified in the GBR) is the only GA considered to make a 'weak' contribution to the Green Belt. We believe that the methodology and subsequent findings of that piece of work are flawed, so to rely upon this evidence to justify the selection of this site under Option 2B is questionable. Notwithstanding this, we are firmly of the view that Option 2A and a dispersed approach to Green Belt approach should be taken if the Vision and Objections of the WLP are to be realised in respect of meeting housing needs for the whole of the Borough.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26366

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Land West of Barnston Road, Heswall has been identified as a Single Urban Extension under Option 2B, claimed to be capable of delivering 2,584 dwellings. It would appear that the rationale for the selection of this site as an urban extension is with reference to the Council's Green Belt Review (GBR). 'General Area 6' (as identified in the GBR) is the only GA found to make a 'weak' contribution to the Green Belt. We believe that the methodology and subsequent findings within the GBR are flawed. Particularly in reference to how the GAs have been assessed and the finding in the GBR that only GA 6 makes a 'weak' contribution. So to rely upon the GBR evidence to justify the selection

of this site under Option 2B is questionable. We do not support Option 2B and are firmly of the view that the principle of Option 2A as a dispersed approach to Green Belt release is the only appropriate approach to take and should be pursued if the Vision and Objectives of the WLP are to be realised in respect of meeting housing needs for the whole of the Borough. It would simply not be possible to deliver this quantum of housing under either Options 1 or 2b and so the principle of Option 2A provides the flexibility of supply and certainty the Council need to ensure that the WLP can be considered sound in this regard.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26399

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We consider that the location identified for the single large scale urban extension at Heswall would be wholly inappropriate. This is primarily because it is divorced from the Urban Core, within an area of the Borough which the Council has identified as dominated by commuter-based settlements. Indeed, there are no major employment sites at all within the vicinity. Journeys over the distance required by bus to reach the principal urban areas and employment sites are unattractive. Although there is a railway station, this provides only an hourly service even at peak times, with a change required to reach Liverpool or Birkenhead. Paragraph 103 of the NPPF states "The

planning system should actively manage patterns of growth" in support of the objectives listed in paragraph 102 which are intended to promote sustainable transport. Amongst others, these include addressing the potential impacts of development on transport networks, pursuing opportunities to promote walking, cycling and public transport and taking into account the environmental impacts of traffic. Paragraph 104 explains how planning policies should "support an appropriate mix of uses across an area, and within larger scale sites, to minimise the number and length of journeys needed for employment, shopping, leisure, education, and other activities". The inevitable result of developing over 2,500 dwellings on a single site next to Heswall will be an excessive dependence on the private car, leading to an incoherent Local Plan. This would be contrary to Strategic Objective 3, "To reduce reliance on private cars for local journeys where possible, through spatial development choices..." and to Strategic Objective 7 "To focus jobs, housing and population growth to area of greatest need of physical, social economic and environmental regeneration". The Council defines rightly defines this area of greatest need as being to the east of the M53 motorway. The resultant Local Plan would also fail the soundness tests from paragraph 35 of the Framework as it would not be justified as an effective strategy or consistent with national policy through enabling the delivery of sustainable development.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26409

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We urge the Council not to pursue a strategy that is over-reliant on a single, very large site, for the reasons summarised below: There would be a significant period of time before any meaningful delivery was achieved at the single site in Heswall. When development did eventually commence there would be considerable lead-in periods for the required site preparation and infrastructure works, much more so than under the Option 2A 'dispersed' approach of releasing a range of smaller sites. There is considerable evidence from around the country of Planning Inspectors favouring a more dispersed strategy of meeting identified needs in preference to over-reliance on

a small number of very large sites (or in this case, potentially one single site), which limits the ability for people to purchase homes within a reasonable distance from their local community. There is a very real risk that the Council would fail to deliver the required levels of development if it chose to focus on a single, very large site. That is for a variety of reasons including likely market saturation and dilution of developer interest, with inevitable restrictions associated with multiple housebuilders trying to deliver sufficient units at one large site. Sustainability will be maximised by following a strategy that is based on a greater degree of dispersal across the Borough, thereby helping to meet needs locally as opposed to remotely. We firmly believe that a balanced portfolio of sites is needed in order to ensure sufficient delivery throughout the lifetime of the development plan. The infrastructure needed to facilitate sites, such as SHLAA0927, is clearly of a much lesser scale than that required to support the development of a single urban extension and so it can be delivered over a shorter timeframe.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26471

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26548

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Option 2B would include 2,500 homes in the local plan period, representing 20% of the overall need of 12,000. There is limited flexibility with this Option. Placing such a high reliance on one site to deliver homes increases the risk of under-supply, as has been evidence with previous reliance on Wirral Waters. Other authorities that have failed their Housing Delivery Test have been overly-reliant on large strategic sites. Other local plans have been found unsound due to over-reliance on sites like this. Pursuing Option 2B would result in an unsound local plan, because it would not be justified; this option would not follow an appropriate strategy, having regard to the available evidence base. There are alternative options identified in the Issues and Options Plan, that are more appropriate, namely Option 2A. There are also gaps in the evidence that mean this approach would conflict with NPPF paragraph 31 that requires "the preparation of all policies" to be "underpinned by relevant and up-to-date evidence." The Council's

evidence paper T10 (page 3) notes that further assessment of off-site traffic impacts associated with this option is required and is currently being undertaken. This is a gap in the evidence base that undermines the soundness of pursuing this option. In addition to a gap in the evidence, the existing evidence finds an alarming problem with the existing road infrastructure, onto which new accesses are being proposed – as set out in T10. This is not sound plan-making. Heswall station is not accessible (as noted in PP2.1), whilst T1 confirms that Heswall is an urban centre that is “poorly served by public transport.” Furthermore Option 2B shows the significant impact of Option 2B upon junctions in Heswall, with 18 junctions in and around the town becoming over capacity by 2035. Any additional development within Heswall could increase pressure on GPs, with the area already nearing capacity (PP2.1). All schools within Settlement Area 7 Heswall are over 90% capacity. Evidence Paper ECC1.1 anticipates the area comprises ALC Grades 3a and 3b. It notes that SP062 is in arable uses, including wheat, barley and oilseed rape. Around one-third of the site is also subject to agri-environmental stewardship agreement; the existence of these stewardship agreements place an environmental sensitivity to the agricultural use of the land, as well as a pure economic sensitivity. The MEAS RAG (ECC2) screening does not acknowledge that SHLAA site 1981 is within agri-environmental stewardship. This is likely to mean that land within this proposed allocation is of greater ecological value than MEAS have found. SHLAA site 4034 does not appear to have been reviewed by MEAS’s RAG screening, even though it is subject to agri-environmental stewardship and the Council’s SHLAA shows it includes priority habitat. This is likely to mean that land within this proposed allocation is of greater ecological value than MEAS have found. The MEAS RAG screening does not acknowledge that SHLAA site 1956 is within agri-environmental stewardship. This is likely to mean that land within this proposed allocation is of greater ecological value than MEAS have found. Page 8 of the MEAS RAG screening relating to SHLAA site 1955 mistakenly refers describes the ecological constraint as amber, when the supporting evidence points to red (as per the colour coding). The site is adjacent to ancient woodland and a local wildlife site. A local wildlife site extends into the boundary of SHLAA site 1946, hence a red RAG screening. These omissions show that this Option is flawed on ecological grounds. The Council’s SHLAA notes that site 4034 is constrained by Listed Buildings and by Barnston Conservation Area. The Council’s SHLAA site 1956 has a ‘red’ rating from MEAS (in ECC2) due to “significant deliverability constraint” due to archaeological constraints, but this is not cross-referenced in the Council’s SHLAA. The Council’s SHLAA site 1955 notes there are heritage constraints by way of Listed Buildings, Barnston Conservation Area and archaeology. This is replicated in the MEAS RAG screening, which finds “significant deliverability constraint” in terms of archaeology. The open countryside to the west of Barnston contributes to the setting of the village’s Conservation Area and the Grade II listed Christ Church, noted in both ECC5 and the Barnston Village Conservation Area Appraisal. Although the highways evidence is not yet complete, the strategic allocation is likely to require vehicular access to the A551 to both the north and south of the village of Barnston (as explained in T10). There needs to be assessment of the impact

of increased vehicle flows and improved highways upon Barnston Conservation Area. The A551 through Barnston Conservation Area (and to the north and south of the settlement) has sporadic sections of pavement, and where these exist, they are often extremely narrow. In the almost-certain event that improvements to the pedestrian and cycling infrastructure are a prerequisite of the allocation's development, there is a significant risk that such upgrades would adversely affect the character and appearance of the Conservation Area, given the limited available space to upgrade the infrastructure without impacting on boundary features or historic urban grain. Without the results of the further analysis that is currently missing, it is unknown what the resulting traffic levels in Barnston will be – noting that there will be vehicular access to the A551 to both the north and south of the village. Any increase in traffic would result in adverse impacts upon the character and appearance of the conservation area. The council's approach to solving the brownfield shortfall through one major release of Green Belt land is flawed and unsound and will further add to the existing spatial imbalance across the Borough whereby certain areas receive all the proposed growth, with other settlements receiving none.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26611

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Yes, we support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity

and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the attached Vision Document. We support the identification of the land at Heswall for a potential Single Urban Extension of around 2,584 homes in the Council's Option 2B and, as outlined in the attached Vision Document, we are committed to working proactively with the Council towards its future delivery, should it be allocated in the Local Plan. However, a very considerable shortfall is still likely to result over the plan period even if this land is allocated and we believe that additional Green Belt release over and above the Single Urban Extension will be required. In this context we have identified a number of land parcels across our landholding aside from those included in the potential Single Urban Extension or within the Council's Dispersed Green Belt option 2A. All of these make a weak contribution to the Green Belt and are shown in the attached Vision Document. We estimate that these sites could accommodate around a further 5,000 dwellings which would make a vital contribution to the likely shortfall in market and affordable homes. Furthermore, our Vision Document outlines an opportunity to not only provide land for much-needed new homes, but to create new communities, compensatory biodiversity enhancements and new countryside access networks.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5682701>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26640

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

There are fatal problems in the selection process. The logic of the overall process sequence is flawed. It begins by applying two hard site characteristic filters, flood risk and statutory environment designations, to eliminate sites a priori. It then applies a scoring system / 'professional judgement' related to the 5 purposes of the green belt (which is also faulty in itself, see below) to create three sub-groups of 'strong', 'moderate' and 'weak' sites. The 'weak' sites are then split into two groups according to them having been submitted by developers / landowners or not. It then supposedly applies 'detailed' assessments on several other site characteristics, each of which singly, or in combination, can lead to an 'interim conclusion' in Table B (Appendix 4.7) of 'do not to take forward' or 'potential site' or 'further investigation' or 'potential site subject to more impact assessments'. The criteria adduced in Table B have the power to eliminate sites. If that is so then these criteria should have been applied as filters in step one along with flood risk and statutory designations. The process is logically incoherent: it goes from site filtering due to hard constraints, to filtering through a

crude (almost arbitrary) ranking step based on vague definitions (the 5 GB purposes) and 'judgment', to a site 'developability' step based on developer site submission, to a further hard filtering step. After failing to distinguish between Green Belt sites on the issue of heritage and weighting the '5 purposes' overall score accordingly, the issue then arises again in the final filtering and sometimes dominates the site 'interim conclusion'. The result is that the final set of sites selected becomes strongly dependent on the decision 'filtering' sequence. This is not an acceptable overall decision process. The pragmatic argument appears to be that all the evidence on important site constraints is not yet available, so the Council came up with this process instead. If so, the current selection of sites is unsound and premature on any rational basis. Examining Table B 'Interim Conclusions' displays some of the problems: it lists just 25 of the 46 'weakly performing sites' of Table 11 in Green Belt Review 2019. We do not know how the $46 - 25 = 11$ sites exited consideration. Of the 25 listed, over half are decisions subject to further assessments and over two-thirds of the 15 'potential sites' are subject to further assessments on important criteria. The current selection is at best premature. Of the 25 in Table B at least 19 were submitted by developers / landowners. Only 4 'No' sites had developer interest. We do not know which of the 100 initial GB sites considered were developer submitted. It is not clear if parcels 7.15 – 7.17 in Option 2B were submitted by developers but parcel 7.18 was. Evidence suggests that one landowner, who owns much of the Option 2B land, was allegedly encouraged by WMBC to submit their land parcels. We do not know which of the 100 initial GB sites considered were developer / landowner submitted either voluntarily or by WMBC invitation, which should be available for public inspection. It seems 'developability' in a very literal and immediate sense dominated the Council's site selection process. A sceptical observer might be tempted to conclude that the overall selection 'process' was put together for window dressing purposes around a pre-ordained 'developer' led, result. I believe a relatively simple but coherent multi-criteria process could be set up for the present Wirral problem. If rational, integrated, coherent multi-criteria site assessment and ranking is beyond the Council so that only large 'weak' versus 'moderate' site groupings can be defined it would still be possible to set up a simple 'fair lottery' process to select sites within an agreed highly dispersed, small / medium site 'weak' group. This is the rational default response if objective site ranking is not possible. A wide geographical site spread could be ensured by defining areas in the GB, choosing an area at random and then choosing one site within that area also at random. This process would be repeated until all areas were covered and sufficient sites accumulated to meet any given LP Inspector mandated housing shortfall under Option 1B.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5655879>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26642

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The Council has failed adequately to respond to public concern about release of Green Belt in the Development Options Review. The Issues and Options Document (IOD) does not adequately keep Green Belt out of risk. The Council has inadequately explored all avenues before considering Green Belt release. The IOD and technical papers give figures quoted by the Council and Peel Holdings that show sufficient capacity exists through regeneration, extant permissions, bringing empty homes into use, windfalls, and others.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26663

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

We urge the Council not to pursue a strategy that is over-reliant on a single, very large site, for the reasons summarised below: There would be a significant period of time before any meaningful delivery was achieved at the single site in Heswall. When development did eventually commence there would be considerable lead-in periods for the required site preparation and infrastructure works, much more so than under the Option 2A 'dispersed' approach of releasing a range of smaller sites. There is considerable evidence from around the country of Planning Inspectors favouring a more dispersed strategy of meeting identified needs in preference to over-reliance on

a small number of very large sites (or in this case, potentially one single site), which limits the ability for people to purchase homes within a reasonable distance from their local community. There is a very real risk that the Council would fail to deliver the required levels of development if it chose to focus on a single, very large site. That is for a variety of reasons including likely market saturation and dilution of developer interest, with inevitable restrictions associated with multiple housebuilders trying to deliver sufficient units at one large site. Sustainability will be maximised by following a strategy that is based on a greater degree of dispersal across the Borough, thereby helping to meet needs locally as opposed to remotely.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26876

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

The LLFA understands that as part of the Local Plan consultation Options 2A and 2B are less focused on the urban area and include some areas of greenfield or previously undeveloped sites. As stated above the LLFA believes that large scale developments cannot demonstrate that flood risk as a result of development is not increased without first understanding the catchment and its characteristics. This is especially true of previously undeveloped sites. The LLFA advocates the master-planning approach as previously set out. Again, large scale developments sites must be considered at the outset to understand existing catchment characteristics so that these are mimicked through the development process. Where large scale sites are sub-divided into smaller developments it is crucial that a catchment based approach is adopted to mitigate the cumulative impact that development might have on surface water flood risk. The LLFA agrees with the SFRA where it states: "If there is a lot of development occurring within one catchment, particularly where there is flood risk to existing properties or where there are few opportunities for mitigation, the cumulative impact may be to change the flood response of the catchment". Master-planning will also help address gaps in the knowledge of the ordinary watercourse network that could significantly impact on flood risk. Analysis of surface water flood risk mapping suggests that there are many unmapped ordinary watercourses throughout Wirral and within the undeveloped areas of Options 2A and 2B. Furthermore, many watercourses have been culverted or piped in the past which increases unknowns about site drainage. Furthermore the LLFA believes sustainable drainage should be a key consideration, at the very early stages of site development and not as an afterthought. Failure to consider the existing land drainage and flow paths alongside management of surface water as a result of development prior to design of even the most high level layout proposal contradicts the objectives of achieving sustainable drainage. Sustainably draining the site and preservation of existing catchment behaviour should be considered prior to layout/design proposals in order to inform them. The LLFA supports the SFRA where it states: "The effectiveness of a flow management scheme within a single site is heavily limited by site constraints including (but not limited to) topography; geology and soil (permeability); development density; existing drainage networks both on-site and in the surrounding area; adoption issues; and available area. The design, construction and ongoing maintenance regime of such a scheme must be carefully defined at an early stage and a clear and comprehensive understanding of the catchment hydrological

processes (i.e. nature and capacity of the existing drainage system) is essential." The SFRA also states that master planning should ensure that existing overland flow paths are retained within the development and that blue-green infrastructure should be used wherever possible to accommodate such flow paths, again, potentially affecting the layout. " "The requirement for an understanding of the behaviour and characteristics of the catchments prior to development is separate to the SuDS layout and design, but should be used to inform it. At a minimum, a concept SuDS design based on the findings of a study should form a part of any pre-application discussion/consultation and demonstrate an understanding of how proposed development will impact on:

- The site and its natural hydrology
- Historical drainage elements
- The ecology of the site and its surroundings
- Natural flow routes

Flow routes should be analysed for the existing site and as a result of any proposed development and the preliminary design should include the proposed sub-catchments, discharge points, conveyance routes and storage areas. As discussed earlier the LLFA believes that ownership and responsibility for maintenance of SuDS as a whole is also critical to ensure future flood risk is managed appropriately. The LLFA has a legal requirement to maintain a 'Flood Risk Asset Register' and details of maintenance and ownership of SuDS components can be provided by developers and captured within this register. Ordinary Watercourses As well as being a statutory consultee for management of surface water flood risk for major planning applications the LLFA also acts as a regulator for ordinary watercourses under the Land Drainage Act 1991 (any watercourse, including ditches, culverts etc that are not main river). The LLFA will generally refuse requests to culvert watercourses, instead encouraging "daylighting", or opening-up of existing culverts to manage flood risk in line with Environment Agency policy, which can impact any proposed layout. This approach has been picked up in the SFRA, used in the evidence base for production of the Local Plan, where the strategic recommendation (recommendation C) for many sites states: "In line with the daylighting policy and where there may be opportunities to do so, there could be potential to remove culverts and restore watercourses to a more natural condition. In many cases, opening culverts can reduce flood risk when combined with SuDS" Consent for alterations to ordinary watercourses is not granted via the planning process, but falls under the Land Drainage Act 1991. Any proposed layouts should not be based on an assumption that consent to culvert watercourses will be granted or that daylighting of existing culverts will not be required to manage flood risk.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2711

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2756

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

This area has a specific architectural character, and any development should reflect that existing character to provide the cultural and community link to enhance community development. This could be achieved by producing a distinctive Design Brief in consultation with the local community.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2826

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

See below

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

See below

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

See below

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

See below

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

See below

Q3f Impact on Heritage

See below

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

See below

Q3h Flood Risk

See below

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

See below

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

See below

Q3k Development Viability

See below

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

See below

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The table shown (4.7) highlight parcels of Greenbelt that are not acceptable for release. I strongly disagree with this suggestion and would implore you to take option 2a and 2b out of the plan altogether.

Q3n Other reasons

There should be no building on Wirral's Green belt because there are enough brownfield sites available to accommodate all our housing and employment needs from 2020 to 2035.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2862 (Wirral Wildlife)

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Wirral Wildlife objects because of harm to wildlife from this proposition. Barnstondale is ancient woodland LWS, vulnerable to harmed by trampling, access and disturbance. Water levels and quality in the Prenton Brook, which flows down through 2 more LWS, would be at risk. This area has the largest badger population in Wirral, and would be at risk from direct harm, loss of foraging habitat and increased road traffic. Bats and their insect prey would be harmed by artificial light at night. There are good bird populations including many Red and Amber listed species. There may be enough wintering bird usage to qualify as Supporting Habitat for the Dee Estuary SPA - this must be ascertained before any decision is made. There are 15 ponds, and historic records of Great Crested Newts. A large part of the parcel is BMV agricultural land which should be protected for future food production. See attached document for all of Chapter 4.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Most of Wirral's Green Belt has value for wildlife, and any large-scale release would be bound to impact on LWS, priority habitats, priority species or Supporting Habitats to the SPAs. See our response to Chapter 3.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

In a time of climate emergency, all BMV land should be kept as farmland to provide food.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

See response attached and supplementary response to Chapter 3.

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5861583>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-296

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2992

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Dont support the strategy of taking Green Belt - should do Urban Intensification

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3235

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3253

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

What exactly is meant by "weakly performing" for Green Belt purposes? In that context, why does Map B in Appendix 4.7 have fewer recommended sites West of Barnston Rd than Map C? Does the apparent willingness of landowners to sell influence such decisions?

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3278

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3518

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Barnston is a conservation area - conserve it.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Roads already congested.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Negative impact on open countryside.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The character of the area will be completely ruined.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Heswall is already incredibly busy. The traffic during rush hour is unbearable. This will only add to the problem causing complete grid lock.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3576

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3849

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Houses being built on this Green Belt land are not needed and certainly wouldn't match the criteria of affordable housing. There is not a shortage of housing in Heswall, as the amount of properties on the market for SALE or RENT proves.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3956

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

building on these sites is contrary to strategic objectives 4,5 and 6. The sites identified support areas of Special Biological Interest, include ancient hedges, include trees that combat climate change (we should be developing brownfield sites and ADDING trees to these developments not reducing tree numbers) and would remove sites that help combat flooding (ie would be tarmacked instead increasing ground water run off)

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4032

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Contiguous habitat network for wild plants, animals and wildlife. Birds, Pheasants, Owls and Foxes all present and living wildly on the land itself. Impact on protected treelines with roots which stretch tens of meters beneath the ground over the boundaries currently set. Cleaner air provided by this land from an already built up area (Heswall and Pensby) High flood risks - provides space for water to prevent flooding. Huge increase in flood risk for all existing homeowners in the area. Most of the green belt – about two-thirds – is in agricultural use. This cannot be considered of low environmental value when global population growth and climate change are putting increasing pressure on land, and when we grow less than two-thirds of our own food. Now, more than ever, we need to avoid unnecessarily losing our countryside. Site of Biological Importance Conservation Area. Site currently provides:

- clean air;
- clean and plentiful water;
- thriving biodiversity;
- reducing harm on the environment caused by hazards;
- sustainable and efficient use of natural resources;
- enhancing cultural heritage;
- mitigating and adapting to climate change;

- minimising waste;
- managing exposure to chemicals;
- improving biosecurity. Tree preservation orders on trees lining the proposed land.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

No capacity in the current road and Transport System to accommodate an increase of such size in a single location. Uncosted east west link - huge increase in costs. High accident rates on all adjacent roads - increasing the use of high accident areas will directly result in increase casualty rates. Not to mention the heavy traffic required for construction. Amber/Red Mersey Travel rating. Extensive uncosted internal highway layout required. Enhancement to bus service and access to new bus infrastructure required on Barnston Road and Whitfield Lane.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Removal of access to the countryside for a huge percentage of elderly or vulnerable who live near or surrounding the area. Public footpath directly through the site. Huge singular and year(s) long requirement of noise and pollution from the construction. Massive visual impact for all residents, walkers and cyclists. Removal of a public footpath joining 2 villages and regularly used by the public. Noise impact for a prolonged period - many home workers and elderly live in the area. Primary School on the boundary of the proposed work - huge safety risk and noise issues.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Moderate to High Elevated nature of landscape, historic fields, habitats and features. Total removal of all publically accessible open space of the area, in one single hit. Agricultural Economy and Land Study 2019 designates land as 3a & 3b - 3a being among the best and most versatile land available for agricultural land. How this land has been self-characterised as low value by the council is simply unbelievable and untrue. MEAS Screening - Overall Summary - Red - significant constraint - the land should not even be up for consideration.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

No local school capacity. Shops and amenities already overcrowded with no further capacity. Lack of parking.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

No heritage impact assessment available. Land of potential heritage significance.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

£2.8M for SP061 and SP062. New primary and ten secondary substations required. No drainage assessment available. No telecoms assessment available. No water assessment available. Telecoms to local area already well below the future requirements. Drainage already overcome in recent storms on surrounding routes. Huge surface water spread across proposed land during periods of high downpour.

Q3h Flood Risk

Flood risk to all surrounding properties by removal of drainage - drains present on plans. Natural Green Belt drainage removed by built up area. Increased risk of surface flooding to all surrounding properties. Ponds and sinks shown on sites.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

There are adequate brownfield and underdeveloped non-green belt land packages available to meet the demand, and require more thorough investigation.

Q3k Development Viability

A development of this size in a single location will introduce huge disruption to the local area. Its not viable given the current infrastructure to make such demanding proposals. Heavy traffic down small roads with either no walkway or unsafe walkways is unreasonable. This is a heavy foot traffic area with no Health and Safety impact assessment performed or available. Surrounding house pricing will be disproportionately decreased for many years by developing a single large area such as proposed, both from construction itself, the lost character of the area and the removal of accessible green spaces and views from the elevated nature overlooking Liverpool City. The openness is capable of having both spatial and visual aspects – in other words, the visual impact of the proposal is significant as is its volume. The duration of the development is disproportionately long, and its remediability – There are currently no provisions to return land to its original state or to an equivalent (or improved) state of openness despite requirements to do so by Government The degree of activity likely to be generated, such as traffic generation is hugely significant on one large development.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

High quality 3a and 3b land to be removed. Local produce quantities directly and significantly affected by proposals.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Green Belt serves five purposes, this single large development impacts all purposes of the land and it is the Councils duty to abide by the law and protect this land:

- a) to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas - Heswall and Pensby are already sprawled, this land prevents the unrestricted sprawl the council is required to protect.
- b) to prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another; - this proposal joins Heswall, Pensby and Barnston in to one against the councils duty and mandate to prevent this.
- c) to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment - this proposal directly removes accessible countryside from thousands of local residents. It also removes the elevated nature of the landscape with historic fields, habitats and features including a view across to Liverpool, from all local public access for all time. Its simply unacceptable.
- d) to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns - The setting and character of all towns and villages in the surrounding area will no longer be preserved as is the councils duty to do so.
- e) to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land - the council is duty bound to maintain, develop and enhance Green belt land for its intended use cases. the councils incoherent and incorrect assessment that this land is weakly performing, is simply a measure of their own failures. The land should be invested in and enhanced as Green Belt land which is accessible to all through the public footpath in place. Improvements to the footpath itself as well as signage and access would be hugely beneficial for the local area - as has been your mandate to deliver yet by self-proclamation you have failed?

Q3n Other reasons

Housing need calculation are inaccurate as per previous general comments in the first sections of this submission.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4253

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

A loss of habitat for wildlife.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

There would be an increase in air and noise pollution from the increase in traffic.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

It is now a semi rural area, divided by several fields from Pensby. If these fields are built on it will become one large urban sprawl.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The current road system has not had any development for the last 70 years. For the amount of traffic and the required utilities, extensive structural development must take place. This will impact negatively on the rural nature of this area.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4406

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4622

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I strongly object to this area being put forward as the preferred location for a single urban extension into greenbelt. I believe the option put forward will create significant traffic congestion and does not make the best use of Wirral's sustainable transport infrastructure (eg electric rail) .

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5655824>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4632

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Site has agricultural land It is in the greenbelt, none of which should be used for housing.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Will impact surrounding area with noise and light pollution. Impact on wildlife and habitat

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Increases urbanisation of countryside

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4919

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Unjustified loss of Green Belt that will weaken the focus on Urban Regeneration.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)**

As 3a.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

As 3a.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Loss of identity of existing townships, Barnston in particular.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

To aid Urban regeneration, the prime objective

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Obviously.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4973

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

WFPOSPS does not wish to choose between one or ather of the options for possible release of green belt, but would point out that a public footpath dissects the site in option 2b

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

See previous comments re use of brownfield sites.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

See comments in Q3j

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

See previous comments in Q3j

Q3n Other reasons

See previous comments on housing need calculations which are unrealistic.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5065

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Large areas of greenbelt should not be released. OPTion 2b should be taken out of plan

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5261

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5464

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5630

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5727

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

We strongly disagree with any Green belt release but find this option preferable to the option 2a in terms of protecting natural features on site, developing sustainable transport links etc. Any housing should be subject to the highest standards of sustainable development with grey water plumbing systems, solar panels, electric charging points etc

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5792

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Table 4.7 Parcels are not acceptable for release. There is the 'in principle' reason that Green Belt boundaries should remain 'permanent' but also it fails all eligibility criteria – the Purposes of GB, Heritage, Landscape Character, Ecology, Biodiversity, Traffic, Services, Pollution, and more. It's also not necessary, given a realistic 'Housing Requirement' of 3,000. The case for describing this Site (like all others) as 'weakly performing' is flawed, as is the GB Review (explained earlier). This is not a sustainable location for development and the harm to Wirral's Green Belt would be profoundly against the national interest of Green Belt designation. We are confident that this option would be found unsound at examination. ITPAS, WGSA and authors will NOT enter into a commentary on relative merits of GB Sites. They are ALL 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, which there are. Option 2B is a complete non-starter. WGSA has had legal advice to this effect. The notion in the GB Review, that Birkenhead alone on Wirral is a large built-up area and, as such, extension of any other areas would not constitute

'Sprawl', is nonsense. Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston constitute a large built-up area and Option 2B would increase the existing Sprawl by 25%.

This Site would fail GB Purposes

- a) Sprawl;
- b) Merge distinct communities (Pensby, Heswall and Barnston);
- c) Countryside Encroachment;
- d) Historic Character damaged (see Heritage Report); and
- e) Assist Regeneration, which is an 'exceptional circumstance' on Wirral and of national significance.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The proposed road system doesn't work, would destroy fragile ecology, overload existing roads with overload at peak periods already, cause danger and avoidable deaths. The remoteness from local services, health services and employment would cause a huge increase in vehicle journeys, pollution, lost time travelling and is a non-sustainable proposal which would run counter to Council's and National Climate Change Aims and Objectives. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

These Green Belt Sites have great amenity value. Travelling along Barnston Road and Gill Road is a pleasant run through countryside. This would degenerate into views and impression of urban sprawl and encroachment, with continuous and uninviting housing estates. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

These Green Belt Sites have great amenity value and character. Travelling along Barnston Road and Gill Road is a pleasant run through countryside. This character would be lost: open countryside would degenerate into views and the impression of urban sprawl and encroachment, with continuous and uninviting housing estates. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Impact on Local Services: Local services particularly Health and Transport are stretched now. Such a large increase would lessen the quality of life, health (particularly mental health – already a high incidence on Wirral) and welfare. See also full Comments to Q3a.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

These Sites have great historic value and assets for the Wirral which would be lost by development. It would be wanton loss as there is no need for houses of the number contemplated by the Council and these sites are unsuitable. See the Heritage Report submitted to this Consultation which includes the conclusion that for legal reasons (of potential loss of significant and irreplaceable Heritage) these Sites cannot be developed. See also full Comment to Q3a

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

These are at their limit already. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3h Flood Risk**Q3i The site boundary is wrong****Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these****Q3k Development Viability****Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land**

The Council passed a Motion unanimously NOT to release ANY productive agricultural land. These Sites are 'productive agricultural land' and are needed for future food security. To develop these Sites would run counter to the Climate Change Aims and Objectives of the Council and Government and do great harm. It would also not comply with the NPPF2019 in several critical respects. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This is self-evident. To develop these Sites would run counter to ALL the five Purposes of Green Belt – Sprawl, Merging, Encroachment, Historic Character and Assisting Regeneration. It would also involve completely ignoring the reasons why Merseyside County Council drew up such tight Green Belt Boundaries on Wirral – to really target

ALL significant development towards Regeneration of the declining and deprived areas of the Wirral (north and east primarily) – something signed up to by ALL Local Authorities within Merseyside and which is almost as acute a need today. Develop here and residents of the north and east will continue to die ten years earlier than those in the west and endure poorer conditions and life-chances. The Council has to decide: the moral imperative is clear. See also full Comment to Q3a.

Q3n Other reasons

Housing Need Calculation using 'standard method' and discredited ONS 2014 Data produces an OAN 3 to 4 times reality and that produced from the 'starting point' of the 'standard method' and applying more robust official Local Data produced by the Council. The 12,000 figure distorts all decision-making and makes release of Green Belt an inevitable consequence totally unnecessarily and is a political decision which should NOT come into Planning.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5832

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Sites are currently prime arable land used for farming and support wildlife and this will be lost if used for housing. Any destruction of greenbelt habitats and reduction in countryside areas will increase the carbon footprint and so does not adequately take into account the governments commitment to tackling the climate crisis under the Paris Climate Agreement.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Change of use will add to increased traffic on Milner Road, Barnston Road and through the few routes between Heswall and Liverpool. The roads are already congested during rush hour. Residents of any new properties will use the routes to existing short cuts down Milner Road to avoid Heswall, which is a B-road and it will only take a couple of parked cars to gridlock this road.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The local services/amenities will be swamped by this level of development.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The proposed development will connect the boundaries of Heswall with Barnston village, creating a single conurbation from places that have always been separate.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

There is no infrastructure to support the level of proposed development. As well as houses you would require additional supermarkets, shops and school. The existing schools in the area are oversubscribed as it is. The sites would require extensive utilities, none of which are currently adjacent.

Q3h Flood Risk

The sites are very wet in winter, usually attracting wading birds during late winter. Increasing the density of urban development will lead to surface water flooding.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Wirral is where Liverpool was in 1980 with the majority of brownfield sites undeveloped. No one would have wanted to live anywhere near Albert Dock in Liverpool in 1980 and now it is prime residential real estate. The development of Wirral Waters will lead to a knock on effect on the desirability of neighbouring areas. The whole of Birkenhead is ready for and in dire need of redevelopment and it is in this and adjacent areas that the housing need (1 or 2 bed flats, not houses) is most acute. It also has the best transport links for Liverpool.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The sites are currently and historically been actively farmed intensively with agricultural crops or supporting livestock. This is not worthless scrubland on the edge of a conurbation. The production utility of the sites will be crucial in future decades for sustainability of food production in this country.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Development will lead to loss of all Green Belt between Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Thingwall and the precedent will jeopardise green belt between Heswall and Thurstaston in future.

Q3n Other reasons

A house has been built on Barnston Road on a plot that was previously part of another property's garden. This single new-built house took almost a year to sell. There is simply no demand for this level of residential properties in this area. The demand would appear to be in and around Birkenhead and for social housing rather than executive homes.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5884

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Destroying greenbelt land is against the WBOC environmental aims. This is an extended piece of high quality agricultural land that can be used efficiently to produce crops and livestock. It also allows a diverse habitat for wildlife.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

A large development here would need considerable changes to transport options. The roads at Barnston, Thingwall, and Arrowe Park are all very congested at key times. Access through Barnston Dale is prohibited to large trucks and it is a conservation area. If 2500 houses were built, then the impact of approx 4000 cars would cause chaos and safety issues. Access to the motorway would be via Brimstage or Levers Causeway ie. other traffic congestion areas. Access onto Barnston Road from Whitehouse Lane, Acre Lane, and particularly Milner Road is already very difficult and there have been a series of accidents already at these locations. Access to Arrowe Park Hospital, an acute hospital, would cause issues especially during mornings and early evenings due to traffic flows. Living on Barnston Road we are aware of the volume of cars at these times. The train station

at Heswall Hills does not provide a solution to commuter travel to work as it is not electrified and so does not offer a direct link to Liverpool.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

These areas have a positive impact on the mental well being of many local residents. There is a footpath across the fields used by residents. Whitfield Common itself is small and would not cater for a large growth in the number using it. The local noise levels would increase due to the increased volume of cars.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

These areas enhance the rural nature of central Wirral. The impact of extra traffic will cause an increase in noise and pollution, and make the area less rural.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Heswall is already very busy and cars queue at key times to go through it. It forms the major route to Chester and West Kirby for many. This would be increased by more houses. Schools and leisure services would be impacted greatly by any large single increase in residents. Available parking in Heswall is currently limited. Likewise access to GP services would need to increase for 5000 plus extra residents.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The close proximity of the new build to Barnston conservation area would adversely effect this region.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

All would need to improve as already indicated. Drainage is already a problem.

Q3h Flood Risk

Barnston Road regularly floods due to run-off from the fields.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

There should not be ANY options to build on greenbelt. It is not what the majority of Wirral residents want.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

There would be a significant loss of agricultural land. In the current COVID-19 crisis the land SP062 is being used to plant crops. Given the nature of long term planning this facility must not be lost in the current climate - climate change, Brexit, COVID-19. All highlight the need to produce local foods. See photograph below which highlights use of land in March 2020.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Yes - as discussed above!

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834660>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5898

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Again, adopting a more realistic assessment of housing need, doesn't require any release of Green Belt and can be accommodated on brownfield land in locations that will benefit from regeneration. The areas referenced 7.15 – 7.18 and grouped as Option 2b, do exactly what the purpose of Green Belt intends. Their release for development would create the Urban Sprawl that Green Belt is, by definition, intended to avoid. It would also remove the extremely valuable separation between Heswall and Barnston that currently respects and supports their individual character, history and identity.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-610

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6153

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6158

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I disagree with the release of any greenbelt. WBC has proven to its citizens it is not required for housing need. 15500 urban sites identified and reports that show a realistic housing need of 6000 homes maximum. The 155000 homes does not include the 11000 still to be allocated at Wirral Waters I totally disagree with greenbelt sites being prioritised by WBC for speculative developer's interest over and above their value to the people of the Wirral. WBC is failing to protect the best interests of the people of Wirral in using this approach Wirral Waters and its strategic regeneration sites are the only large single urban extension Wirral needs. WBC need to commit numbers to those schemes and drive regeneration, affordable and sustainable homes on the Wirral. This would comply absolutely with the NPPF 3 principles of soundness test for a new plan.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6435

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6612

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This is still a fine piece of open countryside - however weakly performing you want to call it. It should not be built on. It's a very pleasant walk across these fields to reach the Fox & Hounds at Barnston from Heswall. It's a very large chunk of land to destroy. How many more local plans will it take to eradicate all the green belt in this area at this rate? Not many!

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The building of 2500 new homes would put a massive burden on the roads in this area. Many roads are already inadequate for the number of vehicles in use today & there is currently hardly any sensible public transport - a handful of buses & a railway line that goes to Bidston once an hour. The whole idea of building on such a large scale in this area is preposterous.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

There are currently few amenities in this area - it's green belt after all.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

It would be destroyed.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

It would overwhelm local services. Are the developers going to provide any?

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Immensely detrimental effect.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

As I have already said - we will need all the agricultural land we have after brexit.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

A massive area of green belt lost. Totally unacceptable.

Q3n Other reasons

We don't need 12000 new homes!

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6685

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Do you mean Birkenhead or extending other towns/villages? Again misleading.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6752

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Don't want to lose ANY Green Belt but I believe this is a better option than scattered developments, which could encourage further erosion of Green Belt.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6878

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

No building on green belt and definitely no large scale building as whole area, for many reasons, would be destroyed for everyone.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6891

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6908

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Building on brownfield sites should be the goal. Regeneration of areas that have suffered economic and social decline need to be prioritised. Focussing on building a whole new settlement will leave no financial support for areas in need.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7032

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7073

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

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.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

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.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

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.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

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.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

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.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7104

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels of land that are not acceptable for release. I strongly disagree Option 2b should really be taken out of the issue and options documents.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels of land that are not acceptable for release. I strongly disagree
Option 2b should really be taken out of the issue and options documents.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7156

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4. 7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7170

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7193

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The infrastructure of Heswall is already at a critical point. the addition of approximately 5,000 new residents to an estimated population of 19,500 is unthinkable. I would also create a transport nightmare in the area.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The infrastructure of Heswall is already at a critical point. the addition of approximately 5,000 new residents to an estimated population of 19,500 is unthinkable. I would also create a transport nightmare in the area.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7335

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Yes, utterly inappropriate to double the population of Barnston/Heswall in one swoop (7.15-7.19) and 7.11.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7407

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Absolutely Not - to developing such a huge area, which would strip the Villages of Pensby, Irby, Barnston, Thingwall and Heswall of their identities and form one massive urban sprawl.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Absolutely Not - to developing such a huge area, which would strip the Villages of Pensby, Irby, Barnston, Thingwall and Heswall of their identities and form one massive urban sprawl.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7414

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The A551 is the main route for emergency services to Arrowe Park Hospital, which served the whole of Wirral. Buses are available to Liverpool from Heswall and as a consequence, commuters are already turning parts of Telegraph Road A540 into a carpark, with cars left all day. This also applies to many side roads off Telegraph Road i.e. Poll Hill, which is impassable at times. Cars park all day on Irby Road, Pensby Road also. There is no direct train link to Liverpool from Heswall. Barnston Road is a Council designated accident route, with fatalities over the years, the speed varies from 40mph - 20mph back to 30mph within half a mile, the traffic is congested as it is a commuter route at peak times to get motorway access.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

All the primary schools in West Wirral are full to capacity in either all or some of the year groups KS1 where schools cannot legally exceed classes of 30 children below the age of 7 years.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The scale of the proposed development in plan option 2b would be enormous and completely out of keeping, destroying agricultural land, ancient hedges, footpaths and overwhelming all local services and amenities. There are so many empty shops and businesses already, people would have to use cars to access shopping and work, when we should be encouraging walking, cycling not polluting the air by driving. I am totally against a development of this size on the Green belt, it would join Heswall, Irby, Pensby, Barnston and Thingwall into one huge conglomerate and would lose the separate identity of our ancient villages.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The 1975 act recognizes the Catastrophic effects of any serious incident at the Thingwall Reservoir, which was found to have serious construction defects in 2017. The sewers are near to full capacity due to other branches joining it within the designated area. The existing infrastructure, roads, drains, sewers can barely cope with the current demand which often results in flooding along Barnston Road and into Barston Dip. Barnston Road is a Council designated accident rout, with fatalities over the years, the speed varies from 40mph - 20mph back to 30mph within half a mile, the traffic is congested as it is a commuter route at peak times to get motorway access.

Q3h Flood Risk

The 1975 act recognizes the Catastrophic effects of any serious incident at the Thingwall Reservoir, which was found to have serious construction defects in 2017. The sewers are near to full capacity due to other branches joining it within the designated area.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Should this development go ahead, the impact on local facilities would be devastating to the local environment, the farmland included is prime agricultural land with heritage hedging, this is Wirral best and most versatile agricultural land. The existing infrastructure, roads, drains, sewers can barely cope with the current demand which often results in flooding along Barnston Road and into Barston Dip. Barnston Road is a Council designated accident route, with fatalities over the years, the speed varies from 40mph - 20mph back to 30mph within half a mile, the traffic is congested as it is a commuter route at peak times to get motorway access.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The scale of the proposed development in plan option 2b would be enormous and completely out of keeping, destroying agricultural land, ancient hedges, footpaths and overwhelming all local services and amenities. There are so many empty shops and businesses already, people would have to use cars to access shopping and work, when we should be encouraging walking, cycling not polluting the air by driving. I am totally against a development of this size on the Green belt, it would join Heswall, Irby, Pensby, Barnston and Thingwall into one huge conglomerate and would lose the separate identity of our ancient villages. Should this development go ahead, the impact on local facilities would be devastating to the local environment, the farmland included is prime agricultural land with heritage hedging, this is Wirral best and most versatile agricultural land. The existing infrastructure, roads, drains, sewers can barely cope with the current demand which often results in flooding along Barnston Road and into Barston Dip. Barnston Road is a Council designated accident route, with fatalities over the years, the speed varies from 40mph - 20mph back to 30mph within half a mile, the traffic is congested as it is a commuter route at peak times to get motorway access.

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7425

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

If regeneration in the Birkenhead area is the main objective why put a single large scale urban extension in the Barnston area? Significant improvements to infrastructure would be needed in two areas rather than one.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

If regeneration in the Birkenhead area is the main objective why put a single large scale urban extension in the Barnston area? Significant improvements to infrastructure would be needed in two areas rather than one.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7442

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

One single block in the middle of the Wirral will alter the whole area. I have seen what happened in Moreton and Woodchurch. We don't want NO GO areas here.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

One single block in the middle of the Wirral will alter the whole area. I have seen what happened in Moreton and Woodchurch. We don't want NO GO areas here.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7743

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7812

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7911

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3h Flood Risk

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7923

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**

As previously stated infrastructure will not be able to cope with this increase in population

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)**Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8046

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Should not be any options to build on green belt land. Option 2b would join townships of Heswall and Barnston together and would destroy their historic and rural character.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8054

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8074

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Contiguous habitat network for flora and fauna. Established ancient hedgerows. Owls, woodpeckers, multiple varieties of finches, hawks, foxes, wild fowl, hedgehogs and field mice. Impact on mature protected trees with root systems that stretch far beyond current boundaries. Cleaner air an already densely populated area of Heswall, Pensby and Barnston. Increase in flood risk. Provide essential drainage and run-off and the impact of such large development would have potentially catastrophic impact on the flood-risk for large parts of Heswall, Pensby and Barnston.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Lack of capacity in the current road and transport infrastructure to accommodate additional demand, especially at peak times. If we assume 2.2 people per residence and only half of them are travelling in/out of the area each working day, this would be an additional 13,200 journeys passing through three already congested bottle necks twice a day (Heswall Cross, Thingwall roundabout, junction of Barnston Rd and Station Rd). Without significant changes to the local road network, spreading out far beyond the proposed development, there would be a huge increase in congestion and consequent leap in accident and casualty rates. This area already has an Amber/Red Merseytravel rating, needing extensive, yet to be costed, changes to road layout.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The MEAS assessment of SP062 describes the "significant deliverability constraint" and flags an overall RED RAG rating. The development would remove access to the countryside for the young, elderly and vulnerable who live in and around the area, including the removal of a well-used public footpaths. Huge visual impact for all residents, visitors, walkers, runners and cyclists. The impact on, and increased risks, for the pupils at Heswall Primary school, placed right on the edge of the proposed site. The complete removal of publicly accessible open space in one fell-swoop.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Lack of capacity in local schools, medical and dental practices.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

No details are provided of the impact assessments for drainage, water, power or telecoms, all of which would represent significant challenges to improve or unacceptable deterioration for residents and businesses.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

There are ample brown-field and non-green-belt sites available to meet demand.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

This would result in the removal of high quality 3a and 3b land. Local produce and the businesses that rely on that produce would be significantly impacted.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The National Planning Policy Framework (NPPF) lays out the five purposes of designating green-belt; to check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas, to prevent neighbouring towns from merging into one another, to assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment, to preserve the setting and special character of historic towns, to assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land. This proposal each of those key principles irretrievably. There is no evidence presented of the special circumstances demonstrated to show that the benefits of the development will outweigh the harm caused to the green-belt.

Q3n Other reasons

As laid out in my response to 2.1, the calculation of housing need is fundamentally flawed and over-estimated.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8149

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8316

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our

control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3h Flood Risk

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this

development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Yes, We support the identification of the site shown in Figure 4.7 as a potential location for a Single Urban Extension should the Council require land to be released from Green Belt to meet its development needs. We can confirm that this land falls under our control and that it is deliverable in line with the definition of the Framework; the site is available now, offers a suitable location for development now and is achievable with a realistic prospect that housing will be delivered on site within five years. The

development of this site can bring sufficient social, wellbeing, economic and environmental benefits to Wirral. Further information on this development opportunity and an initial concept masterplan for the site can be found in the accompanying Vision Document. We would welcome an opportunity to discuss this development option further with the Council and expand upon our commitment described in the Vision Document.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5679301>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8373

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8396

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable to be released. I strongly disagree. Option 2b must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8614

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Object to all development of current Green Belt land on environmental (particularly wildlife) grounds

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-873

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Green belt/field sites should never be developed.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8818

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The scale of this development is such that it would, in effect, create a small new town between Barnston, Heswall and Storeton, completely transforming the nature of possibly the most characteristic rural section of central Wirral. Apart from the serious loss of agricultural land, there would be very serious loss of habitat for a rich diversity of wildlife, including foxes, badgers, mice, voles, kestrels and buzzards.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Storeton Lane is already quite a busy road (although it manages to retain a rural feel), with a very narrow junction onto Barnston Road. This would be likely to become impossibly busy, if a development on the proposed scale were to take place.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The noise level would increase tremendously. Also, this is one of the very few parts of central Wirral where one can believe that one is actually in countryside. That sense would be completely destroyed.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9082

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9089

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This is not a sustainable location for development and the harm to Wirral's green belt would be very much against the national interest of Green Belt designation. The option would be unlikely to be found watertight under examination and therefore, should be removed.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9117

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality & increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality & increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality & increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9157

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality and increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality and increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

A major development in this area will completely change the character of the locality and increase pressure on the local infrastructure.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9327

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Huge environmental impact on roads, traffic, possibility of 5000 additional cars. Loss of Green Belt causing urban sprawl between Pensby and Barnston.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Would require huge transport restructuring to meet the demand of over 2000 additional homes, causing huge disruption to existing residents. Roads are already extremely busy and in poor condition.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Visual impact to area, increasing urban sprawl and causing villages of Pensby and Barnston to merge.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Green Belt is there to separate villages and prevent urban sprawl. Building on Green Belt would cause villages to merge contrary to the reason for Green Belt.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Schools in the area have been closed due lack of demand eg Fishers Lane Primary School, Pensby Girls & Boys secondary merged, this would put pressure on local schools, these schools are now being used for other purposes, nationally there is a lack of teachers - where would additional children be educated? Healthcare is stretched due to an ageing population, more residents would add to this pressure - there is a national shortage of GPs and nurses.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Wirral is known for its greenery, we need to preserve this for future generations and to protect the environment.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Additional residents would put further pressure in infrastructures and utilities that are already stretched and are constantly being updated as they don't meet current needs.

Q3h Flood Risk

This area of Green Belt is prone to flooding and would put residents at risk.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Farming is a vital income for the Borough, lack of Green Belt will lead to a reduction in income and sustaining agricultural land.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Will cause urban sprawl between Pensby, Heswall and Barnston with no distinction boundaries

Q3n Other reasons

If housing need was based on calculations carried out by outside agencies there would be no requirement to build on Green Belt thus preserving it for the good of the environment and future generations.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9432

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Replacing existing farmland/greenbelt with housing will negatively impact the environment.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

This area is not well served by public transport (limited bus services only) so the likelihood is that car use will dramatically increase putting additional strain on the roads and increasing pollution/particulates.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Currently these areas have separate identities to Heswall, the proposed build will produce an amalgamous mass and completely eliminate the character of Barnston village.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I think the regeneration of the urban areas of Wirral is key to a healthy future for all Wirral residents. We need to provide more employment opportunities and affordable housing if the Wirral is to have a more prosperous future which I don't think will be achieved through building on existing greenbelt.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The loss of any agricultural land should be avoided to ensure continuing employment for those currently involved and to future proof the food supply for the existing UK market and potential future external markets.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The Green Belt was set up to:

- 1) check the unrestricted sprawl of large built-up areas;
- 2) prevent neighbouring towns merging into one another;

- 3) assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment;
 - 4) preserve the setting and special character of historic towns;
 - 5) assist in urban regeneration, by encouraging the recycling of derelict and other urban land
- Whilst all of these are important the 5th point is key. The point of green belt is to encourage urban regeneration which is still required and therefore to give developers a more profitable option to build on green belt would just detract from any potential urban development opportunities.

Q3n Other reasons

As noted previously I believe that the housing need is overstated considerably.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9733

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9806

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9890

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The sites in Option 2B all provide much needed green space, and to build there will completely change the feel and fabric of the area, and would result in further urban sprawl. Wirral is a place of contrasts, and the beauty of West Wirral is significantly as a result of the green space that is available for all to enjoy, and to build on that land unnecessarily would change the look and feel of Wirral forever. Our Council has a responsibility to enhance and not destroy the beauty of our Borough for future generations, and if necessary the building of new property should be restricted.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The road infrastructure in and around Option 2B is already busy at peak times, and a significant increase in new properties in the area would only make the situation much worse, particularly where Barnston Road runs through Barnston Village, and its junction with Storeton Lane. These roads will not be able to take the additional traffic without there being significant traffic queues, and the detriment that would have on the conservation village of Barnston.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

To build on the areas in Option 2B will completely change for the worse the character of this area of Barnston and Heswall, and is not necessary if Brownfield sites are used.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The heritage of the conservation village of Barnston would be destroyed.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

There is sufficient brownfield sites available to satisfy housing needs and the council should ensure these are used.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Building on land contained in Option 2B will lose that greenbelt land forever.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9984

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Q3n Other reasons

Other No green belt should be released. Instead set realistic housing requirement targets which will alleviate the need for any green belt release.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2740

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The number of Green Belt sites would require a Design Brief to ensure that the local architectural and cultural characteristics are retained. Speculative generic contemporary construction is unlikely to enhance the heritage or development potential of such proposals.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18376

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing today to express my complete horror at the thought of building on the fields behind Belmont Drive. My family and I have lived in this area all our lives . This week my children were lucky enough to see geese in our garden. The following day we sat outside trying to figure out exactly where the woodpecker was. My favourite experience was watching the fox jumping around in the grass. Clearly this is a area for nature and natural beauty. How could this even be in consideration?

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I would ask that we use all available brown belt land and green belt is not even an consideration.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Most people live in this area of the Wirral because of its green belt and it's natural beauty . Removing the green belt will change the whole dynamics of the area, merging several townships. Also putting additional pressure on our road net works.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9062

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This site has been incorrectly classed as a weak performing parcel, although it has been screened out based on its many restrictions and unviability I am concerned that this incorrect classification may be a future problem for the site and request the correct 'Moderate' to 'High' performing rating is given to SP043 Vineyard Farm.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Traffic around M53 junction 4 and 5 clearly demonstrates development on the east of the M53 will cause huge transport problems.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

SP043 is an open quite area unique interms of its tranquility and function in providing a green corridor for wildlife to the open countryside. This site should have been

omitted from the outset and should not be included in any assessment of potential site.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

SP043 is a flood risk as has been identified.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

SP043 offers the highest grade agricultural land on the Wirral.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This is Prime highly performing greenbelt. Should never have been included in any assessment as it has far too many issues for development and is a prized biodiverse asset.

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23975

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Agree to the exclusion of Parcels 4.8 to 4.13, which appear on Map C of Appendix 4.7 as a potential 'eastern urban extension'. Such a development would cause remarkable damage to the area and in particular add thousands of cars to the totally inadequate local roads and swamp local services.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656957>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13765

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Not only would development of sites SP061, SP062 & SP064E, SP065 be an act of vandalism destroying food producing farmland at a time when this is urgently needed following the UK's exit from Europe. It would also render the SBI's, significantly less useful as any wildlife would end up in the middle of housing estates rather than open countryside. Should this reckless scheme be passed the very least that would be required would be a significant upgrade and monitoring of the sewage system which is in my opinion either at or very close to capacity

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

I have a number of concerns relating to the land drainage and ability of the existing sewage disposal capabilities relating to the above sites. From Grid Reference SJ 281 830 (roughly opposite Barnston W.I.) a farm track leads towards Pensby, (highlighted in red on the map) land is drained in a southerly direction (left) towards a stream (marked F) which runs roughly parallel to Whitfield Lane, this stream then runs in a culvert beneath Barnston Road to eventually emerge in Brimstage village where it passes under Brimstage Road in a series of three culverts to eventually join the Clatter Brook. In periods of heavy rain the land is unable to absorb the water, this results in Barnston Road flooding both opposite Whitfield Lane and near to Christchurch, Brimstage village has also flooded on a number of occasions due to the inability of water to pass through the culverts under Brimstage Road [see attached map]. Any extensive housing development of Sites SP062 and/or SP064E with its attendant roads, hard standing etc can only lead to a worsening of the current situation unless remedial works are carried out to the affected culverts. To the North (right) of the track the land drains the remainder of Sites SP061 & SP062, Barnston & Pensby in to what eventually becomes Prenton Brook which in turn is joined by unnamed streams which drain Thingwall. The main stream of Prenton Brook rises in Pensby where it emerges from a culvert to flow through Barnston Dale Site of Biological Importance (SBI 30), then flows under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow (also part of SBI 30, the only pasture/woodland SBI on Wirral), it then flows in to Murrayfield Hospital SBI (Site 31), from there it enters Lower Heath Wood SBI (Site 73). It should be pointed out that part of Murrayfield Hospital is occupied by 'Barnstondale Centre' where children are often in close proximity to the stream. The whole length of this stream is closely followed by a 1 m sewer pipe with a flow meter close to its source in Pensby, this was constructed in the early 1960's and enabled the development of Pensby as it now is. The sewer pipe continues under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow where two inspection shafts are located, when originally constructed these shafts were well away from the stream, erosion over the years has now left them exposed and within the stream bed. There have in the past been problems with the sewer when a number of sink holes appeared within the meadow, this occurred from 2010 through to 2014 and were reported to United Utilities by the then tenant farmer, these issues were only belatedly addressed by United Utilities following the involvement of the then MP Esther McVey. As the sewer progresses through Dale Meadow a number of pipes (6, possibly more)

cross the stream bearing sewage from houses in Storeton Lane, some are suspended over the stream, others buried in concrete within the stream bed, there are also pipes buried beneath the Dale Meadow connecting the houses on Barnston Road, Woodlands Drive area. The main sewer eventually emerges in Murrayfield Hospital SBI were it enters Barnston Storm Tanks (these are accessed via Private Drive) a large treatment facility which has an outlet with grating directly in to Prenton Brook. As the pipe enters the facility a further pipe is suspended over the stream carrying waste from the direction of the hospital. The sewer continues though Lower Heath Wood SBI where it is joined by a branch that roughly follows the line of the Bidston/Wrexham railway delivering sewage and waste water from the general direction of Heswall Hills.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13771

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Stream C is used by United Utilities in order to discharge water from Crosshill Reservoir, there have been problems with this stream ever since the reservoir was opened C1918. These discharges cause major erosion at the Storeton end of Dale Meadow. A number of attempts have been made by United Utilities & their predecessors to alleviate the problem, all so far unsuccessful. The last attempt was carried out despite a false start in 2015 with work costing at a rough guess in excess of £500,000, on completion they gave assurances that in future the flow would not exceed specific limits. This has been breached many times since, particularly during 2017 when major problems were found with the roof of the reservoir, as a result the weir they constructed to alleviate the erosion is now much worn away and virtually useless. So much sand and silt has been washed down stream during excess discharge in to stream 'C' that the level of the main Prenton Brook bed has been raised as much as 6 to 10 inches, this results in branches & debris collecting against the pipe creating a strain where the pipe crosses the stream from the direction of the hospital. Formerly North West Water Authority carried out inspections and scouring of the stream in the 1960's and 70's the National Rivers Authority who took over from North West Water Authority in the early 80's did this a couple of times, this ensured that branches and debris endangering the pipes crossing the stream were in good order. The Environment Agency was formed in the mid 90's and took over these responsibilities, they have never carried out any form of inspection and have certainly not done any remedial work., or any other form of maintenance. There is no system in place to check or inspect these pipes or the main sewer. When I last walked through Dale Meadow (Friday 28/09/2019) there were several blockages caused by fallen trees/branches where these wash up against the pipes they create dams increasing pressure on the pipes. It is far from impossible for a falling branch to damage these pipes releasing sewage which would go undetected and flow through the Barnstondale Centre where as I have pointed out children frequently play. From 2006 to date I have reported the following issues to United Utilities:- 7 instances of sewer pipes being either broken or dislodged. 8 Instances of the grating to Prenton Brook fouled with offensive material 3 Pollution incidents, source unknown. 7 Instances of excess discharge from Thingwall Reservoir. (I have photographic evidence for all except 2 or 3 of these incidents) As these are just the incidents that I have recorded, I wonder just how many other incidents there have been which may have been notified, or more likely gone unseen and unreported. "

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11154

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Urban housing allocations should only be brownfield or used land not urban green spaces. All deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that the council is not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Urban housing allocations should only be brownfield or used land not urban green spaces. All deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that the council is not considering brownfield land that is being made available..

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11176

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

We are opposed to the development of the Green Field site at the bottom of Grange Road/Abbey Road/Carpenters Lane for the following reasons:

- 1) Road entry to West Kirby will be far less attractive with 50 houses & 100+ cars rather than sheep.
- 2) Considerable environmental Damage
- 3) Huge consequences for residential roads with 100+ cars + delivery firms into unsuitable roads.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11192

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Urban green space should be preserved and any new urban houses should be on Brownfield sites.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Urban green space should be preserved and any new urban houses should be on Brownfield sites.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1875

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

As previously stated the total number of dwellings proposed is not aligned to projected population growth. Furthermore there are approximately 4-500 empty homes which could part or totally fulfil any need the actual exists.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2305

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The Green Belt locations are less well served by public transport than the urban brownfield sites, and Wirral Council's principles are to reduce the use of private vehicles, and the subsequent increase in traffic pollution, leading to the Climate Challenge. Developing these sites run counter to the Council's core principles. It is likely that speculative developers would be unlikely to invest in the necessary provision of public transport when considering developing Green Belt allocated areas for residential and employment purposes. It would be better financially and socially to improve existing services than depend upon speculative promises in the future.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Speculative generic commercial and residential designs are unlikely to reflect the unique architectural character of each Green Belt proposed redevelopment site. Robust & enforceable Planning Policy is essential for each Green Belt site; a distinct Development Brief should be provided for each proposed development site in advance of development.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23819

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment**Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site****Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The Council has not searched non-green belt areas, including brownfield sites with the vigour applied to Green belt land. There has been no published 'for consultation' review of brownfield sites as that for Green Belt. An arithmetic calculation base – rather than actual -has been used and it is questioned whether the Council's register of such land is up to date.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2672

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

This question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land not urban green space. All deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that Council are not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-597

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Rejecting the Council's reasons that pockets of the greenbelt will have to be built on.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Rejecting the Council's reasons that pockets of the greenbelt will have to be built on.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Rejecting the Council's reasons that pockets of the greenbelt will have to be built on.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Rejecting the Council's reasons that pockets of the greenbelt will have to be built on.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

This question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land not urban green space. All deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that Council are not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6380

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Proposed urban housing allocations should not encroach on the Greenbelt in any way. There are no advantages to urban housing allocations.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6511

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Brownfield sites should be fully uses - not Greenbelt release

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Brownfield sites should be fully uses - not Greenbelt release

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6599

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6661

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land not urban green space. all deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that council are not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

This question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land not urban green space. all deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable prior to plan adoption. There is evidence that council are not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6678

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be BROWNFIELD only or used land NOT urban green space. ALL deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable PRIOR to plan adoption. There is evidence available brownfield land is NOT being considered.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

The question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be BROWNFIELD only or used land NOT urban green space. ALL deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable PRIOR to plan adoption. There is evidence available brownfield land is NOT being considered.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The question is misleading. Urban housing allocations should be BROWNFIELD only or used land NOT urban green space. ALL deliverable land on brownfield sites should have been made deliverable PRIOR to plan adoption. There is evidence available brownfield land is NOT being considered.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7092

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Urban housing should be Brownfield site only or used land not urban green spaces. All deliverable land on Brownfield sites should be made deliverable prior to the plan adoption. There seems evidence that WBC are not considering Brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Urban housing should be Brownfield site only or used land not urban green spaces. All deliverable land on Brownfield sites should be made deliverable prior to the plan adoption. There seems evidence that WBC are not considering Brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Urban housing should be Brownfield site only or used land not urban green spaces. All deliverable land on Brownfield sites should be made deliverable prior to the plan adoption. There seems evidence that WBC are not considering Brownfield land that is being made available.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7162

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Misleading question. Housing allocations should only be Brownfield or used land not urban green space.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Misleading question. Housing allocations should only be Brownfield or used land not urban green space.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7185

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

The question is misleading, urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land, not urban green space.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The question is misleading, urban housing allocations should be brownfield only or used land, not urban green space.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7323

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

It is my preferred option rather than destroying the Wirral Greenbelt. History would not thank you.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

It is my preferred option rather than destroying the Wirral Greenbelt. History would not thank you.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7993

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Ensure the Council's register of urban sites with development is comprehensive and up to date. I am aware of omissions in Heswall for Appendix 4.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8498

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

No release of Green Belt

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-860

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

There should be no development on green belt/field sites because this would result in an increase in the carbon footprint of the borough. Green belt/fields produce oxygen and offset tonnes of carbon.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Any development on green belt/field sites would impact on much of the rural feel of Wirral.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

No building development should be on agricultural sites. Using agricultural land would result in a major change to the rural character of Wirral.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

There should be no development on green belt/field sites because this would result in an increase in the carbon footprint of the borough. Green belt/fields produce oxygen and offset tonnes of carbon. It would also impact on much of the rural character of Wirral which in turn would negatively impact on the potential of Wirral to become a significant tourist destination.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10428

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2498

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Destruction of trees

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Pensby road already very busy with traffic

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

it will destroy the outlook with a housing estate instead of the beautiful fields

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Ruin a rural community

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Schools already oversubscribed and its already very difficult to get an appointment at the doctors surgery. This housing estate would be unsustainable

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

As already stated pressure on both infrastructure and utilities would be horrendous

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Urban housing allocations should be brownfield only. There is evidence that the Council are not considering brownfield land that is being made available.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Proposed site is presently used as farm land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

No viable reason to build houses on green belt land

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10439

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Current model exaggerates housing demand

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2694

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Green Belt land should remain undeveloped to provide the necessary resource the Climate Challenge

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7994

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Ensure the Council's register of urban sites with development is comprehensive and up to date.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2505

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Council have not consulted with all landowners of brownfield sites who wish to sell their land

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-603

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4748

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7026

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

I do not agree with Eastham or any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8140

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10404

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

I do not agree with Eastham SHLAA 1850 or any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9692

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I object to ALL areas of greenbelt land being released.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7718

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

I do not agree with Eastham SHLAA 1850 or any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7892

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3h Flood Risk

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3k Development Viability

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

No loss of agricultural land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Q3n Other reasons

I do not agree with any of the green spaces being developed.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1361

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Developments should not take place on the Green Belt for previously mentioned reasons.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6605

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

None of the green belt should be released for "development".

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

None of the green belt should be released for "development".

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-6867

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

No green spaces to be built on - they are all essential. Coronavirus confirms this fact.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2740

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The number of Green Belt sites would require a Design Brief to ensure that the local architectural and cultural characteristics are retained. Speculative generic contemporary construction is unlikely to enhance the heritage or development potential of such proposals.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2516

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Totally disagree with any green belt release. Please note comments to all the above questions have already been given in 4.2

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11696

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I live on Barnston Rd and we are subject to horrendous traffic . In the day there may be a quiet lapse for a very short time but at other times we have a job to get out of our drives & in the morning it is impossible to keep an appointment at certain times because of the queues at the crossroads at Storeton Lane. We have ambulances , police cars ,& fire engines racing up & down quite a lot as it is a straight run to Heswall & the Chester Rd.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Also the water drains off the fields & runs down towards Whitehouse Lane when we have a big shower [some residents have sand bags ready] so this would be made worse if houses were built in this area.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I do believe that if houses were to be built on Barnston Rd they would not be for the first time residents but for the richer people & to make a large amount of money for the developer.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14905

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I recently attended a Drop-in session at Bromborough Civic Centre, and whilst not examining all plans, I was shocked and dismayed to see possible plans to build many houses on land between Heswall and Pensby. This is a disgrace! How can this be justified, other than to line the pockets of developers and those associated with it. I was advised that this was only an option but it feels very much like someone in power is trying it on. Each new generation is born into an impoverished world that they see as normal, but over time, bit by bit, Wirral's precious green areas are swallowed up and concreted over. What shame! As they say, 'once its gone, its gone' and we will be judged by future generations. Now here's a suggestion - how about planting trees and/or meadows for our decimated wildlife on those areas shown for probably development, for their benefit and ours - now that would be welcome forward thinking don't you think!! Its not rocket science. To conclude, I vehemently oppose any development on Wirral's greenbelt.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14916

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I wish to oppose the above plan for a huge housing estate between Barnston and Heswall in the strongest possible way. This is one of the few stretches of green fields left in Wirral and it would be a tragedy to lose it. Already half of Wirral is under concrete and we need fields and trees as lungs for the peninsula. I have read the arguments for and against and am clear that there is no need or demand to take green belt land. We are not required to build so many houses that we cannot accommodate them on existing brown field sites. I have absolutely no doubt that building on green fields suits developers because it is cheaper but once lost we will never recover these open spaces

and I urge you to resist this unnecessary development. I was appalled to see that WBC Consultants had classified tracts of green belt as 'weakly performing'. Who are these people? This is just another example of the arrogant, small-minded and short-sighted view of some individuals. So I would suggest to you that if these areas have to 'perform' for the population that you embark on an historic project to create a Wirral Forest. There is enough evidence and demand for a huge expansion of tree cover in the UK (to which I believe Wirral council agrees) and this would be a wonderful gift for our children and grandchildren. Create a forest with paths, ponds and glades for future Wirral residents to enjoy – I am sure you would have no shortage of volunteers to help with it. That really would be something for Wirral people.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18376

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I am writing today to express my complete horror at the thought of building on the fields behind Belmont Drive. My family and I have lived in this area all our lives . This week my children were lucky enough to see geese in our garden. The following day we sat outside trying to figure out exactly where the woodpecker was. My favourite experience was watching the fox jumping around in the grass. Clearly this is a area for nature and natural beauty. How could this even be in consideration ?

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

I would ask that we use all available brown belt land and green belt is not even an consideration.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Most people live in this area of the Wirral because of its green belt and it's natural beauty . Removing the green belt will change the whole dynamics of the area, merging several townships. Also putting additional pressure on our road net works.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-20871

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The nature and appeal of Heswall as a small town will be catastrophically changed forever. Furthermore, my immediate locale will become a disruptive building site for years. For future generations an alternative to building on green belt sites must be identified. There is an alternative. It is up to WBC to find a resolution which doesn't damage the unique characteristics of the Wirral peninsular.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The impact on local services and amenities will be immense

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

From a local perspective the prospect of losing green belt (Option 2B) 'on my doorstep' is appalling, not only on an aesthetic level but in terms of the pressure on infrastructure is of deep concern. The local road system in Heswall is not designed to cater for a huge expansion in housing and its accompanying traffic.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14905

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I recently attended a Drop-in session at Bromborough Civic Centre, and whilst not examining all plans, I was shocked and dismayed to see possible plans to build many houses on land between Heswall and Pensby. This is a disgrace! How can this be justified, other than to line the pockets of developers and those associated with it. I was advised that this was only an option but it feels very much like someone in power is trying it on. Each new generation is born into an impoverished world that they see as normal, but over time, bit by bit, Wirral's precious green areas are swallowed up and concreted over. What shame! As they say, 'once its gone, its gone' and we will be judged by future generations. Now here's a suggestion - how about planting trees and/or meadows for our decimated wildlife on those areas shown for probably development, for their benefit and ours - now that would be welcome forward thinking don't you think!! Its not rocket science. To conclude, I vehemently oppose any development on Wirral's greenbelt.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8035

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-12544

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Options 2a & b however is completely unnecessary as it will destroy forever the buffer between Irby and Thingwall, which are 2 very different villages and this plan would create an urban sprawl.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-18366

Site Reference

All Single Urban Extension Green Belt Sites

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

I have registered so as to be able to complete the above mentioned questionnaire online but I am experiencing difficulty in being able to "open" the consultation document so as to respond to the questions. I am mindful that the consultation period is due to expire this coming Monday and therefore would be grateful if you would accept this e-mail as record of my opposition to both Options 2A and Option 2B involving the release of Green Belt land. I am particularly opposed to the release of the three parcels reference SP061, SP062 and SP065 because I am on the opinion that their release for development would contravene the five purposes of the Green Belt. I also do not agree with the Council's opinion that these parcels perform weakly in this regard.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24572 (Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel lies adjacent to Barnstondale Local Wildlife Site and ancient woodland. Without significant buffering of at least 50m there is potential for significant impacts especially through disturbance and pollution of the Prenton Brook. Light pollution could negatively impact the bat population that uses the brook for foraging.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5765

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

No Green Belt land should be considered for release. The character of Wirral would be permanently ruined.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14134

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel of land is currently designated as Green Belt to protect Barnston Dale, which provides an important habitat for wildlife. In addition, this area of the Green Belt preserves the historic nature of Barnston Village and Dale. The parcel of land met the criteria of Green Belt in 1983 under the Merseyside Green Belt Local Plan. The reasons for scheduling have not changed and legislation requires that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified. Such circumstances have not been evidenced or justified in the Plan.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

If residential development of Parcel Reference SP062 was to occur, there would be severe pressure on the already overloaded road network in the area. Local roads Pensby Road (B5138), Barnston Road (A551) and Brimstage Road (A5137) are already congested at peak times and, in particular, the roundabouts at Thingwall (junction of A551 and B5138) and Gayton (junction of A540, A551 and A5137), together with the road junction at Arrowe Park (junction of A551 and A552), are all at their limits. Further afield, Junctions 3 and 4 of the M53 motorway are already at capacity during peak hours. Significant improvement to the road network would need to be made,

presumably at the developer's cost, to accommodate the extra traffic. In particular, the improvements required at the motorway junctions would be extensive and costly, allied with the works required to the local roads, which would be likely to involve widening, and hence property take. This, I suggest, would render the development of SP062 'undeliverable' in terms of the National Policy on planning, due to the costs of the road infrastructure improvements, rendering the development uneconomic.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16179

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Apologies, I digress. My house is on the East of Barnston Road roughly 40 metres from the actual highway. Our walk begins at 8.30 am and it takes a minute or so to reach Barnston Road. We are within the Barnston Conservation Area boundary. To our left we are looking along Barnston Road in the direction of Heswall, each side is bounded by sandstone walls with substantial hedgerows in the distance as the village opens up to countryside. Directly ahead of us over the sandstone wall we can see the grade 2 listed Christ Church and beyond a gradual rise of fields in the landscape leading to a mature tree lined ridge which separates site SP062 from Pensby and Downham roads and Napps Way. In your evidence base informing the Local Plan both the Wirral Landscape Character Assessment and the Barnston Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan both recognize our current view as a characteristic which identifies Barnston as a small rural village and great weight is given to the importance of the outward rural views from the Barnston Conservation Area. I see open countryside, what do you see? Document GB 1 in your evidence base see's Urban Fringe, ARUP only considers countryside as being to the East of Barnston road at the point at which we stand. We must move on now, but let's wait for the break in the traffic. To our left for as far as you can see is the daily weekday queue of almost standstill traffic with most vehicles being of single occupancy. We cannot blame these commuters for this, they have no

alternative. No reliable Bus service and a Rail service that does not take them directly to where they work. Having crossed Barnston Road we now turn right on the footpath alongside the Christ Church cemetery, you will notice that the road cuts through the landscape here with both the Church to the left and Bank Farm to the right standing on higher ground. Excuse me whilst I cough, exhaust fumes I think, lungs not what they were! What happens to the particulates being emitted and gathering at this point? Do they go to ground and wash into our watercourses? or do they rise into the atmosphere and pollute the air in lower lying areas on the Wirral? 40 metres further on we reach our next turning point, we are still within the Conservation Area almost in the centre of the Village just before the Barnston Road / Storeton Lane Junction. In your evidence base, Mott Macdonald say there will be no changes to this junction if the Western Urban Extension is adopted, the reality, of course, is that it would be impossible to make any change here that would make a noticeable improvement in traffic flow. With the increase in traffic numbers generated by the Western Urban Extension by a possible 3000 or more vehicles on Barnston Road how far do you think these early morning queues might extend? Our bird surveys of SP062 during the last few years identify these fields as feeding grounds for European protected species which also nest in Barnston Dale, the surrounding hedgerows interspersed with mature trees outside the Barnston Dale SBI serve as wildlife corridors to enhance and support three of Wirral's important SBI,s including Wirral's only Wood pasture SBI. The Mott Macdonald plan is to construct a road directly through this important wildlife area to join up to Gills Lane. Your evidence base also says that sites supporting this category of wildlife will not be considered for development, how do you explain this? Time to move on, our next style takes us onto familiar ground for me. This and the next public footpath field are in the occupation of Manor Farm and so are two of the fields adjacent to them, the total area of the four fields is 13.5 hectares, not insignificant. The whole 13.5 hectares does not have a SHLAA site reference and has not been submitted for development by the landowner. I suggest that this is not an oversight by the said landowner because he has submitted sites further along the public footpath. For a public consultation of this nature surely only land which is confirmed as available and developable at the time of consultation should be included, it does appear that you have adopted that criteria for Brown Field land so why not Green Belt Land ? This is not an isolated case, the Glebe field confirms it, many owners of land included in your Green Belt parcels do not wish for their land to be developed. Like the previous Flatts field this field is also designated as a post medieval Townfield and lidar maps indicate a network of land cultivation within the current historic hedgerow boundary. The footpath traverses over this undulating field in a southerly direction from one corner to another. The next style is at a point where the landscape begins to rise, we cross a trackway and another style into the next field. The trackway between the styles is of historic importance, it was formerly the access route from Barnston Road where the Lodge house is located to the manor house 'Pensby House' and Farm which was located on what is now Downham Road South. The trackway appears to disappear in the field in which we are now walking but 30cms below the field surface the cobbled trackway is generally intact. Its position below the surface

is consistent with two centuries of livestock farming gradually building layers of compost material, improving soil structure and enabling a profitable return from the land for modern farming practices, a true indicator of the value of the land aside from generalized ALC grading.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Listen, at this point we can hear the children attending Heswall Primary School at play on their playing field, what a fantastic setting for them to experience their environment. I'm not convinced that the site of the School is large enough to provide space to accommodate all the educational needs of the children who will be resident on the Western Urban Extension and this will likely generate further traffic movements along narrow lanes leading out from site SP062. There is nothing in your evidence base to suggest that this is being addressed. Our walk has taken longer than usual because we have been able to consider all that site SP062 has to offer the residents of Wirral over a distance of just over one kilometre. Do the people of Wirral need to have this valuable Green Belt site and the adjacent SP061 replaced with houses.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Let's move off the main road, we turn left onto Wirral public footpath Deeside no25. I recently helped WBC footpaths officer and his group of volunteers clear this first section of footpath exposing some fine Victorian clay pavements which now enhance the appeal for the many walkers that use this route. The rise from the main road brings us to what is believed to be the centre of the original Township, on our left is the Grade 2 listed former Barnston School now a Church and Community Hall. The footpath opens up to Old Lane which circles the old township. We reach the first style, a well-worn stone structure which adjoins the Cemetery, as we climb to the top of the style the landscape opens up in front of us and we can appreciate the countryside, and yes, my breathing feels better. Before we dismount the style, if you look to your right, you will see the former Church Glebe field, now in private ownership, a playground and community

gathering point in my childhood and for many generations before and still occasionally used by campers. The Glebe field lies within Green Belt site SP062, it does not have a SHLAA site reference because the owner does not wish for it to be developed. From the stone stile it is only a short distance across the Cemetery grounds to the next stile and our first field, occupied by Bank Farm. We are now entering Green Belt site SP062. The Flatts field, a name of Norse origin still used today by local residents, it is a medieval Townfield, recorded by Liverpool Museum and contains a large open water wildlife pond and undulating ground giving the impression of trackways beneath the surface. Linked to historic routes to Brimstage current discussion is exploring the involvement of this field as a possible retreat route from the 'Battle of Brunanburh' to the river Dee coastline. To the right of the footpath there are several hectares of land in the occupation of Beech Farm and in the distance is Barnston Dale.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

At this point on SP062 we can reference a distinct comparison in drainage, as we look towards Heswall from this point all the land to the South drains into the Clatter Brook, all the land to the North drains into Prenton Brook. In your evidence base, the Water Cycle Report recognizes that the sewer network in the former settlement area 8, part of which we now stand, is sparse and evidence exists that the current sewer passing through Barnston Dale, Murrayfield Hospital and Lower Heath Wood SBI's and beyond through the Prenton Brook and Fender valleys are polluting the natural watercourses. Your Water Cycle Report 2013 does not consider large scale development in settlement area 8 and certainly not on the scale of the Western Urban Extension. Would it be prudent to update this report? The scale of upgrade to the drainage system to support Option 2b between Barnston and Birkenhead and taking further measures to minimize the additional surface water runoff, which will contribute to the category 3 flood zone at Brimstage, are certainly important considerations to this Option.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

During our walk we have been able to appreciate views across species rich hedgerows, many of which can be identified as historic and have mature oak trees growing in them. One field contains three large mature oaks growing in the middle of the field, an uncommon feature of many intensively farmed Counties. These trees and hedgerows absorb carbon dioxide and provide cleaner air for the whole of the Wirral and support many wildlife species. 15 wildlife ponds exist across the site and some of the species counted in our bird survey indicate that the site is of high ecological importance. The last field on our walk is occupied by Manor Farm also and has been given a SHLAA site reference. All the land to the South and bounded by Barnston Road is occupied by Carnsdale (of Norse origin) Farm another historic site surrounded by post medieval and town fields and is likely to be the site of the second 'Manor' of Barnston described in Domesday . In recent years the young farmer in occupation has won the Cheshire Farming and Wildlife award in the Cheshire Farms Competition on several occasions. His approach to farming is set out in the Government's view of best Farming practice for the future, however, the Western Urban Extension will end his farming career in Barnston and will see the demise of the three other Agricultural holdings in the village as individual farms. Our last style on the footpath before dropping down on to Whitfield Lane is a good place to turn and admire the views over the countryside. At this point you can see the small rural village of Barnston with its prominent listed church, the Liverpool skyline, the Winter Hill radio mast on the Pennines, Storeton Ridge, the aircraft approach but not quite the landing at John Lennon Airport, the Wind turbines on Frodsham Marsh, Helsby Hill, Runcorn Iron bridge and the approach to the Clwydian Mountain range. Where else on the Wirral can you view another Country and several English Counties from a single viewpoint.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I farm in Barnston Village which, like all four farms in Barnston occupies land to the East and West of Barnston Road all occupying and reliant on land classified, in part, as 'the best and most versatile Agricultural Land' according to NPPF and Defra's 25 year Environment Plan, within Green Belt site SP062. Exceptional circumstance and declining health resulted in my early retirement having only achieved 40 years of service to Manor Farm, my Father went into full retirement at the same time after 65 years continuing a successive commitment to this farm by my family, Grandfather 56 years, Grandmother 69 years. My Grandmother's parents met each other at the Manor farm as child servants in 1869, I can go on. I have been able to trace direct family descendants mainly working in land based industries moving through the local communities in the immediate vicinity of Barnston Village since 1600. All, along with

other residents, made each community and village a distinct part of Wirral and created part of the rich heritage which we can now enjoy. Landican, Arrow, Lower and Higher Thingwall, Lower and Higher Pensby, Irby, Thurstaston, Oldfield, Gayton and Heswall are some of the distinct areas where family members have lived. Sadly, many of these communities have already merged and their independent identities lost. Releasing Green Belt land for development will further assist in the consignment of more distinct areas and communities to the history book. I would like you to join me as I take you on one of my familiar walks. I have been encouraged by my GP based at the Warrens Health Centre to take regular walks having lost a significant degree of lung capacity in recent years. The health centre has provided me with exceptional care and the staff are great, though it is hard to neglect the pressures that exist with the vast number of patients on their list. My friends say that other GP practices in the area suffer from the same pressures. Should the Western Urban Extension option be adopted how will our local health centres fair with a further 6000 residents living within the historic Township boundary of Barnston?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23825

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Drainage and sewage To consider developing SP061/SP062/SP063/SP064/SP065 is flawed by unacceptable infrastructure and health and safety problems. Existing infrastructure barely copes with current demand. Should these proposals go ahead, this would have serious impacts. Barnston Dale (served by the A551) was formed in the Ice Age and is a steep U-shaped valley. The stream in the valley and its unnamed tributaries drain most of central Wirral. The Dale is an ancient woodland with three Sites of Biological Importance. First sewer was constructed in c1900. Second sewer running parallel was completed in the 1960s. Sink holes are associated with the original sewer. The streams drain half of SP062, all of SP061 and also Thingwall. Following representations by a local MP concerning sink holes and Crosshill Reservoir discharge erosion in Barnston Dale 2013 – 2015, United Utilities were required to undertake repairs to sink holes (some 3 feet deep) in 2015. Some identified problems highlighted during the project reinstatements still remain outstanding. Discharges from Thingwall Reservoir (opened c1918) have caused major erosion. The flow from the reservoir exceeds specific limits. The reservoir was found to have major construction defects in 2017 and, as a result, the weir (constructed to stop erosion) has been rendered virtually useless. The 1975 Act recognises the catastrophic effects of any serious incident at Thingwall Reservoir. The reservoir which, apparently in an emergency would need to be emptied is would be adjacent to a proposed new development of 504 houses. The overflow from the sewer treatment plant at Barnston Storm Tanks overflows into a stream and is regarded locally as a serious health risk. There is also an appalling stench! The sewer is near full capacity due to other branches joining it within the designated areas. The A551 already floods by the entrance to the Dale. Should high tides and heavy rain combine, serious flooding occurs. Brimstage Brook (SP062) is liable to flooding. 60 hectares of potential development within parcels SP062 and SP064 will increase surface water flow to Brimstage Brook which in Brimstage Village and beyond contributes to an existing highest category 3 flood zone. Flow recorder chambers with regulators and storm overflows exist to the rear of Belmont Drive and at the end of Private Drive with additional pump facility at Private Drive to discharge into the Fender Valley Sewer. Sewage treatment is in Birkenhead. Fluvial process has increased in time as greater surface water volume enters Prenton Brook from Higher Pensby resulting in manhole access chambers 78 and 79 being exposed to the full flow of the brook with the potential to cause pollution. Pollution incidence in Prenton Brook will directly impact on the Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and boreholes further downstream in Prenton. Prenton Brook is a recorded river tributary and as such is under the control of The Environment Agency. The predecessor, The

National Rivers Authority regularly scoured out the course of Prenton Brook within Barnston Dale to control the fluvial process, this is ignored by EA. Considerations for the effects on the ecology of Barnston Dale would be significant. Should these proposals go ahead there would be further impact arising from lack of maintenance/inspection of the stream for blockage; lack of the inspection of the sewer; Inspection shafts eroding into the stream; excessive discharge into one of the streams; sewage related discharge is evident into Prenton Brook; increased likelihood of flooding; Brimstage Brook (westerly SP062) would be subject to further flooding. Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: History of the area; Maps; Photographic evidence; Factual data.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24684

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Parcels 7.17 to 7.19 have a good contribution to check unrestricted sprawl. These Parcels also have a higher than 'weak' contribution to keeping separation of Pensby and Barnston but also Pensby and Thingwall. In these Parcels, there is a 'fuzzy' boundary along Barnston Road and development would add to the sprawl of Thingwall here. Development north of Gills Lane, would perceptually and actually bring Pensby and Barnston, closer together. The existing development at Thorncroft Drive and the Donkey school creates a form to allow development and sprawl. Encroachment would be obvious from the nearest roads. It has at least a 'moderate' contribution to GBT purposes, not 'weak'. This contribution is stronger in the northern parts.



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2519

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels to that are not acceptable for release. Option 2b should be taken out of the issues and options document

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25478

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

My overriding view is that due to the high cost and damage to the environment the above single release of Greenbelt would bring, this is not the right location and it would be by far preferable to locate this housing close to electric rail lines with frequent services linking with new proposals for stations on the West Kirby and Chester Lines as above.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I feel that the transport related documentation supplied as part of the consultation is inadequate, simply trying to support a major development in a relatively high property cost area - albeit in the wrong place. With a potential number of dwellings somewhere between 2000 and 3000 based on page 21 of the Consultation Summary Document, presumably an associated population increase of around 8.000 based on average 3 to 4 persons per dwelling, I consider that this option would have a major impact on the surrounding highway network, infrastructure and services. Lack of access to bus services/rail services – detailed review provided. Lack of accessible transport infrastructure and parking at bus/rail stations. Transport information supplied did not make recommendations for complimentary works such as junction improvements in the wider area – detailed consideration of need for improved road infrastructure provided in attachment.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I feel that development in the Meols /Leasowe or Bebington / Eastham areas would minimise carbon emissions and assist Wirral in satisfying in meeting its Climate Emergency objectives.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5655824>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2510

Site Reference

Parcel 7.17 (SP062A, SHLAA 0884) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

There are urban sites available in the north of the town



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10228

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Green Belt should be protected

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22009

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Justifying Green Belt release: The Green Belt Review Consultation had numerous responses, some 2,300 we believe and yet this seems to have been disregarded by the Council. There is neither clarity, nor justification why certain areas of Green Belt have been selected over others. The Council should be reminded why land was set aside for Green Belt in the first place; it was a policy for controlling urban growth, maintaining areas of agriculture, forestry and leisure activities. It was set aside to avoid urban sprawl, maintaining open land and the feeling of openness that we all enjoy when we venture into the countryside. This is undoubtedly attractive land for developers, it is easier to develop and the properties that it can accommodate can be bigger, more luxurious and command a higher price tag.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-22803

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Finally, given the current geopolitical climate, I would suggest that Wirral Borough Council does its "bit" to help maintain the faith of its inhabitants and does not destroy their legacy.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

The lure of this should not, however, be used by the Council to attract developers, brownfield sites must be developed as a priority, maintaining an environment that we can all enjoy. The focus of any local plan should be the regeneration of urban areas and no the destruction of Green Belt.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We all need to focus on maintaining green spaces for food production, tree-planting, cleaner air, health/welfare and leisure protecting wildlife assets, as well as preserving what we have for future generations. It has been suggested that the Council's justification for this is that areas of the Green Belt are "weakly" performing, although I have not seen any figures which the Council has used to justify these claims. Is it not more that areas of the Green Belt have allowed to become "weakly" performing simply because the landowners have removed the tenancies from their farmers, or made it increasingly difficult for their tenants to function at a productive and profitable level?

Q3n Other reasons

Summary: The document "Wirral's Local Plan 2020 to 2035: Issues and Options Consultations" is extensive and far reaching but fundamentally is flawed simply because the Maths used to justify the perceived requirement for 12000 new homes, just does not add up. It is inappropriate, foolhardy and generally inconsiderate to future generations to destroy the Green Belt – once it's gone, it's gone!

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23824

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Drainage It is clear that the combined sewer network is insufficient to sustain development on the scale of the Western Urban Extension.

Barnston and its surrounding landscape sits at the head of the Prenton Brook river valley, all the land to the west naturally rising towards Heswall and Pensby. The control of surface water run-off on clay structured soils into the source of both Brimstage and Prenton brooks poses major environmental challenges which have not been considered by WBC. We suggest that both drainage systems will require major infrastructure costings. Agricultural and some surface water drainage from roads and development hard standings enters both the combined sewer network and directly into Prenton Brook via a culvert under Barnston Road at Holmwood Avenue. Erosion along the Prenton Brook tributaries is already evident in Barnston Dale, undermining ancient woodland trees with tree protection orders (TPOs). The surface water drain from Gills Lane joining the combined sewer in Barnston Dale is at over-capacity and regularly floods. It now serves Dale View Close off Gills Lane, Pensby as a sewer pipe although this was not its original designation. In Barnston Dale meadow, it presents at a depth of only 30cm below the surface of the meadow. This meadow has the only Wood Pasture SBI designation on the Wirral and is sensitive to nitrate contamination.

Additionally, surface water drainage in a contaminated condition enters Prenton Brook to the rear of Belmont Avenue. Volume has increased significantly in past decades, especially in storm conditions, resulting in considerable bank erosion in Barnston Dale meadow. In peak storm flows, Prenton Brook regularly floods the Wood Pasture designated meadow, introducing nitrate contamination. Two thirds of the Agricultural land for Option 2b drains directly into Prenton Brook. The remaining third of the land drains into Brimstage Brook and contributes to a category 3 flood zone. Sites SP065, SP061 and part of SP062 lie within a drinking water safeguard (groundwater protection) zone. Development on these areas is subject to control measures generated by the Environment Agency.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24153 (United Utilities 2)

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

None of the land operated by United Utilities within Green Belt Parcel 7.18, including SHLAA site 0932 is available to potential housing development. This land is to be retained for operational purposes.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24573 (Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel lies adjacent to Barnstondale Local Wildlife Site and ancient woodland. Without significant buffering of at least 50m there is potential for significant impacts especially through disturbance and pollution of the Prenton Brook. Light pollution could negatively impact the bat population that uses the brook for foraging. Furthermore parcels SP061 and SP064 are known to be important for BoCC red listed birds including lapwing, herring gull, skylark, linnet, house sparrow and Schedule 1 listed barn owl. Wintering curlew is also found here suggesting that the fields may be functionally linked to the internationally designated sites. A HRA assessment would be required.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2970

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

TOO much environmental damage. do you not read a newspaper.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The current roads cannot cope. Currently we have little in the way of public transport.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The visual impact would be extreme. There would be no amenity.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Such a development would turn a rural area into a small town.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

We do not have any local services.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

The heritage would be lost forever.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

There is no real infrastructure and the current level of utilities would not be able to cope.

Q3h Flood Risk

Currently we have a low flood risk but with more building flood risk will increase.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Green belt should only be used as an absolute last resort.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

We need all the agricultural land we have. We need to be able to produce our own food.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

The Wirral is already overdeveloped loss of more Green Belt is no acceptable.

Q3n Other reasons

Your calculations are flawed. Only the Planning Department think 12000 is correct. You do not need to use any Green Belt land.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-5027

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The roads serving the surrounding communities are already barely able to - Cope with traffic needs, as demonstrated by rush-hour delays on Barnston Road, Storeton Lane, Gills Lane, Whitfield Lane and Whitehouse Lane.

- Articulated vehicles are prohibited on Barnston Road (except for access) for a very good reason. Has this even been taken into consideration?
- Furthermore, this road is signed as an Accident Alert Route.
- Traffic congestion on Telegraph Road through the centre of Heswall is already heavy.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The Green Belt site Option 2B is totally unsuitable for housing development. It provides a green buffer against urban sprawl the proposed development would totally merge Heswall, Pensby and Barnston, to the detriment of people who now reside there. SP062 provide a swathe of productive farmland that enhances the character of the Wirral.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

School capacity (Barnston Primary School) is not sufficient to cater for 2500 new homes. The same is true of GP services in the area.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Productive farmland would be lost. The UK should aim to be more self-sufficient in food production, not less.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13765

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Not only would development of sites SP061, SP062 & SP064E, SP065 be an act of vandalism destroying food producing farmland at a time when this is urgently needed following the UK's exit from Europe. It would also render the SBI's, significantly less useful as any wildlife would end up in the middle of housing estates rather than open countryside. Should this reckless scheme be passed the very least that would be required would be a significant upgrade and monitoring of the sewage system which is in my opinion either at or very close to capacity.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

I have a number of concerns relating to the land drainage and ability of the existing sewage disposal capabilities relating to the above sites. From Grid Reference SJ 281 830 (roughly opposite Barnston W.I.) a farm track leads towards Pensby, (highlighted in red on the map) land is drained in a southerly direction (left) towards a stream (marked F) which runs roughly parallel to Whitfield Lane, this stream then runs in a culvert beneath Barnston Road to eventually emerge in Brimstage village where it passes under Brimstage Road in a series of three culverts to eventually join the Clatter Brook. In periods of heavy rain the land is unable to absorb the water, this results in Barnston Road flooding both opposite Whitfield Lane and near to Christchurch, Brimstage village has also flooded on a number of occasions due to the inability of water to pass through the culverts under Brimstage Road [see attached map]. Any extensive housing development of Sites SP062 and/or SP064E with its attendant roads, hard standing etc can only lead to a worsening of the current situation unless remedial works are carried out to the affected culverts. To the North (right) of the track the land drains the remainder of Sites SP061 & SP062, Barnston & Pensby in to what eventually becomes Prenton Brook which in turn is joined by unnamed streams which drain Thingwall. The main stream of Prenton Brook rises in Pensby where it emerges from a culvert to flow through Barnston Dale Site of Biological Importance (SBI 30), then flows under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow (also part of SBI 30, the only pasture/woodland SBI on Wirral), it then flows in to Murrayfield Hospital SBI (Site 31), from there it enters Lower Heath Wood SBI (Site 73). It should be pointed out that part of Murrayfield Hospital is occupied by 'Barnstondale Centre' where children are often in close proximity to the stream. The whole length of this stream is closely followed by a 1 m sewer pipe with a flow meter close to its source in Pensby, this was constructed in the early 1960's and enabled the development of Pensby as it now is. The sewer pipe continues under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow where two inspection shafts are located, when originally constructed these shafts were well away from the stream, erosion over the years has now left them exposed and within the stream bed. There have in the past been problems with the sewer when a number of sink holes appeared within the meadow, this occurred from 2010 through to 2014 and were reported to United Utilities by the then tenant farmer, these issues were only belatedly addressed by United Utilities following the involvement of the then MP Esther McVey. As the sewer progresses through Dale Meadow a number of pipes (6, possibly more) cross the stream bearing

sewage from houses in Storeton Lane, some are suspended over the stream, others buried in concrete within the stream bed, there are also pipes buried beneath the Dale Meadow connecting the houses on Barnston Road, Woodlands Drive area. The main sewer eventually emerges in Murrayfield Hospital SBI where it enters Barnston Storm Tanks (these are accessed via Private Drive) a large treatment facility which has an outlet with grating directly in to Prenton Brook. As the pipe enters the facility a further pipe is suspended over the stream carrying waste from the direction of the hospital. The sewer continues though Lower Heath Wood SBI where it is joined by a branch that roughly follows the line of the Bidston/Wrexham railway delivering sewage and waste water from the general direction of Heswall Hills.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13771

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment**Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site****Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services****Q3f Impact on Heritage**

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Stream C is used by United Utilities in order to discharge water from Crosshill Reservoir, there have been problems with this stream ever since the reservoir was opened C1918. These discharges cause major erosion at the Storeton end of Dale Meadow. A number of attempts have been made by United Utilities & their predecessors to alleviate the problem, all so far unsuccessful. The last attempt was carried out despite a false start in 2015 with work costing at a rough guess in excess of £500,000, on completion they gave assurances that in future the flow would not exceed specific limits. This has been breached many times since, particularly during 2017 when major problems were found with the roof of the reservoir, as a result the weir they constructed to alleviate the erosion is now much worn away and virtually useless. So much sand and silt has been washed down stream during excess discharge in to stream 'C' that the level of the main Prenton Brook bed has been raised as much as 6 to 10 inches, this results in branches & debris collecting against the pipe creating a strain where the pipe crosses the stream from the direction of the hospital. Formerly North West Water Authority carried out inspections and scouring of the stream in the 1960's and 70's the National Rivers Authority who took over from North West Water Authority in the early 80's did this a couple of times, this ensured that branches and debris endangering the pipes crossing the stream were in good order. The Environment Agency was formed in the mid 90's and took over these responsibilities, they have never carried out any form of inspection and have certainly not done any remedial work., or any other form of maintenance. There is no system in place to check or inspect these pipes or the main sewer. When I last walked through Dale Meadow (Friday 28/09/2019) there were several blockages caused by fallen trees/branches where these wash up against the pipes they create dams increasing pressure on the pipes. It is far from impossible for a falling branch to damage these pipes releasing sewage which would go undetected and flow through the Barnstondale Centre where as I have pointed out children frequently play. From 2006 to date I have reported the following issues to United Utilities:- 7 instances of sewer pipes being either broken or dislodged. 8 Instances of the grating to Prenton Brook fouled with offensive material 3 Pollution incidents, source unknown. 7 Instances of excess discharge from Thingwall Reservoir. (I have photographic evidence for all except 2 or 3 of these incidents) As these are just the incidents that I have recorded, I wonder just how many other incidents there have been which may have been notified, or more likely gone unseen and unreported."

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23823

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Species-rich hedgerows grow across all three sites (SP061, SP062, SP065) which enjoy a level of protection. They provide an environment to support insects, butterflies, moths and nesting birds. These hedgerows also provide essential wildlife corridors to support three local wildlife sites (SBI's) along the 2km length of Barnston Dale and Lower Heath Wood. Low nitrogen-input fields, generally assigned to horse grazing, provide additional support to insects sensitive to traditional agricultural practice. Higher Level Stewardship farming in parcel 7.15 (SP062) favours low nitrogen inputs and wildflower buffer strips on field margins provide additional wildlife support. Barnston Dale is an ancient woodland and is given specific protection. The habitat enclosed within it and surrounding it supports European and UK protected plant, bird, bat and large mammal species which grow, roost, nest, breed and feed there. Ground flora is particularly sensitive to public access and would be lost through proximal development. The protected status of ancient woodland does not allow development within 50 metres of it. When applied, the buffer will effectively separate parcels 7.16 and 7.17 (SP062) removing any possibility of the construction of intersectional roads proposed to join Gills Lane. European and UK protected bird, bat and large mammal species have been recorded feeding on SP061. Bats, roost and breed on part of the site. Barnston fields across all three sites (SP061, SP062, SP065) support valuable bird species. Our survey of birds is on-going and a report is attached. Red list birds, of concern in conservation, include lapwing, herring gull, barn owl, linnet, house sparrow, skylark and starling.

Amber list includes stock dove, dunnoek, black headed gull, greylag goose, redshank, mallard, meadow pipit and kestrel. During adverse weather conditions in late Autumn, Winter and Spring, Barnston fields are used by gulls, greylag and pink footed geese, curlew, redshank, snipe and oyster catcher for shelter, and water-logged fields on SP061 and SP062 become feeding grounds for these species. For this reason, we believe that Barnston qualifies as functionally linked supporting habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA and should be offered additional protection. The Bird Conservation Targeting Project (BCTP) produces breeding distribution maps for rare and declining farmland and woodland birds. The following species are identified in the designated areas: Tree sparrow; Redshank; Grey partridge; Lapwing; Corn bunting. Full documentation to support these facts is prepared and available for the Inspector. The documented evidence to date includes: Survey area maps; Reports; Distribution maps; Woodland habitat. If the development went ahead, rich ancient hedgerows that form valuable wildlife corridors would be decimated and wildlife, currently preserved in the Dale would be stranded. The Wirral Landscape Character Assessment and the Wirral Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2019 references, viz. SP062 – scattered field ponds (15), many open water, SP061 – cluster of 3 ponds within a woodland copse with Defra ‘High Priority’ designation and one outlying pond. Also, there is designated woodland, ‘High Priority and ‘Ancient’ designations (SP061, SP062); a high concentration of historic field patterns (SP061, SP062 and SP065); medieval town fields and historic settlement (SP062); wooded ridgelines (SP062); grade 2 listed buildings (SP062); long distance views (SP061, SP062, SP065); public footpath (SP062) and outward views from a designated Conservation Area (SP062). Consultants have been required to include costings to road schemes. We believe that other costings, both financial and environmental, have not been assessed. A Freedom of Information request to WBC 2018 identified that no environmental impact assessment had been made to Green Belt sites in Barnston. There is no evidence to suggest that a full, effective assessment has been carried out to date.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Existing roads barely cope with current demand. Wirral is a peninsula with water on three sides. All travel to Merseyside and Cheshire is therefore concentrated on very limited and congested routes. There is factual evidence to identify the additional cars on the roads in areas SP061, SP062 and SP063 with a range of 1658- 2486 using the Transport National Travel Survey and RAC forecast. (NB. The same survey identifies households with “2 or more cars” in which case, the number of additional cars could be well in excess of 3100). The A551 (Barnston Road) has been designated by the Council as unsafe and has imposed a weight restriction. Articulated vehicles are banned except for access. The A551 has been designated an accident alert route with fatalities over recent years. Due to the fact that Barnston Village has four farms and lanes and road structures on commuter routes, severe congestion and danger is caused on a daily basis now. On several roads, within a space of a less than half a mile, speed restrictions range from 20MPH to 30MPH to 40MPH 20MPH and back to 30MPH & Traffic counts show

high density on the commuter routes through the lanes. Commuters already face long queues at peak times to get to the motorway. The A551 is the main route from Heswall for emergency vehicles to the main A&E hospital (Arrowe Park – also in West Wirral). The A551 is a heavily congested commuter route to Liverpool via J3 of the M53. The A5137 (Brimstage Road) is a heavily congested commuter route to J4 of the M53. NB. This junction has been identified as dangerous by the Highways Agency due to the regularity of vehicles queuing to exit at peak times. Buses are available to Liverpool from Heswall via the A540 and, as a consequence, commuters are already turning parts of Telegraph Road (A540) into a car park where their cars are left all day. (This also applies to many side roads off Telegraph Road e.g. Poll Hill Road, some of which are impassable at times.). There is no direct train link to Liverpool from Heswall Hills Station. The present bridge over Barnston Dale was built in 1875. The A551 already floods by the entrance to the Dale. Lorries attempting to reach the M53 via the A5137 regularly get stuck under the low railway bridge. A second low railway bridge is located in Whitehouse Lane (a much-used narrow link road between Barnston Road and Brimstage Road). The roadway below this bridge always floods in heavy rain. The road is then closed. Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: Green Belt land parcels in question and the number of houses proposed; Photographic evidence of the dangerous conditions already in place; Detailed traffic counts; Crash map information; Pending FOI request from WBC regarding full details of crashes on the A551, not just the publicised figure which covers only part of the road.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The Green Belt is enjoyed by ALL Wirral residents – accessible due to the size of the Borough – contributing to tourism and leisure opportunities with access to farming and forests.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

All of the primary schools in the designated area are full to capacity in some or all year groups in F2 and KS1, i.e. where schools cannot legally exceed classes of 30 for children below the age of 7 years. Where schools can accept over 30 in a class in Key Stage 2, the schools have had to accept pupils over the net capacity calculation. It is acknowledged that the numbers vary year on year but traditionally these schools reflect the birth rate. When the birth rate is normal or high, the schools are over-subscribed. Should these proposals go ahead there would be further impact on the limited capacity of these schools and admission of further pupils would prejudice the education of all pupils.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Disturbance/destruction of an historic footpath network. Public footpaths, most of which are in the Green Belt, have huge amenity value. There are three in this area in SP062, SP065L and submitted site 1958 within SP065. Wirral has over 200 miles of highly accessible public footpaths within its 45-mile boundary. The areas indicated by SP061, SP062 and SP063 contain special Historic Landscape Character types (HER1, HER2, HER3, HER4, HER5, HER6, HER7, HER8 refer), of which only c7348 hectares fall into this category across Cheshire. There are approximately 16 hectares of Town Field in Barnston. The field systems have the potential to contain rich habitats; archaeological remains and historic ecofacts. In addition, there is the potential for ridge and furrow to be discovered as well as earthworks e.g. HER2 Ancient Field Systems. These field systems are largely characterised by irregular and semi-irregular field patterns associated with a network of winding paths, tracks and lanes serving hamlets and villages. Retention is encouraged: If a boundary is in poor condition, seek to restore; If a boundary is in fair/good condition, seek to maintain; Relic boundaries should be re-instated. Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: Maps; Plans; Township boundaries; Medieval Town Fields maps; Medieval Woodland maps; Medieval Planned Enclosure maps; Late Post Medieval Agriculture Improvements maps; The Cheshire Historic landscape Improvement: Ancient Fieldscapes; HER Medieval Townfields. The assessment should also include an ancient Parish boundary recorded in Domesday (SP061) and potential monument status at Cross Hill (SP065).

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The impact of drainage should be considered both in cost terms and environmental impact. Option 2b is only served by a single combined sewer pipe laid through three SBI wildlife sites in Barnston Dale, Murrayfield Hospital and Lower Heath Wood. It is joined at three intersections at Holmwood Avenue, Belmont Drive and Private Drive, Barnston. The catchment for this sewer extends into Pensby, Heswall and Urban Barnston on Brimstage Road. A storm tank exists at Private Drive, Barnston, which we have monitored for several years. It consistently discharges into Prenton Brook with the full knowledge of both United Utilities and the Environment Agency. This is unacceptable. Already inadequate and unsustainable, any additional development contributing to this poorly functioning network will result in further pollution incidence and extensive environmental damage. 2,500 new homes in Option 2b will overwhelm capacity completely.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

We reiterate the significance of retaining food producing land and emphasise the proposed future ALC grouping for 3a and 3b soils. The 'best and most versatile' should be protected, referenced by NPPF and Defra's 25-year Environment Plan. We acknowledge the commitment made by WBC to retain Agricultural land on the Wirral. Development on the existing Green Belt farmlands will destroy the unique and separate character of existing villages, resulting in excessive urban sprawl. Agricultural policies, agreed at both national and local levels, are seriously compromised. Data proves that agriculture is still of considerable significance in terms of its impact on the economy of Wirral. Post BREXIT, food production will take on an even greater importance; therefore there is a need to retain existing farms. UDP Policy AGR1 emphasise that national planning policy places upon sustaining the rural economy and protecting the countryside. All Wirral's rural areas fall within the Green Belt. In Wirral over half of the land used for agriculture is classified within the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF). Land of this quality is of national importance which should normally be protected from development. Existing UDP Policy AGR1 seeks to protect land of poorer quality to protect parcels of land incapable of future agricultural use due to fragmentation. Adjacent development disturbance can have operational implications for cropping patterns and livestock husbandry. 80 hectares of the survey area (i.e. the land west of Barnston Road) are currently engaged in Natural England Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) Scheme indicated by the present Government as a progressive requirement in Agriculture post Brexit. HLS agreements include our references to management of the historic landscape, BCTP, hedgerows and ditches, permanent pasture, arable buffer strips and species rich habitats. The Secretary of State's former Strategic Guidance for Merseyside specifically states that development allowed near farms needs to be such as to avoid incompatible land use. The priority attached to the protection of agricultural enterprise in UDP Policy AGR1 reflects the continuing importance of agriculture to the local economy and the special contribution that agriculture makes to maintaining the character and landscape of Wirral's rural areas. Full documentation to support these facts is available.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659115>

Attachment 2

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659116>

Attachment 3

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659117>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23825

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Drainage and sewage To consider developing SP061/SP062/SP063/SP064/SP065 is flawed by unacceptable infrastructure and health and safety problems. Existing infrastructure barely copes with current demand. Should these proposals go ahead, this would have serious impacts. Barnston Dale (served by the A551) was formed in the Ice Age and is a steep U-shaped valley. The stream in the valley and its unnamed tributaries drain most of central Wirral. The Dale is an ancient woodland with three Sites of Biological Importance. First sewer was constructed in c1900. Second sewer running parallel was completed in the 1960s. Sink holes are associated with the original sewer. The streams drain half of SP062, all of SP061 and also Thingwall. Following representations by a local MP concerning sink holes and Crosshill Reservoir discharge erosion in Barnston Dale 2013 – 2015, United Utilities were required to undertake repairs to sink holes (some 3 feet deep) in 2015. Some identified problems highlighted during the project reinstatements still remain outstanding. Discharges from Thingwall Reservoir (opened c1918) have caused major erosion. The flow from the reservoir exceeds specific limits. The reservoir was found to have major construction defects in 2017 and, as a result, the weir (constructed to stop erosion) has been rendered virtually useless. The 1975 Act recognises the catastrophic effects of any serious incident at Thingwall Reservoir. The reservoir which, apparently in an emergency would need to be emptied is would be adjacent to a proposed new development of 504 houses. The overflow from the sewer treatment plant at Barnston Storm Tanks overflows into a stream and is regarded locally as a serious health risk. There is also an appalling stench! The sewer is near full capacity due to other branches joining it within the designated areas. The A551 already floods by the entrance to the Dale. Should high tides and heavy rain combine, serious flooding occurs. Brimstage Brook (SP062) is liable to flooding. 60 hectares of potential development within parcels SP062 and SP064 will increase surface water flow to Brimstage Brook which in Brimstage Village and beyond contributes to an existing highest category 3 flood zone. Flow recorder chambers with regulators and storm overflows exist to the rear of Belmont Drive and at the end of Private Drive with additional pump facility at Private Drive to discharge into the Fender Valley Sewer. Sewage treatment is in Birkenhead. Fluvial process has increased in time as greater surface water volume enters Prenton Brook from Higher Pensby resulting in manhole access chambers 78 and 79 being exposed to the full flow of the brook with the potential to cause pollution. Pollution incidence in Prenton Brook will directly impact on the Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and boreholes further downstream in Prenton. Prenton Brook is a recorded river tributary and as such is under the control of The Environment Agency. The predecessor, The National Rivers Authority regularly scoured out the course of Prenton Brook within Barnston Dale to control the fluvial process, this is

ignored by EA. Considerations for the effects on the ecology of Barnston Dale would be significant. Should these proposals go ahead there would be further impact arising from lack of maintenance/inspection of the stream for blockage; lack of the inspection of the sewer; Inspection shafts eroding into the stream; excessive discharge into one of the streams; sewage related discharge is evident into Prenton Brook; increased likelihood of flooding; Brimstage Brook (westerly SP062) would be subject to further flooding. Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: History of the area; Maps; Photographic evidence; Factual data.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24684

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Parcels 7.17 to 7.19 have a good contribution to check unrestricted sprawl. These Parcels also have a higher than 'weak' contribution to keeping separation of Pensby and Barnston but also Pensby and Thingwall. In these Parcels, there is a 'fuzzy' boundary along Barnston Road and development would add to the sprawl of Thingwall here. Development north of Gills Lane, would perceptually and actually bring Pensby and Barnston, closer together. The existing development at Thorncroft Drive and the Donkey school creates a form to allow development and sprawl. Encroachment would be obvious from the nearest roads. It has at least a 'moderate' contribution to GBT purposes, not 'weak'. This contribution is stronger in the northern parts.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9797

Site Reference

Parcel 7.18 (SP061) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This is good arable land which is currently and for many years has been farmed successfully and is both productive (definitely not weak performing) and an asset to the community. The land is currently seeded in barley and many hundreds of walkers each day are using it for exercise, although this has increased due to Corona we may expect that these habits will persist as residents learn to appreciate more the beauty of their immediate locale and rely less on cars.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Heswall, Barnson Road and Milner Road and Whitfield are already congested providing a danger in view of the presence of a large Primary School.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The merging of several distinct villages will completely spoil the separate historic and rural identities of Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Irby.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The huge number of house suggested would have a devastating impact on Local Services. To cater for the new demand on services would require a huge investment by NHS, and other providers.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

This is a distraction from the urgent need to regenerate the rundown and blighted areas of brownfield sites in the east of the Wirral - notably Birkenhead

Q3k Development Viability

There are so many reasons that one wonders how come this was ever proposed in the first place. A huge development of this sort would blight the area for many years - our local "Happy and Green award winning primary school would be in turmoil. There would need to be large new roads gauged through the landscape, new utility and services provision. The management of such a huge project would be very difficult and time consuming and fraught with difficulty over many years.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

This is some of the best agricultural land on Wirral as I have demonstrated arlier. How it came to be classified as weakly performing is derisory and needs to be investigated since it has lead to a fierce and unnecessary debate

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Of course - huge loss of grenbelt land and the purposes thereof.

Q3n Other reasons

Simply don't need that number of houses.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10042

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Will impact separation of Heswall and Barnston

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

No need to release any Green Belt to meet the housing need.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-10681

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Support

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

As commented earlier

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-1105

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons**

Loss of our greenbelt on this scale is not sustainable and contravenes the objective to combat climate change

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons**Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11372

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I write to object most vehemently to Option 2B - the single Urban Extension West of Barnston Road, Heswall. This proposal would destroy forever the green belt, the farms and wildlife habitat and replace them with a soulless urban sprawl. The infrastructure required to service such a project would cost millions of pounds and wreck forever the whole character of this area. The Council must listen to the views of local residents whom they are supposedly representing and who will be required to pay increased Council tax to fund such a scheme detrimental in all aspects to the area

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

This proposal would destroy forever the green belt, the farms and wildlife habitat and replace them with a soulless urban sprawl. The infrastructure required to service such a project would cost millions of pounds and wreck forever the whole character of the area.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

The Council must listen to the views of local residents whom they are supposedly representing and who will be required to pay increased Council tax to fund such a scheme detrimental in all aspects to the area.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11400

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This possible use of greenbelt land is not necessary and is based on flawed calculations. Independent experts estimate that approximately 2500/5000 new homes would be the maximum requirement not 12000. Even this could be too many in view of the nil population growth on Wirral for some years. Any required house building could easily be provided from brownfield sites.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Roads and drains are already poorly maintained and would require substantial investment. The road network in this area is already fully used and a vast increase in the number of cars would create gridlock as well as much increased pollution. Public transport on Barnston Road is already non-existent!

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Development of this site would contradict the rules that I thought existed to prevent the joining together of existing areas. Heswall Pensby and Barnston would become one vast urban sprawl!

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Facilities such as Doctors Dentists and Schools are already at capacity and would be unable to cope with any increase in demand.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Roads and drains are already poorly maintained and would require substantial investment. The road network in this area is already fully used and a vast increase in the number of cars would create gridlock as well as much increased pollution. Public transport on Barnston Road is already non-existent!

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Develop brownfield sites only as promised!

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The greenbelt here is in fact prime farmland and needs to be preserved to secure food production (avoiding imports from around the World) and to provide cleaner air and improve health and welfare. This exercise should not be used as an opportunity for landowners such as Lever Estates to make money nor to enrich housing developers.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Please leave our greenbelt untouched! Develop brownfield sites only as promised!

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-11403

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

It would appear that WBC is using flawed data and a figure of 2500/5000 is a more realistic figure than the 12000 new homes constantly quoted especially as the population of Wirral has been unchanged for many years. As the availability of jobs in this area is nil any housing requirements would be better served by using brow field sites nearer to industry and the jobs market. I trust this new consultation will not be ignored as the one in 2018 appears to have been!

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Public transport on Barnston Road is virtually non-existent and an increase in car traffic would be frightening. According to figures quoted at the consultation session there is estimated to be over 900 extra car journeys a day on Barnston Road. This would create gridlock.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The local facilities eg Doctors Dentists and Schools are already at capacity and could not cope with any increase in demand.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Drainage is already a problem on this road and along with most other local roads very poorly maintained.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

The land under these site references is prime farm land not green belt as such and following Brexit there will be a greater need to produce our own food, therefore it is imperative that farm land be preserved for the future.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-219

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

I do not believe that Green Belt should be released. If the Council cannot meet the plan, then the timescale should be extended beyond 2035 to allow time to develop more Brownfield sites

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24570 (Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel lies adjacent to Barnstondale Local Wildlife Site and ancient woodland. Without significant buffering of at least 50m there is potential for significant impacts especially through disturbance and pollution of the Prenton Brook. Light pollution could negatively impact the bat population that uses the brook for foraging.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-24571 (Cheshire Wildlife Trust)

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel lies adjacent to Barnstondale Local Wildlife Site and ancient woodland. Without significant buffering of at least 50m there is potential for significant impacts especially through disturbance and pollution of the Prenton Brook. Light pollution could negatively impact the bat population that uses the brook for foraging.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-26251

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

- Classified as a LCR Core Biodiversity Area.
- Also includes a River Corridor

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

- Public Rights of Way x 3
- one of highest number of footpaths on a single SP site.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Purpose 4 To preserve the setting and special character of historic towns-permanently alter special character of conservation area of Barnston Village

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

SP062 includes a flood zone 3 or above.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Purpose 5: To assist in urban regeneration by encouraging the recycling of derelict land -great distance from areas of greatest need & would have least impact on recycling of derelict land and other urban land& properties that will be developed in SP062 are wrong type

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Purpose 3 To assist in safeguarding the countryside from encroachment Single land use of SP062 is high quality agricultural land-any new development would intrude discordantly into open countryside. In terms of actual BMV lost -at 70 HAs, SP062 represents second greatest loss of BMV land -and only 2 HAs less than greatest loss at SP042. SP062 is unusual as only SP that council's commented on in 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' that is only developable if another neighbouring parcel SP061 is also developed,with loss of the 21.32 HAs of BMV at that location.Combined loss of BMV would be 91.3 HAs -over 20 HAs more than next site with greatest concentration of BMV.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Purpose 1: To check the unrestricted sprawl of large built up areas•methodology to assess SPs against this purpose of considering whether the development of a green belt site would join up 'Core Strategy Settlement Areas'. I would argue strongly that this is a very arbitrary/wholly unrealistic.

The true purpose of SP062 is to prevent merging of distinct towns/villages of Pensby, Heswall and Barnston. Will have highest level of impact - not 'lowest impact' which it is currently erroneously assigned to SP062.

Appendix 6 notes that development of SP062 would both reduce and remove the physical separation between the towns of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston, the council then assess SP062 in appendix 3 not serving purpose 2 and acting as preventing merging of neighbouring towns. This is an error which needs rectifying

Q3n Other reasons

Incorrect data and methodology has been used to establish the shortfall in the housing pipeline, specifically:•The use of wholly incorrect 'baseline' figures; misinterpretation of the 'buffer' referred to in the NPPF2; understatement of figures relating to number of properties available from redevelopment of brownfield sites & those relating to previously empty properties brought back into use during local plan period and understatement of 'windfall'sites. Boundary strength: error made in classification of SHLAA 884 SP062 as having a 'strong' boundary. SHLAA 884 SP062 needs to be reclassified as 'moderate'(as not over 75%)

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5674334>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-3702

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The sites in reference 2B are totally inappropriate for development. The transport connections are inadequate - no train service to Liverpool, poor access to M53, Birkenhead and Liverpool. No schools. Narrow roads (Station Road, Barnston Dale, etc)

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The sites in reference 2B are totally inappropriate for development. The transport connections are inadequate - no train service to Liverpool, poor access to M53, Birkenhead and Liverpool. No schools. Narrow roads (Station Road, Barnston Dale, etc)

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

There is plenty of available brownfield land to meet the actual needs of the borough.
The data being used by the Council is out of date!!!!

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4755

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels that are not acceptable for release, I strongly disagree. Option 2b, must be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4853

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-4966

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-62

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Infrastructure cannot cope with the scale of the proposed developments - Sewage, road routes, electricity and gas supplies. This is a area that is already hard to reach from east wirral. The area would be grid locked and far too densely populated. Cars and vehicle would increase pollution castle in the area.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Not enough main routes into the area. Grid lock with occur. Too many cars in the area at the moment. Thought of more vehicles in the area would paralyse the flow of traffic and free movement of existing residents.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Huge noise pollution 2500 homes??@??!?!?!?@??

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Completely devastate the well established culture and community of the area.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

In order to support such a significant population increase the entire local service provision would need to change the character of the area would completely destroyed - build on brown field sites!

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Utilities cannot cope with the proposed development

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

There is more than enough brownfield land to develop. Leave the green belt alone!!!

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

We need green belt for the health of the community. don not eradicate it with ridiculous options like this.

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-745

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7550

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The identified location is semi rural and would require massive infrastructure changes to support 2500 homes. The infrastructure projects themselves would by necessity impact on additional greenbelt release.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7551

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

This is an area which is poorly served by current public transport. This will necessitate use of private cars and add to traffic congestion and local air pollution levels, both counter to our current global climate crisis.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-7902

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-8508

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

The focus should be on regeneration of urban brownfield sites as now stated by the Council. Therefore, there should be not be ANY options to build on Green Belt to catalyse regeneration. Option 2b would bring the townships of Heswall and Barnston together which would destroy their historic and rural character and be particularly contrary to the function of green belt of preventing neighbouring towns merging into one another.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-851

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Objection to massive reduction in Green Belt and knock-on effects of pollution on wildlife as well as current residents

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Massive impact. Infrastructure definitely would not cope and traffic would become unmanageable as opposed to extremely busy now. Storeton Lane, Barnston Dip and Gills Lane in particular are already accident blackspots.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Noise pollution; schools, transport links, shops??

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Huge - 2500 houses on farm land would totally alter the character of the whole area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Bus routes and shops are inadequate for expansion proposed

Q3f Impact on Heritage

These areas are mentioned in Domesday Survey and have individual characters. The area is also of archaeological interest with its Viking links

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

see above; roads, buses, shops, even telecommunications would be severely impacted

Q3h Flood Risk

Barnston Dip in particular is a flood risk, but the whole area is low lying and at the bottom of hills

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Brownfield land MUST be used first. Brownfield sites should be compulsorily purchased if access is not available and they are lying derelict.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Loss of any agricultural land when there are plenty of brownfield sites is unacceptable

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Green Belt has been allocated for a reason and it should not be up for negotiation

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9799

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This will destroy a landscape of huge public amenity and will reduce much needed agricultural land.SP062 is classified as a LCR Core Biodiversity Area and SP062 is one of a small number of sites which includes a flood zone 3 or above. - classified as a LCR Core Biodiversity Area. - Also includes a River Corridor

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

The surrounding roads cannot manage the resultant traffic - both during construction and post development. Great distance from areas of greatest need & would have least impact on recycling of derelict land and other urban land & properties that will be developed in SP062 are wrong type

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The visual impact to a large unspoilt parcel of land will be devastating. Public Rights of Way x 3 – one of highest number of footpaths on a single SP site.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The single land use of SP062 is as agricultural land and therefore any new development would intrude discordantly into the open countryside. This land is currently used for the growing of crops and the rearing of sheep and cattle. Development would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the north of Heswall, that would reduce the physical separation between Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. Permanently alter special character of conservation area of Barnston Village

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Local services - schools, health services etc could not cope with such a huge influx of new residents

Q3f Impact on Heritage

This would introduce additional development into the open countryside, to the north of Heswall, that would reduce the physical separation between Heswall (SA7) and the rural village of Barnston could affect the rural character and local distinctiveness of Barnston Conservation Area. SP062 borders on and would impact upon a designated conservation area - Barnston Village.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

As stated roads, sewerage etc would struggle to cope with a development of this size

Q3h Flood Risk

Analysis of sites considered for further investigation against Appendix 7 'Green Belt Parcels Initial Constraints' and Appendix 13 'SHLAA Green Belt Sites Initial Constraint Analysis' shows SP062 to be one of a small number of sites which includes a flood zone 3 or above.

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

An error has been made in the classification of SHLAA 884 SP062 as having a 'strong' boundary. The methodology clearly states that only Strategic Parcels with a boundary strength of OVER three quarters are to be classified as 'Strong' SHLAA 884 SP062 is assessed to have a boundary strength of 75% (three quarters) which is NOT over three quarters. Therefore, SHLAA 884 SP062 needs to be reclassified as 'moderate'

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Comparison of SP062 to other 'sites for further investigation' In the background report – section 5.2 – states that: '... individual Parcels and Sites could only be preferred on the basis of having least harm to the purposes including of including land within the green belt' There are other sites that could be developed and create 'less harm' than developing SP062 and presents the overwhelming cast that under no circumstances should SP062 be considered for development when there are many sites , providing capacity for more than the shortfall in housing, where development would have 'less harm' than the development of SP062. Great distance from areas of greatest need & would have least impact on recycling of derelict land and other urban land & properties that will be developed in SP062 are wrong type.

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

SP062's single use is agricultural and therefore any new development would intrude discordantly into open countryside currently used for growing crops and rearing sheep/cattle. The council's own document states that 'where significant development of agricultural land is necessary, (councils) should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of higher quality'. Analysis of 'Sites for Further investigation' and 'Map of High Quality Agricultural Land' show that much of SP062 is high quality agricultural land Of the sites recommended for further investigation, 17 strategic parcels – with combined capacity for 1,041 to 1,563 properties – have NO 'BMV agricultural land' and would therefore be more suitable for development than SP062. Furthermore, of the sites recommended for further investigation which include BMV agricultural land, SP062 has one of the higher % of agricultural land. In terms of actual BMV lost through development, at 70 HAs, SP062 is the 2nd greatest loss of BMV land – aonly 2 HAs less than the greatest loss at SP042. In addition to the 17 sites with NO BMV, there are 34 sites containing lesser area of BMV – with combined capacity for 6,726 to 10,092 properties – and therefore be more suitable for development than SP062. However, SP062 is unusual as it is the only SP about which the council have commented in the 'Initial Green Belt Assessment' that is only developable if another neighbouring parcel – SP061 – is also developed: 'Would not be suitable for release from the Green Belt independently of SP061' Therefore any development of SP062 would also see the development of SP061 and loss of the 21.32 HAs of BMV at that location. Therefore the combined loss of BMV in the development of SP062 (and SP061) would be 91.3 HAs – over 20 HAs more than the next site with the greatest concentration of BMV. Single land use of SP062 is high quality agricultural land - any new development would intrude discordantly into open countryside. In terms of actual

BMV lost - at 70 HAs, SP062 represents second greatest loss of BMV land – and only 2 HAs less than greatest loss at SP042. SP062 is unusual as only SP that council's commented on in 'Summary of Initial Green Belt Assessment' that is only developable if another neighbouring parcel SP061 is also developed, with loss of the 21.32 HAs of BMV at that location. Combined loss of BMV would be 91.3 HAs – over 20 HAs more than next site with greatest concentration of BMV.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Development of the green belt has a de facto impact upon the green belt

- methodology to assess SPs against this purpose of considering whether the development of a green belt site would join up 'Core Strategy Settlement Areas'. I would argue strongly that this is a very arbitrary/ wholly unrealistic.
- The true purpose of SP062 is to prevent merging of distinct towns/villages of Pensby, Heswall and Barnston. Will have highest level of impact - not 'lowest impact' which it is currently erroneously assigned to SP062.
- Appendix 6 notes that development of SP062 would both reduce and remove the physical separation between the towns of Heswall, Pensby, Thingwall and Barnston, the council then assess SP062 in appendix 3 not serving purpose 2 and acting as preventing merging of neighbouring towns. This is an error which needs rectifying. Boundary strength: error made in classification of SHLAA 884 SP062 as having a 'strong' boundary. SHLAA 884 SP062 needs to be reclassified as 'moderate' (as not over 75%)

Q3n Other reasons

Housing need calculations do not substantiate the need to build so many houses that the green belt needs to be developed. Incorrect data and methodology has been used to establish the shortfall in the housing pipeline, specifically: The use of wholly incorrect 'baseline' figures; misinterpretation of the 'buffer' referred to in the NPPF2; understatement of figures relating to number of properties available from redevelopment of brownfield sites & those relating to previously empty properties brought back into use during local plan period and understatement of 'windfall' sites.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5656473>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13765

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Not only would development of sites SP061, SP062 & SP064E, SP065 be an act of vandalism destroying food producing farmland at a time when this is urgently needed following the UK's exit from Europe. It would also render the SBI's, significantly less useful as any wildlife would end up in the middle of housing estates rather than open countryside. Should this reckless scheme be passed the very least that would be required would be a significant upgrade and monitoring of the sewage system which is in my opinion either at or very close to capacity

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

I have a number of concerns relating to the land drainage and ability of the existing sewage disposal capabilities relating to the above sites. From Grid Reference SJ 281 830 (roughly opposite Barnston W.I.) a farm track leads towards Pensby, (highlighted in red on the map) land is drained in a southerly direction (left) towards a stream (marked F) which runs roughly parallel to Whitfield Lane, this stream then runs in a culvert beneath Barnston Road to eventually emerge in Brimstage village where it passes under Brimstage Road in a series of three culverts to eventually join the Clatter Brook. In periods of heavy rain the land is unable to absorb the water, this results in Barnston Road flooding both opposite Whitfield Lane and near to Christchurch, Brimstage village has also flooded on a number of occasions due to the inability of water to pass through the culverts under Brimstage Road [see attached map]. Any extensive housing development of Sites SP062 and/or SP064E with its attendant roads, hard standing etc can only lead to a worsening of the current situation unless remedial works are carried out to the affected culverts. To the North (right) of the track the land drains the remainder of Sites SP061 & SP062, Barnston & Pensby in to what eventually becomes Prenton Brook which in turn is joined by unnamed streams which drain Thingwall. The main stream of Prenton Brook rises in Pensby where it emerges from a culvert to flow through Barnston Dale Site of Biological Importance (SBI 30), then flows under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow (also part of SBI 30, the only pasture/woodland SBI on Wirral), it then flows in to Murrayfield Hospital SBI (Site 31), from there it enters Lower Heath Wood SBI (Site 73). It should be pointed out that part of Murrayfield Hospital is occupied by 'Barnstondale Centre' where children are often in close proximity to the stream. The whole length of this stream is closely followed by a 1 m sewer pipe with a flow meter close to its source in Pensby, this was constructed in the early 1960's and enabled the development of Pensby as it now is. The sewer pipe continues under Barnston Road to emerge in Dale Meadow where two inspection shafts are located, when originally constructed these shafts were well away from the stream, erosion over the years has now left them exposed and within the stream bed. There have in the past been problems with the sewer when a number of sink holes appeared within the meadow, this occurred from 2010 through to 2014 and were reported to United Utilities by the then tenant farmer, these issues were only belatedly addressed by United Utilities following the involvement of the then MP Esther McVey. As the sewer progresses through Dale Meadow a number of pipes (6, possibly more) cross the stream bearing

sewage from houses in Storeton Lane, some are suspended over the stream, others buried in concrete within the stream bed, there are also pipes buried beneath the Dale Meadow connecting the houses on Barnston Road, Woodlands Drive area. The main sewer eventually emerges in Murrayfield Hospital SBI where it enters Barnston Storm Tanks (these are accessed via Private Drive) a large treatment facility which has an outlet with grating directly in to Prenton Brook. As the pipe enters the facility a further pipe is suspended over the stream carrying waste from the direction of the hospital. The sewer continues though Lower Heath Wood SBI where it is joined by a branch that roughly follows the line of the Bidston/Wrexham railway delivering sewage and waste water from the general direction of Heswall Hills.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>



Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-13771

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Stream C is used by United Utilities in order to discharge water from Crosshill Reservoir, there have been problems with this stream ever since the reservoir was opened C1918. These discharges cause major erosion at the Storeton end of Dale Meadow. A number of attempts have been made by United Utilities & their predecessors to alleviate the problem, all so far unsuccessful. The last attempt was carried out despite a false start in 2015 with work costing at a rough guess in excess of £500,000, on completion they gave assurances that in future the flow would not exceed specific limits. This has been breached many times since, particularly during 2017 when major problems were found with the roof of the reservoir, as a result the weir they constructed to alleviate the erosion is now much worn away and virtually useless. So much sand and silt has been washed down stream during excess discharge in to stream 'C' that the level of the main Prenton Brook bed has been raised as much as 6 to 10 inches, this results in branches & debris collecting against the pipe creating a strain where the pipe crosses the stream from the direction of the hospital. Formerly North West Water Authority carried out inspections and scouring of the stream in the 1960's and 70's the National Rivers Authority who took over from North West Water Authority in the early 80's did this a couple of times, this ensured that branches and debris endangering the pipes crossing the stream were in good order. The Environment Agency was formed in the mid 90's and took over these responsibilities, they have never carried out any form of inspection and have certainly not done any remedial work, or any other form of maintenance. There is no system in place to check or inspect these pipes or the main sewer. When I last walked through Dale Meadow (Friday 28/09/2019) there were several blockages caused by fallen trees/branches where these wash up against the pipes they create dams increasing pressure on the pipes. It is far from impossible for a falling branch to damage these pipes releasing sewage which would go undetected and flow through the Barnstondale Centre where as I have pointed out children frequently play. From 2006 to date I have reported the following issues to United Utilities:- 7 instances of sewer pipes being either broken or dislodged. 8 Instances of the grating to Prenton Brook fouled with offensive material 3 Pollution incidents, source unknown. 7 Instances of excess discharge from Thingwall Reservoir. (I have photographic evidence for all except 2 or 3 of these incidents) As these are just the incidents that I have recorded, I wonder just how many other incidents there have been which may have been notified, or more likely gone unseen and unreported."

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5834755>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-14134

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This parcel of land is currently designated as Green Belt to protect Barnston Dale, which provides an important habitat for wildlife. In addition, this area of the Green Belt preserves the historic nature of Barnston Village and Dale. The parcel of land met the criteria of Green Belt in 1983 under the Merseyside Green Belt Local Plan. The reasons for scheduling have not changed and legislation requires that Green Belt boundaries should only be altered where exceptional circumstances are fully evidenced and justified. Such circumstances have not been evidenced or justified in the Plan.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

If residential development of Parcel Reference SP062 was to occur, there would be severe pressure on the already overloaded road network in the area. Local roads Pensby Road (B5138), Barnston Road (A551) and Brimstage Road (A5137) are already congested at peak times and, in particular, the roundabouts at Thingwall (junction of A551 and B5138) and Gayton (junction of A540, A551 and A5137), together with the road junction at Arrowe Park (junction of A551 and A552), are all at their limits. Further afield, Junctions 3 and 4 of the M53 motorway are already at capacity during peak hours. Significant improvement to the road network would need to be made, presumably at the developer's cost, to accommodate the extra traffic. In particular, the improvements

required at the motorway junctions would be extensive and costly, allied with the works required to the local roads, which would be likely to involve widening, and hence property take. This, I suggest, would render the development of SP062 'undeliverable' in terms of the National Policy on planning, due to the costs of the road infrastructure improvements, rendering the development uneconomic.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-16179

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Apologies, I digress. My house is on the East of Barnston Road roughly 40 metres from the actual highway. Our walk begins at 8.30 am and it takes a minute or so to reach Barnston Road. We are within the Barnston Conservation Area boundary. To our left we are looking along Barnston Road in the direction of Heswall, each side is bounded by sandstone walls with substantial hedgerows in the distance as the village opens up to countryside. Directly ahead of us over the sandstone wall we can see the grade 2 listed Christ Church and beyond a gradual rise of fields in the landscape leading to a mature tree lined ridge which separates site SP062 from Pensby and Downham roads and Napps Way. In your evidence base informing the Local Plan both the Wirral Landscape Character Assessment and the Barnston Conservation Area Appraisal and Management Plan both recognize our current view as a characteristic which identifies Barnston as a small rural village and great weight is given to the importance of the outward rural views from the Barnston Conservation Area. I see open countryside, what do you see? Document GB 1 in your evidence base see's Urban Fringe, ARUP only considers countryside as being to the East of Barnston road at the point at which we stand. We must move on now, but let's wait for the break in the traffic. To our left for as far as you can see is the daily weekday queue of almost standstill traffic with most vehicles being of single occupancy. We cannot blame these commuters for this, they have no alternative. No

reliable Bus service and a Rail service that does not take them directly to where they work. Having crossed Barnston Road we now turn right on the footpath alongside the Christ Church cemetery, you will notice that the road cuts through the landscape here with both the Church to the left and Bank Farm to the right standing on higher ground. Excuse me whilst I cough, exhaust fumes I think, lungs not what they were! What happens to the particulates being emitted and gathering at this point? Do they go to ground and wash into our watercourses? or do they rise into the atmosphere and pollute the air in lower lying areas on the Wirral? 40 metres further on we reach our next turning point, we are still within the Conservation Area almost in the centre of the Village just before the Barnston Road / Storeton Lane Junction. In your evidence base, Mott Macdonald say there will be no changes to this junction if the Western Urban Extension is adopted, the reality, of course, is that it would be impossible to make any change here that would make a noticeable improvement in traffic flow. With the increase in traffic numbers generated by the Western Urban Extension by a possible 3000 or more vehicles on Barnston Road how far do you think these early morning queues might extend? Our bird surveys of SP062 during the last few years identify these fields as feeding grounds for European protected species which also nest in Barnston Dale, the surrounding hedgerows interspersed with mature trees outside the Barnston Dale SBI serve as wildlife corridors to enhance and support three of Wirral's important SBI,s including Wirral's only Wood pasture SBI. The Mott Macdonald plan is to construct a road directly through this important wildlife area to join up to Gills Lane. Your evidence base also says that sites supporting this category of wildlife will not be considered for development, how do you explain this? Time to move on, our next style takes us onto familiar ground for me. This and the next public footpath field are in the occupation of Manor Farm and so are two of the fields adjacent to them, the total area of the four fields is 13.5 hectares, not insignificant. The whole 13.5 hectares does not have a SHLAA site reference and has not been submitted for development by the landowner. I suggest that this is not an oversight by the said landowner because he has submitted sites further along the public footpath. For a public consultation of this nature surely only land which is confirmed as available and developable at the time of consultation should be included, it does appear that you have adopted that criteria for Brown Field land so why not Green Belt Land ? This is not an isolated case, the Glebe field confirms it, many owners of land included in your Green Belt parcels do not wish for their land to be developed. Like the previous Flatts field this field is also designated as a post medieval Townfield and lidar maps indicate a network of land cultivation within the current historic hedgerow boundary. The footpath traverses over this undulating field in a southerly direction from one corner to another. The next style is at a point where the landscape begins to rise, we cross a trackway and another style into the next field. The trackway between the styles is of historic importance, it was formerly the access route from Barnston Road where the Lodge house is located to the manor house 'Pensby House' and Farm which was located on what is now Downham Road South. The trackway appears to disappear

in the field in which we are now walking but 30cms below the field surface the cobbled trackway is generally intact. Its position below the surface is consistent with two centuries of livestock farming gradually building layers of compost material, improving soil structure and enabling a profitable return from the land for modern farming practices, a true indicator of the value of the land aside from generalized ALC grading.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Listen, at this point we can hear the children attending Heswall Primary School at play on their playing field, what a fantastic setting for them to experience their environment. I'm not convinced that the site of the School is large enough to provide space to accommodate all the educational needs of the children who will be resident on the Western Urban Extension and this will likely generate further traffic movements along narrow lanes leading out from site SP062. There is nothing in your evidence base to suggest that this is being addressed. Our walk has taken longer than usual because we have been able to consider all that site SP062 has to offer the residents of Wirral over a distance of just over one kilometre. Do the people of Wirral need to have this valuable Green Belt site and the adjacent SP061 replaced with houses.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Let's move off the main road, we turn left onto Wirral public footpath Deeside no25. I recently helped WBC footpaths officer and his group of volunteers clear this first section of footpath exposing some fine Victorian clay pavements which now enhance the appeal for the many walkers that use this route. The rise from the main road brings us to what is believed to be the centre of the original Township, on our left is the Grade 2 listed former Barnston School now a Church and Community Hall. The footpath opens up to Old Lane which circles the old township. We reach the first stile, a well-worn stone structure which adjoins the Cemetery, as we climb to the top of the stile the landscape opens up in front of us and we can appreciate the countryside, and yes, my breathing

feels better. Before we dismount the style, if you look to your right, you will see the former Church Glebe field, now in private ownership, a playground and community gathering point in my childhood and for many generations before and still occasionally used by campers. The Glebe field lies within Green Belt site SP062, it does not have a SHLAA site reference because the owner does not wish for it to be developed. From the stone style it is only a short distance across the Cemetery grounds to the next style and our first field, occupied by Bank Farm. We are now entering Green Belt site SP062. The Flatts field, a name of Norse origin still used today by local residents, it is a medieval Townfield, recorded by Liverpool Museum and contains a large open water wildlife pond and undulating ground giving the impression of trackways beneath the surface. Linked to historic routes to Brimstage current discussion is exploring the involvement of this field as a possible retreat route from the 'Battle of Brunanburh' to the river Dee coastline. To the right of the footpath there are several hectares of land in the occupation of Beech Farm and in the distance is Barnston Dale.

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

At this point on SP062 we can reference a distinct comparison in drainage, as we look towards Heswall from this point all the land to the South drains into the Clatter Brook, all the land to the North drains into Prenton Brook. In your evidence base, the Water Cycle Report recognizes that the sewer network in the former settlement area 8, part of which we now stand, is sparse and evidence exists that the current sewer passing through Barnston Dale, Murrayfield Hospital and Lower Heath Wood SBI's and beyond through the Prenton Brook and Fender valleys are polluting the natural watercourses. Your Water Cycle Report 2013 does not consider large scale development in settlement area 8 and certainly not on the scale of the Western Urban Extension. Would it be prudent to update this report? The scale of upgrade to the drainage system to support Option 2b between Barnston and Birkenhead and taking further measures to minimize the additional surface water runoff, which will contribute to the category 3 flood zone at Brimstage, are certainly important considerations to this Option.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

During our walk we have been able to appreciate views across species rich hedgerows, many of which can be identified as historic and have mature oak trees growing in them. One field contains three large mature oaks growing in the middle of the field, an uncommon feature of many intensively farmed Counties. These trees and hedgerows absorb carbon dioxide and provide cleaner air for the whole of the Wirral and support many wildlife species. 15 wildlife ponds exist across the site and some of the species counted in our bird survey indicate that the site is of high ecological importance. The last field on our walk is occupied by Manor Farm also and has been given a SHLAA site reference. All the land to the South and bounded by Barnston Road is occupied by Carnsdale(of Norse origin) Farm another historic site surrounded by post medieval and town fields and is likely to be the site of the second 'Manor' of Barnston described in Domesday . In recent years the young farmer in occupation has won the Cheshire Farming and Wildlife award in the Cheshire Farms Competition on several occasions. His approach to farming is set out in the Governments view of best Farming practice for the future, however, the Western Urban Extension will end his farming career in Barnston and will see the demise of the three other Agricultural holdings in the village as individual farms. Our last style on the footpath before dropping down on to Whitfield Lane is a good place to turn and admire the views over the countryside. At this point you can see the small rural village of Barnston with its prominent listed church, the Liverpool skyline, the Winter Hill radio mast on the Pennines, Storeton Ridge, the aircraft approach but not quite the landing at John Lennon Airport, the Wind turbines on Frodsham Marsh, Helsby Hill, Runcorn Iron bridge and the approach to the Clwydian Mountain range. Where else on the Wirral can you view another Country and several English Counties from a single viewpoint.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I farm in Barnston Village which, like all four farms in Barnston occupies land to the East and West of Barnston Road all occupying and reliant on land classified, in part, as 'the best and most versatile Agricultural Land' according to NPPF and Defra's 25 year Environment Plan, within Green Belt site SP062. Exceptional circumstance and declining health resulted in my early retirement having only achieved 40 years of service to Manor Farm, my Father went into full retirement at the same time after 65

years continuing a successive commitment to this farm by my family, Grandfather 56 years, Grandmother 69 years. My Grandmother's parents met each other at the Manor farm as child servants in 1869, I can go on. I have been able to trace direct family descendants mainly working in land based industries moving through the local communities in the immediate vicinity of Barnston Village since 1600. All, along with other residents, made each community and village a distinct part of Wirral and created part of the rich heritage which we can now enjoy. Landican, Arrow, Lower and Higher Thingwall, Lower and Higher Pensby, Irby, Thurstaston, Oldfield, Gayton and Heswall are some of the distinct areas where family members have lived. Sadly, many of these communities have already merged and their independent identities lost. Releasing Green Belt land for development will further assist in the consignment of more distinct areas and communities to the history book. I would like you to join me as I take you on one of my familiar walks. I have been encouraged by my GP based at the Warrens Health Centre to take regular walks having lost a significant degree of lung capacity in recent years. The health centre has provided me with exceptional care and the staff are great, though it is hard to neglect the pressures that exist with the vast number of patients on their list. My friends say that other GP practices in the area suffer from the same pressures. Should the Western Urban Extension option be adopted how will our local health centres fair with a further 6000 residents living within the historic Township boundary of Barnston?

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23823

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Species-rich hedgerows grow across all three sites (SP061, SP062, SP065) which enjoy a level of protection. They provide an environment to support insects, butterflies, moths and nesting birds. These hedgerows also provide essential wildlife corridors to support three local wildlife sites (SBI's) along the 2km length of Barnston Dale and Lower Heath Wood. Low nitrogen-input fields, generally assigned to horse grazing, provide additional support to insects sensitive to traditional agricultural practice. Higher Level Stewardship farming in parcel 7.15 (SP062) favours low nitrogen inputs and wildflower buffer strips on field margins provide additional wildlife support. Barnston Dale is an ancient woodland and is given specific protection. The habitat enclosed within it and surrounding it supports European and UK protected plant, bird, bat and large mammal species which grow, roost, nest, breed and feed there. Ground flora is particularly sensitive to public access and would be lost through proximal development. The protected status of ancient woodland does not allow development within 50 metres of it. When applied, the buffer will effectively separate parcels 7.16 and 7.17 (SP062) removing any possibility of the construction of intersectional roads proposed to join Gills Lane. European and UK protected bird, bat and large mammal species have been recorded feeding on SP061. Bats, roost and breed on part of the site. Barnston fields across all three sites (SP061, SP062, SP065) support valuable bird species. Our survey of birds is on-going and a report is attached. Red list birds, of concern in conservation, include lapwing, herring gull, barn owl, linnet, house sparrow, skylark and starling.

Amber list includes stock dove, dunnoek, black headed gull, greylag goose, redshank, mallard, meadow pipit and kestrel. During adverse weather conditions in late Autumn, Winter and Spring, Barnston fields are used by gulls, greylag and pink footed geese, curlew, redshank, snipe and oyster catcher for shelter, and water-logged fields on SP061 and SP062 become feeding grounds for these species. For this reason, we believe that Barnston qualifies as functionally linked supporting habitat to the Dee Estuary SPA and should be offered additional protection. The Bird Conservation Targeting Project (BCTP) produces breeding distribution maps for rare and declining farmland and woodland birds. The following species are identified in the designated areas: Tree sparrow; Redshank; Grey partridge; Lapwing; Corn bunting. Full documentation to support these facts is prepared and available for the Inspector. The documented evidence to date includes: Survey area maps; Reports; Distribution maps; Woodland habitat. If the development went ahead, rich ancient hedgerows that form valuable wildlife corridors would be decimated and wildlife, currently preserved in the Dale would be stranded. The Wirral Landscape Character Assessment and the Wirral Landscape Sensitivity Assessment 2019 references, viz. SP062 – scattered field ponds (15), many open water, SP061 – cluster of 3 ponds within a woodland copse with Defra ‘High Priority’ designation and one outlying pond. Also, there is designated woodland, ‘High Priority and ‘Ancient’ designations (SP061, SP062); a high concentration of historic field patterns (SP061, SP062 and SP065); medieval town fields and historic settlement (SP062); wooded ridgelines (SP062); grade 2 listed buildings (SP062); long distance views (SP061, SP062, SP065); public footpath (SP062) and outward views from a designated Conservation Area (SP062). Consultants have been required to include costings to road schemes. We believe that other costings, both financial and environmental, have not been assessed. A Freedom of Information request to WBC 2018 identified that no environmental impact assessment had been made to Green Belt sites in Barnston. There is no evidence to suggest that a full, effective assessment has been carried out to date.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Existing roads barely cope with current demand. Wirral is a peninsula with water on three sides. All travel to Merseyside and Cheshire is therefore concentrated on very limited and congested routes. There is factual evidence to identify the additional cars on the roads in areas SP061, SP062 and SP063 with a range of 1658- 2486 using the Transport National Travel Survey and RAC forecast. (NB. The same survey identifies households with “2 or more cars” in which case, the number of additional cars could be well in excess of 3100). The A551 (Barnston Road) has been designated by the Council as unsafe and has imposed a weight restriction. Articulated vehicles are banned except for access. The A551 has been designated an accident alert route with fatalities over recent years. Due to the fact that Barnston Village has four farms and lanes and road structures on commuter routes, severe congestion and danger is caused on a daily basis now. On several roads, within a space of a less than half a mile, speed restrictions range from 20MPH to 30MPH to 40MPH 20MPH and back to 30MPH & Traffic counts show

high density on the commuter routes through the lanes. Commuters already face long queues at peak times to get to the motorway. The A551 is the main route from Heswall for emergency vehicles to the main A&E hospital (Arrowe Park – also in West Wirral). The A551 is a heavily congested commuter route to Liverpool via J3 of the M53. The A5137 (Brimstage Road) is a heavily congested commuter route to J4 of the M53. NB. This junction has been identified as dangerous by the Highways Agency due to the regularity of vehicles queuing to exit at peak times. Buses are available to Liverpool from Heswall via the A540 and, as a consequence, commuters are already turning parts of Telegraph Road (A540) into a car park where their cars are left all day. (This also applies to many side roads off Telegraph Road e.g. Poll Hill Road, some of which are impassable at times.). There is no direct train link to Liverpool from Heswall Hills Station.

The present bridge over Barnston Dale was built in 1875. The A551 already floods by the entrance to the Dale. Lorries attempting to reach the M53 via the A5137 regularly get stuck under the low railway bridge. A second low railway bridge is located in Whitehouse Lane (a much-used narrow link road between Barnston Road and Brimstage Road). The roadway below this bridge always floods in heavy rain. The road is then closed.

Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: Green Belt land parcels in question and the number of houses proposed; Photographic evidence of the dangerous conditions already in place; Detailed traffic counts; Crash map information; Pending FOI request from WBC regarding full details of crashes on the A551, not just the publicised figure which covers only part of the road.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

The Green Belt is enjoyed by ALL Wirral residents – accessible due to the size of the Borough – contributing to tourism and leisure opportunities with access to farming and forests.

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

All of the primary schools in the designated area are full to capacity in some or all year groups in F2 and KS1, i.e. where schools cannot legally exceed classes of 30 for children below the age of 7 years

Where schools can accept over 30 in a class in Key Stage 2, the schools have had to accept pupils over the net capacity calculation. It is acknowledged that the numbers vary year on year but traditionally these schools reflect the birth rate. When the birth rate is normal or high, the schools are over-subscribed. Should these proposals go

ahead there would be further impact on the limited capacity of these schools and admission of further pupils would prejudice the education of all pupils.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Disturbance/destruction of an historic footpath network. Public footpaths, most of which are in the Green Belt, have huge amenity value. There are three in this area in SP062, SP065L and submitted site 1958 within SP065. Wirral has over 200 miles of highly accessible public footpaths within its 45-mile boundary.

The areas indicated by SP061, SP062 and SP063 contain special Historic Landscape Character types (HER1, HER2, HER3, HER4, HER5, HER6, HER7, HER8 refer), of which only c7348 hectares fall into this category across Cheshire. There are approximately 16 hectares of Town Field in Barnston. The field systems have the potential to contain rich habitats; archaeological remains and historic ecofacts. In addition, there is the potential for ridge and furrow to be discovered as well as earthworks e.g. HER2 Ancient Field Systems. These field systems are largely characterised by irregular and semi-irregular field patterns associated with a network of winding paths, tracks and lanes serving hamlets and villages. Retention is encouraged: If a boundary is in poor condition, seek to restore; If a boundary is in fair/good condition, seek to maintain; Relic boundaries should be re-instated. Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: Maps; Plans; Township boundaries; Medieval Town Fields maps; Medieval Woodland maps; Medieval Planned Enclosure maps; Late Post Medieval Agriculture Improvements maps; The Cheshire Historic landscape Improvement: Ancient Landscapes; HER Medieval Townfields.

The assessment should also include an ancient Parish boundary recorded in Domesday (SP061) and potential monument status at Cross Hill (SP065).

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

The impact of drainage should be considered both in cost terms and environmental impact. Option 2b is only served by a single combined sewer pipe laid through three SBI wildlife sites in Barnston Dale, Murrayfield Hospital and Lower Heath Wood. It is joined at three intersections at Holmwood Avenue, Belmont Drive and Private Drive, Barnston. The catchment for this sewer extends into Pensby, Heswall and Urban Barnston on Brimstage Road. A storm tank exists at Private Drive, Barnston, which we have monitored for several years. It consistently discharges into Prenton Brook with the full knowledge of both United Utilities and the Environment Agency. This is unacceptable. Already inadequate and unsustainable, any additional development contributing to this poorly functioning network will result in further pollution incidence and extensive environmental damage. 2,500 new homes in Option 2b will overwhelm capacity completely.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

We reiterate the significance of retaining food producing land and emphasise the proposed future ALC grouping for 3a and 3b soils. The 'best and most versatile' should be protected, referenced by NPPF and Defra's 25-year Environment Plan. We acknowledge the commitment made by WBC to retain Agricultural land on the Wirral.

Development on the existing Green Belt farmlands will destroy the unique and separate character of existing villages, resulting in excessive urban sprawl. Agricultural policies, agreed at both national and local levels, are seriously compromised.

Data proves that agriculture is still of considerable significance in terms of its impact on the economy of Wirral. Post BREXIT, food production will take on an even greater importance; therefore, there is a need to retain existing farms. UDP Policy AGR1 emphasise that national planning policy places upon sustaining the rural economy and protecting the countryside. All Wirral's rural areas fall within the Green Belt. In Wirral over half of the land used for agriculture is classified within the Ministry of Agriculture, Fisheries and Food (MAFF). Land of this quality is of national importance which should normally be protected from development. Existing UDP Policy AGR1 seeks to protect land of poorer quality to protect parcels of land incapable of future agricultural use due to fragmentation. Adjacent development disturbance can have operational implications for cropping patterns and livestock husbandry. 80 hectares of the survey area (i.e. the land west of Barnston Road) are currently engaged in Natural England Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) Scheme indicated by the present Government as a progressive requirement in Agriculture post Brexit. HLS agreements include our references to management of the historic landscape, BCTP, hedgerows and ditches, permanent pasture, arable buffer strips and species rich habitats. The Secretary of

State's former Strategic Guidance for Merseyside specifically states that development allowed near farms needs to be such as to avoid incompatible land use. The priority attached to the protection of agricultural enterprise in UDP Policy AGR1 reflects the continuing importance of agriculture to the local economy and the special contribution that agriculture makes to maintaining the character and landscape of Wirral's rural areas. Full documentation to support these facts is available.

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659115>

Attachment 2

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659116>

Attachment 3

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659117>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-23825

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

General comment

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Drainage and sewage

To consider developing SP061/SP062/SP063/SP064/SP065 is flawed by unacceptable infrastructure and health and safety problems. Existing infrastructure barely copes with current demand. Should these proposals go ahead, this would have serious impacts. Barnston Dale (served by the A551) was formed in the Ice Age and is a steep U-shaped valley. The stream in the valley and its unnamed tributaries drain most of central Wirral. The Dale is an ancient woodland with three Sites of Biological Importance. First sewer was constructed in c1900. Second sewer running parallel was completed in the 1960s. Sink holes are associated with the original sewer. The streams drain half of SP062, all of SP061 and also Thingwall. Following representations by a local MP concerning sink holes and Crosshill Reservoir discharge erosion in Barnston Dale 2013 – 2015, United Utilities were required to undertake repairs to sink holes (some 3 feet deep) in 2015. Some identified problems highlighted during the project reinstatements still remain outstanding. Discharges from Thingwall Reservoir (opened c1918) have caused major erosion. The flow from the reservoir exceeds specific limits. The reservoir was found to have major construction defects in 2017 and, as a result, the weir (constructed to stop erosion) has been rendered virtually useless. The 1975 Act recognises the catastrophic effects of any serious incident at Thingwall Reservoir. The reservoir which, apparently in an emergency would need to be emptied is would be adjacent to a proposed new development of 504 houses. The overflow from the sewer treatment plant at Barnston Storm Tanks overflows into a stream and is regarded locally as a serious health risk. There is also an appalling stench! The sewer is near full capacity due to other branches joining it within the designated areas. The A551 already floods by the entrance to the Dale. Should high tides and heavy rain combine, serious flooding occurs. Brimstage Brook (SP062) is liable to flooding. 60 hectares of potential development within parcels SP062 and SP064 will increase surface water flow to Brimstage Brook which in Brimstage Village and beyond contributes to an existing highest category 3 flood zone. Flow recorder chambers with regulators and storm overflows exist to the rear of Belmont Drive and at the end of Private Drive with additional pump facility at Private Drive to discharge into the Fender Valley Sewer. Sewage treatment is in Birkenhead. Fluvial process has increased in time as greater surface water volume enters Prenton Brook from Higher Pensby resulting in manhole access chambers 78 and 79 being exposed to the full flow of the brook with the potential to cause pollution. Pollution incidence in Prenton Brook will directly impact on the Drinking Water Safeguard Zone and boreholes further downstream in Prenton. Prenton Brook is a recorded river tributary and as such is under the control of The Environment Agency. The predecessor, The National Rivers Authority regularly scoured out the course of Prenton Brook within Barnston Dale to

control the fluvial process, this is ignored by EA. Considerations for the effects on the ecology of Barnston Dale would be significant. Should these proposals go ahead there would be further impact arising from lack of maintenance/inspection of the stream for blockage; lack of the inspection of the sewer; Inspection shafts eroding into the stream; excessive discharge into one of the streams; sewage related discharge is evident into Prenton Brook; increased likelihood of flooding; Brimstage Brook (westerly SP062) would be subject to further flooding.

Full documentation to support these facts is available. The documented evidence to date includes: History of the area; Maps; Photographic evidence; Factual data.

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other re Q3n Other reasons

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2519

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

Table 4.7 shows parcels to that are not acceptable for release. Option 2b should be taken out of the issues and options document.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-25478

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

My overriding view is that due to the high cost and damage to the environment the above single release of Greenbelt would bring, this is not the right location and it would be by far preferable to locate this housing close to electric rail lines with frequent services linking with new proposals for stations on the West Kirby and Chester Lines as above.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

I feel that the transport related documentation supplied as part of the consultation is inadequate, simply trying to support a major development in a relatively high property cost area - albeit in the wrong place. With a potential number of dwellings somewhere between 2000 and 3000 based on page 21 of the Consultation Summary Document, presumably an associated population increase of around 8,000 based on average 3 to 4 persons per dwelling, I consider that this option would have a major impact on the surrounding highway network, infrastructure and services. Lack of access to bus services/rail services – detailed review provided. Lack of accessible transport infrastructure and parking at bus/rail stations. Transport information supplied did not make recommendations for complimentary works such as junction improvements in the

wider area – detailed consideration of need for improved road infrastructure provided in attachment.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these)

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

I feel that development in the Meols /Leasowe or Bebington / Eastham areas would minimise carbon emissions and assist Wirral in satisfying in meeting its Climate Emergency objectives.

Attachment 1

<https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5655824>

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-9797

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site

Q3a Environmental Reasons

This is good arable land which is currently and for many years has been farmed successfully and is both productive (definitely not weak performing) and an asset to the community. The land is currently seeded in barley and many hundreds of walkers each day are using it for exercise, although this has increased due to Corona we may expect that these habits will persist as residents learn to appreciate more the beauty of their immediate locale and rely less on cars.

Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons

Heswall, Barnson Road and Milner Road and Whitfield are already congested providing a danger in view of the presence of a large Primary School.

Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)

Q3d Impact on the character of the area

The merging of several distinct villages will completely spoil the separate historic and rural identities of Heswall, Barnston, Pensby and Irby.

Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services

The huge number of house suggested would have a devastating impact on Local Services. To cater for the new demand on services would require a huge investment by NHS, and other providers.

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

This is a distraction from the urgent need to regenerate the rundown and blighted areas of brownfield sites in the east of the Wirral - notably Birkenhead.

Q3k Development Viability

There are so many reasons that one wonders how come this was ever proposed in the first place. A huge development of this sort would blight the area for many years - our local "Happy and Green award-winning primary school would be in turmoil. There would need to be large new roads gauged through the landscape, new utility and services provision. The management of such a huge project would be very difficult and time consuming and fraught with difficulty over many years.

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

This is some of the best agricultural land on Wirral as I have demonstrated arlier. How it came to be classified as weakly performing is derisory and needs to be investigated since it has lead to a fierce and unnecessary debate

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Of course - huge loss of grenbelt land and the purposes thereof.

Q3n Other reasons

Simply don't need that number of houses.

Regulation 18 Local Plan Site Specific Comments

Question 4.15 – Option 2B: Single Urban Extension

Comment ID

LPIO-2510

Site Reference

Parcels 7.15 and 7.16 (SP062) - West of Barnston Road, Heswall

Q1 Please indicate the nature of your comment

Objection

Q3 Please indicate why you are supporting, objecting or commenting on the proposed allocation or potential green belt release of the site**Q3a Environmental Reasons****Q3b Transport and Highway Reasons****Q3c Amenity Reasons (for example: overlooking, noise, visual impact)****Q3d Impact on the character of the area****Q3e Impact on / availability of Local Services**

Q3f Impact on Heritage

Q3g Infrastructure and Utilities

Q3h Flood Risk

Q3i The site boundary is wrong

Q3j Development should take place elsewhere in the Borough (if relevant you can choose both of these

Q3k Development Viability

Q3l Loss of Agricultural Land

Q3m Will impact on the Green Belt

Q3n Other reasons

There are urban sites available in the north of the town