



WIRRAL METROPOLITAN BOROUGH COUNCIL

LOCAL DEVELOPMENT FRAMEWORK FOR WIRRAL

SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT

PARKING STANDARDS

REPORT OF CONSULTATION

JUNE 2007

[blank for copying]

1 INTRODUCTION

- 1.1 This document sets out details of the statutory consultation undertaken by the Council under Regulation 17(1) of the Town & Country Planning (Local Development) Regulations 2004 on a Draft Supplementary Planning Document – Parking Standards and on its accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- 1.2 This Report of Consultation will be made available for inspection alongside the adopted Supplementary Planning Document and the final Sustainability Appraisal Report.

2 THE CONSULTATION PROCESS

- 2.1 Consultation on the content of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document and Sustainability Appraisal Report took place for a six-week period between 22 February and 5 April 2007.
- 2.2 Copies of the Draft Supplementary Planning Document, the Sustainability Appraisal Report and the Report of Initial Consultation were sent to statutory consultees and to respondents to the initial consultation undertaken during September to December 2006¹. Letters of notification were sent to the remaining contacts from the Council's Local Development Framework Contacts Database. Comments were invited on the Draft SPD and the accompanying Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- 2.3 Lists of the people and organisations consulted and notified are provided as Appendices to this Report of Consultation.
- 2.2 Copies of the Consultation Letter and the Draft SPD documents were placed on the Council's website and can be viewed at <http://www.wirral.gov.uk/ldf/ldfspcp.asp>. Paper copies of the documents were also made available at the public counter of the Technical Services Department offices and 24 local libraries throughout the Borough. Comments could also be submitted on-line through the Council's internet based consultation system, ECONET.
- 2.3 Public notices were published in the Liverpool Echo, Wirral Globe and Wirral News for two consecutive weeks during the weeks of 21 February 2007 and 28 February 2007.

3 SUMMARY OF RESPONSES.

- 3.1 The consultation drew 18 responses on the Draft SPD and 4 responses on the Sustainability Appraisal Report.
- 3.2 A summary of the comments received and the response of the Local Planning Authority are contained in the following schedules.

¹ Initial consultation on the content of the proposed SPD was undertaken between 1 September 2006 and 10 November 2006 and on the scope of the Sustainability Appraisal Report between 18 October and 1 December 2006.

TABLE OF COMMENTS ON THE DRAFT SUPPLEMENTARY PLANNING DOCUMENT – PARKING STANDARDS

<i>Ref</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
	<p>Draft SPD is impressive.</p> <p>Use of sloping bays incorporating a one way system is preferred - less space is needed, the chance of collision reduced and vacant bays could be seen well in advance.</p>	<p>Noted</p> <p>This would have to be considered at the application stage when site specific factors can be taken into account.</p> <p>To clarify and take account of new national guidance, in the Manual for Streets (DfT, March 2007), it is recommended that Section 3 of the final SPD is revised in the following ways:</p> <p>That Paragraph 3.1 is amended to read:</p> <p>“...The specifications for presenting landscaping schemes are set out in Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 16 – Landscaping and New Development. When developers are preparing their proposals they will be expected to have regard to the national design guide Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007), which can be viewed at http://www.dft.gov.uk/pgr/sustainable/manforstreets/pdfmanforstreets.pdf”</p> <p>That A new paragraph 3.3 is inserted to read:</p> <p>“Parking bays can be laid out in a perpendicular, parallel or echelon (angled) format next to the access way or road, as shown in Figure 1 and Figure 2 below³. The best solution for</p>

Text reproduced from Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007).

ual	Consultation Response	Directors Comments
		<p>achieving the most effective parking layout will depend on site related factors.”</p> <p>That Figure 1 – Parallel and Perpendicular Parking Arrangements and Figure 2 – Echelon Parking Arrangements, are inserted, reproduced from the Manual for Streets.</p> <p>That paragraph 3.4 is amended to read:</p> <p>“The dimensions for car parking spaces are set out in the reasoned justification to UDP Policy TR9. Parking bays will normally be expected to be 2.4 metres wide by 5.5 metres long. A minimum of 4.8 metres in length may, however, be acceptable in some cases. In cases where bays would be parallel to the access way and entered from the side, the length should be increased to at least 6 metres. For echelon (angled) parking bays the minimum acceptable length will be 4.2 metres.”</p> <p>That new paragraphs 3.5 and 3.6 are inserted to read:</p> <p>“The width of the access road needed to access echelon or perpendicular spaces conveniently depends on the width of the bay and the angle of approach. For a 2.4 m wide bay, these values are typically:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • at 90 degrees, width (W) = 6.0 m • at 60 degrees, width (W) = 4.2 m • at 45 degrees, width (W) = 3.6 m⁴

Manual for Streets (DfT, 2007)

<i>ual</i>	Consultation Response	Directors Comments
		Individual bays must be indicated or marked out. Echelon bays should be arranged so that drivers are encouraged to reverse into them. This is safer than reversing out, when visibility might be restricted by adjacent parked vehicles.”
	HSE have not considered the contents of the SPD in detail. General comments indicate it would be helpful to potential developers if constraints imposed by the possible presence of dangerous substance establishment were indicated in a policy statement in the plan. The Council is strongly advised to consult hazardous pipeline operators and to keep records update. Proposals Maps should also show dangerous substance establishments and hazardous pipelines.	<p>This standard comment is directed towards emerging Local Development Frameworks in general.</p> <p>The proposed SPD is intended to supplement UDP Policies TRT3 &TR9. UDP Policy PO9 sets the existing Development Plan context and sets out the criteria upon which any new development near notifiable hazards would be assessed in consultation with the HSE. Up to date records on the location of hazardous installations & pipe lines are kept and maintained by the Technical Services Department and would be annotated on hard copies of the Local Development Framework Proposals Map when the final Development Plan Documents, to replace the UDP, are published.</p> <p>No change proposed.</p>
	No comment	Noted
	Supports Option 3. Would like parking standards to be the same as Mersey-wide SPD and assurance that this will be adopted.	The parking standards reflect those in the proposed for the Merseyside SPD, which has not yet been finalised and subjected to formal consultation and may, therefore, be subject to change, whilst taking account of local circumstances on Wirral. While the SPD does not follow the text of the emerging Merseyside SPD word for word, the maximum standards included are essentially the same. Housing standards are linked to bedroom numbers rather than a general average of

ual	Consultation Response	Directors Comments
	<p>Difficult to interpret 'clear distinction is made between public and private areas'</p> <p>Reference should be made to travel plans, S106 payments and car clubs etc, which are included in the Merseyside SPD.</p> <p>Standards, which improve access and control levels of parking, are supported.</p>	<p>1.5 spaces per dwelling, whereas provision for people with disabilities is intended to also take account of the Code of Practice on Access and Mobility for Merseyside. No change proposed.</p> <p>This is intended to ensure that areas public and private areas can be easily defined within residential areas (paragraph 3.15 now refers). No change proposed.</p> <p>The proposed SPD can only provide guidance on adopted Development Plan policy. At this stage, the SPD is only intended to supplement UDP Policy TR9. The inclusion of these wider matters would require a review of the Development Plan. This will be considered during the preparation of the emerging Local Development Framework. No change proposed.</p> <p>Noted.</p>
ion	<p>Car parking standard for food retail development should be 1 space per 14 sqm to reflect PPG13.</p> <p>The SPD should make reference to benefits of in or edge of centre retail facilities such as linked trips and shared parking.</p>	<p>The proposed standard for town & suburban centres is 1 space per 16 sqm. Elsewhere the standard would be 1 space per 14 sqm. This is consistent for the urban conurbation standard in the Regional Spatial Strategy for the North West (RPG13). No change proposed.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to consider the potential of site specific benefits through a transport assessment or travel plan when individual proposals come forward. No change proposed.</p>
	<p>Theatres are sui-generis and are not covered by the proposed SPD.</p>	<p>It would be more appropriate to consider parking requirements for theatres through a transport assessment or travel plan if and when individual proposals come forward. No change</p>

<i>ual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
		proposed.
	Support move to reduce reliance on cars, with good access for pedestrians and good cycle provision. Pleas standards would be maximum rather than minimum and there is reference to flood risk with a role for porous surfaces.	Noted. Noted.
	Recognition of contribution of parking standards to sustainable transport policy is welcome. Recommends that SPD covers park & ride facilities at railway stations.	Noted. Parking requirements at railway stations are assessed by Mersey Travel through a separate process which involves a technical assessment that takes account of site specific factors when planning applications are made. This is a different exercise from assessing the need for parking at an individual development proposal. No change proposed.
of rt UK	Future planning proposals should include provision for coach access, stopping places, and parking facilities which take account of health & safety and accessibility for all, in locations that appeal to the group market.	The proposed SPD makes provision for coach parking at hotels, assembly and leisure facilities. Safety and accessibility will be taken into account by the Technical Services Department when future applications are determined. No change proposed
	No comment	Noted
or	PPS3 should be included in para 1.3. Paras 1.6-1-8 could explain that SA incorporates SEA and that Appropriate Assessment has been carried out.	Section 1 refers to procedural issues only and will not form part of the proposed SPD. PPS3 is listed in paragraph 2.1 as part of the national planning policy context. No change proposed. Section 1 refers to procedural issues only and will not form part of the proposed SPD. Following consultation with the statutory bodies it was determined that an SEA Report and Appropriate

<i>ual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
	<p>Would be helpful to refer to the Statement of Community Involvement in relation to the application process and the benefits of pre-application discussions.</p> <p>Would be helpful to indicate how Merseyside SPD 'Ensuring Choice of Travel' would be incorporated into the LDF.</p> <p>Would be helpful to explain at paras 2.2 & 3.3 how the SPD would be reviewed if RSS Policies change.</p>	<p>Assessment was not required in this case. No change proposed.</p> <p>Agreed. It is recommended that paragraph 5.1 is amended to read:</p> <p>"In accordance with the Statement of Community Involvement, which can be viewed at http://www.wirral.gov.uk/ldf/FinalAdoptedSCIDec06.pdf"</p> <p>At the time of writing, the proposed Merseyside SPD has not been finalised or subjected to public consultation and may therefore be subject to further changes. The relationship between this SPD and the proposed Merseyside SPD was set out in the initial consultation letter of 27 September 2006. The wider content of the proposed Merseyside SPD cannot yet be brought forward until higher level Development Plan policies have been amended. The inclusion of these wider matters in a Wirral SPD is a matter for a review of the Local Development Scheme rather than the text of this SPD.</p> <p>Agreed. It is recommended that paragraphs 2.4 and 2.5 are amended to read:</p> <p>"Status</p> <p>RSS Policy DP3 and RSS Policy T9 are due to be replaced by Policy DP1 and Policy RT6 in the emerging review of the Regional Spatial Strategy, which was subject to public examination when this Supplementary Planning Document was being prepared. Any significant change to the Draft Regional Spatial Strategy or to national policies will take</p>

<i>ual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
	<p>Would be helpful to refer to the need for design and access statements for many applications at para 7.2.</p> <p>Would be helpful if additional text at paras 3.5 -3.6 explained where standards were derived from. Those from SPG41 can only be guidelines due to para 15.32 in the adopted UDP.</p> <p>Would be helpful to explain how the SPD might need to be revised when existing policies are replaced by the LDF.</p>	<p>precedence over this Supplementary Planning Document.”</p> <p>A review of this Supplementary Planning Document, if necessary, will be scheduled through the Local Development Scheme”</p> <p>Paragraph 6.2 refers to the need for design and access statements, with a reference to the relevant Statutory Instrument. No change proposed.</p> <p>The only guidelines taken from SPG41 are for car sales businesses, which still have local relevance and have now been subject to statutory consultation and appraisal processes. It is, however, recommended that new paragraphs 1.3 and 1.4 are inserted to read:</p> <p>“This Supplementary Planning Document replaces the previous Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 41 – Car Parking Provision, which is now withdrawn.”</p> <p>The proposed parking standards in this SPD have been derived from national planning policies; the existing and emerging Regional Spatial Strategy; work undertaken under the auspices of the Merseyside Local Transport Plan (2006-2011) to promote sub-regional consistency in local standards for parking; and previous guidelines for car sales businesses taken from the Council’s former Supplementary Planning Guidance Note 41.”</p> <p>It is recommended that paragraph 7.1 is amended to read:</p> <p>“It is proposed that the impact of the operation of this</p>

<i>ual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
		Supplementary Planning Document will be monitored through the Council's statutory Annual Monitoring Report. The Annual Monitoring Report will also be used to identify any need for this Supplementary Planning Document to be amended or replaced."
	No comment	Noted.
ably	Consider the proposed SPD to be in general conformity with the adopted Regional Spatial Strategy.	Noted
ion	Efficient, clean and reliable public transport, plus development capable of sustaining their own parking requirements are two sensible measures.	Noted. No change proposed.
	<p>Would like title to be Vehicle Parking Standards.</p> <p>Would like cycle parking standards from SPG42 to be referred to in the tables.</p> <p>Para 4.12 bullet point 2 should refer to clearly defined cycle stand locations if internal storage is impractical.</p>	<p>The title of an SPD is established in the statutory Local Development Scheme approved by the Secretary of State. For clarification it is recommended that paragraph 1.1 is amended to read:</p> <p>"The purpose of this Supplementary Planning Document is to provide advice on the maximum levels of parking provision for motor vehicles..."</p> <p>Cycle parking standards are established in the Development Plan under UDP Policy TR12 and a separate Supplementary Planning Guidance Note. Repeating the cycle standards in this SPD would be an unnecessary duplication. Paragraph 4.4 makes it clear that cycle facilities will be required in accordance with SPG42. No change proposed.</p> <p>See above. Paragraph 4.4 makes it clear that cycle facilities will be required in accordance with SPG42. No change</p>

<i>ual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
	Para 5.4 should be highlighted or underlined.	proposed. Paragraph 4.4 will have no additional force by virtue of any additional emphasis through highlighting or underlining. No change proposed.
	No comment on SPD. Agree that a separate Habitats Regulation Assessment is not required.	Noted.
x	No comment	Noted
	Agrees with the proposed SPD and supports the use of sustainable drainage measures where flooding is an issue.	Noted

Edward J
Comment

TABLE OF COMMENTS ON THE SUSTAINABILITY APPRAISAL REPORT

<i>Person/individual</i>	<i>Consultation Response</i>	<i>Directors Comments</i>
Warrington	SPD unlikely affect their environmental interests. They concur that Habitats Regulation Assessment is not required.	Noted.
Warrington Cycling	Would like objectives and indicators to monitor cycle facilities and access to them.	The SA appraisal of the SPD considers the effects of the proposed parking standards for vehicles. No change proposed.
Warrington Office for the Environment	<p>It would be helpful to explain that Natural England incorporates the former Countryside Agency & English Nature.</p> <p>Para 4.2 should refer to the latest LDS</p>	<p>Agreed. Insert '(Note: Natural England replaced English Nature and the Countryside Agency on 2 October 2006)' at para 1.7 and 'who replaced English Nature and the Countryside Agency on 2 October 2006' at paragraph 1.9.</p> <p>It would be more appropriate to add new paragraph 1.3 'The timetable for the preparation of the Supplementary Planning Document is set out within the Local Development Scheme, approved by the Secretary of State on 24 April 2007. A copy of the Local Development Scheme can be viewed at http://www.wirral.gov.uk/ldf/ldfids.asp The target date for the adoption of the final Supplementary Planning Document is July 2007.'</p>

<p>ty</p>	<p>Welcomes the fact that the SPD and SA recognise contribution of parking standards to sustainable transport policy.</p> <p>Social inclusion table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPD objectives 1 and 2 could have positive impact on accessibility of jobs and services <p>Economic Growth table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPD objective 1 could have positive impact on all the economic growth factors other than worklessness <p>Environmental Protection table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPD Objective 2 could have positive impact on Biodiversity and Pollution <p>Quality of Life table</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ SPD objectives 1 and 2 could have positive impact on General Attractiveness 	<p>Noted</p> <p>Agree that objective 1 (to support sustainable travel choice) could have a positive impact. No adverse impact is foreseen from objective 2 (to minimise environmental impact and reduce reliance on private car). Propose to change '0' to '+' in social inclusion table p33.and add 'SPD objective 1 would be positively compatible with promoting accessibility of jobs and services' under Comments.</p> <p>While accepting the issues can be finally balanced, it is considered that objective 1 would have no significant impact. No change proposed.</p> <p>While accepting the issues can be finally balanced, it is considered that objective 2 would have no significant impact. No change proposed.</p> <p>Agree that objectives 1 and 2 could have a positive impact. Propose to change '0 to +' in quality of life table in appendix 7 and add 'SPD objectives 1 and 2 would be positively compatible with promoting general attractiveness' under Comments.</p>
-----------	--	--

Edward J
Comment

LIST OF PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS CONSULTED

Department	Hutchinson 3G UK Limited	North West Regional Assembly
Foundation Society	Ince Parish Council	NTL
Services Ltd	Knowsley MBC, Forward Planning	NW & North Wales Sea Fisheries Committee
Sea Residents Association	Lands Office - Shell UK Pipelines	O2 UK Limited
Merseyside Strategic Health	Liverpool City Council	Orange Pcs Ltd
	Mersey Estuary Development Co-ordinator	Peacock & Smith
	Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Planning Bureau Limited
	Merseyside Policy Unit	Puddington & District Council
Association of Local Councils	Merseyside Waste Disposal Authority	Ramblers Association (Wirral Group)
Local Council	Merseytravel	Sefton MBC
Community Group	Merseyside Archeological Service	SP Manweb
Service Company	Mobile Operators Association	Sport England North West Region
Office for Wales	Mr & Mrs A Pasterfield	St Helen's MBC
County Council	Mr Clegg	T Mobile (UK) Ltd
Partnership	Mr D McKaigue	The Mersey Partnership
Water	Mr Gladden	Theatres Trust
Wirral Neston Borough Council	Mr I Coulthard	United Utilities (Asset Protection)
(North West)	Mr J Noble	Vodafone Ltd
Services	Mr L Burman	Willaston Parish Council
Local Council	Mr P Barton MCD BA (hons)	WIRED
Associates	Mr P Haywood	Wirral Community Engagement Team
Office for the North West	Ms D Toony	Wirral Community Safety Team
Environmental Services	National Grid	Wirral Local Strategic Partnership
	National Trust	Wirral Society
	Natural England, NW Region	Wirral Sustainable Transport Co-ordinator
Executive	Network Rail (Mining)	Wirral Voluntary and Community Services
Local Council	Network Rail (Planning)	Network
	New Brighton BRAVO	Wirral Wildlife
Generation	Norman Street Residents Association	
Agency	North West Development Agency	

LIST OF PEOPLE AND ORGANISATIONS NOTIFIED

Associates	Braithwaite Associates	Corporate Property Solutions
Architects	Bridgewater Meeting Room Trust	Council for British Archaeology
	Bristol-Myers Squibb Pharmaceutical Research	Country Land & Business Association
	Broadway Malyan Planning	Countryside Properties
	Brockway Dunn Limited	Crosby Homes NW Ltd
	Brodies Solicitors	Crown Estate
	Building Design Partnership	Cuff Roberts Solicitors
	Bullivant Jones & Company	CUH2A Architecture & Planning
	C D Hughes	Cunnane Town Planning
	Caldy CAAC	Cycling Project
	Campaign for Real Ale	D Morgan Plc
	Carey Jones Architects	D2 Planning
	Carpenter Bidwells Planning	Daly International
	Cass Associates	David McLean Homes Ltd
	CB Richard Ellis	David Wilson Homes
	CgMs Consulting	De Pol Associates
	Charlesworth Group Ltd	Dee Estuary Conservation Group
	Chelford Properties	Denis Wilson Partnership
	Cheshire Gardens Trust	Denton Clark & Co.
	Cheshire Jehovah's Witnesses	Depol Associates Ltd
	Cheshire RIGS Group	Design Planning Development
	Cheshire Wildlife Trust	Development Planning & Design Services
	Childer Thornton Conservation Association	Dickinson Dees
	Chris Thomas Limited	Diocese of Chester
	Church Commissioners	Dixon Webb
	Clive Watkin Partnership	Dr K Singh
	CLM Services	Dr M Baker-Schommer
	Colin Buchanan & Partners	Dr M Day
	Colliers CRE	Dr Macbeath
		Drivers Jonas
		Drivers Jonas

ing
ervation Association

dents Association
) Limited

rtnership
s

ources Management
Limited (NW Division)
nd (Wirral District)
on (NW Conservancy)

society

ark
ad Park
1 Country Park
Shore
& Meols Gardens
Park
Woods
1

society
wareness Council
ategic Land

GL Hearn
Goodwin Planning Services
Gough Planning Services
Groundwork Wirral
GVA Grimley
H D Gee Consultants
Halcyon Properties
Hallam Land Management Ltd
Halliwells LLP, Planning Section
Harlor Homes
Haston Reynolds Partnership
Henry Boot Developments Limited
Hepher Dixon
Heswall & District Business Association
Heswall Society
Hickling Gray Associates
Higham & Co.
HM Coastguard
Hooton Park Trust
HOW Planning LLP
Hoylake CVS
Hylgar Properties
Indigo Planning Limited
Inglewood Properties
Irby, Thurstaston & Pensby Amenity
Society
J10 Planning
James Barr Consultants
JMP Consulting
Job Centre Plus
Jones Lang LaSalle
Kemp & Kemp
Kersh Commercial
King Sturge

Kings Gap CAAC
Kings Lane Supporters Association
Knight Frank LLP
Lairdsie Communities Trust
Lambert Smith Hampton
Land Planning Group
Land Projects UK Associates
Landmark Information Group Ltd
Leith Planning Limited
Leverhulme Estates
LRM Development Consultants
M Hussenbux
MacIntosh Communications Limited
Malcolm E Lloyd
Malcolm Judd and Partners
Manor Egremont Mast Action Group
Maritime Housing Association
Mason Owen Property Consultants
Matthews & Goodman
McCormick Architecture
McDyre & Co.
McInerney Homes
MCP Planning & Development
Meols Drive Residents Association
Mersey Basin Campaign
Mersey Docks and Harbour Company
Mersey Estuary Conservation Group
Mersey Waste Holdings Limited
Merseyside & West Cheshire Ramblers
Merseyside & West Lancs Bat Group
Merseyside & West Lancs Bat Group
Merseyside Civic Society
Merseyside Cycling Campaign (Wirral
Branch)

Environmental Trust
Service Headquarters

Property Division

Ltd
(th) Limited

Weston

DMS

ip TP RIBA MRTPI

Mr E Robinson OBE MRAeS
Mr F Burgana BA MCD MRTPI
Mr F Howell
Mr F Hyde
Mr G Bryan
Mr G D Evans
Mr G Noble
Mr G S Puddy
Mr Grey
Mr H Turnbull
Mr I Wyche
Mr J A Wright BA (Hons) MRTPI
Mr J M Corfe
Mr J O'Neil
Mr K Collins
Mr L Parker-Davies
Mr M Curtis
Mr M F Lewis
Mr M G Laurenson
Mr M Harrison
Mr M Muller
Mr Mahoney
Mr Martin
Mr Nuttal
Mr P Jackson
Mr P Pendleton
Mr R J Wood
Mr R L Shelbourne
Mr R Taylor
Mr Reade
Mr Rowland
Mr T Tarr
Mr Toosey

Mr W O'Dowd
Mrs B Murthwaite
Mrs Clarke
Mrs E M Hale
Mrs G Nicholas
Mrs G Wollers
Mrs J M Smith
Mrs K M Ives
Mrs Lewis
Mrs M Dockrell
Mrs R M Fraser
Mrs S Charlesworth
Mrs S Shaw
Mrs T Chadwick
Mrs V Doodson
Mrs Weston
Ms C Radford
Ms Foster
Ms J M McIlhatton
Ms K Robinson
Ms L Woodhead
Ms M Johnson
Ms S Colquhoun
Ms S J Wall
Ms S Magee
Ms S Sweeney
Ms Seager
Muir Associates
Murphys Taxis
N Power Renewables
Nathaniel Litchfield & Partners
National Farmers Union - NW Region
National Wind Power Limited

community Association
community Partnership
environmentalists
golf Club
Ferry Conservation

Society Association
Ration Action Group

Neighbourhood Forum
Services Group Limited
Association of Sea Angling

Fishing Association

Company, Chartered

Associates
Social Equality
Associates Ltd

Partners
Associates
Limited
(North West)
Society
Trust
Residents Association
Group
Limited

Residents Association

Reddington Developments Limited
Redrow Homes
Rev Father Ostaszewski
Robinson Architects
Rock Ferry Community Partnership
Rock Park Estate Management
Committee
Rodney Housing Association
Roger Tym & Partners
Roman Catholic Church
Royal Estates
Royal Liverpool Golf Club
Royal National Lifeboat Institute
RPS Planning Transport & Environment
RSPB Northern England
Rural Development Service
Safety Layne (Investments) Limited
Salisbury Developments
Saughall Massie CAAC
Savills
Seacombe Local Area Partnership
Showmens Guild of Great Britain
Smith & Sons Property Consultants
Smiths Gore
Society for the Protection of Ancient
Buildings
Sommerville Primary School
St. Mary's Catholic College
Stanton Estate Residents Association
Stanton Land & Marine Development
Limited
Steer Davies Gleave
Steven Abbott Associates
Stewart Ross Associates

Storey Sons & Parker
Strutt & Parker
Sure Start (Birkenhead Central)
Survey & Design Associates
Sustrans
Taylor Woodrow Developments
Taylor Young
Terrence O'Rourke
Tetlow King Planning
The BMF Foundation
Thomas Estates Limited
Thorneycroft Residents Association
Thornton Hough Community Trust
Tower Action Group
Townswomen Wirral 101-25
Tranmere Alliance
Tranmere Together
Tulip Limited
Turley Associates
Tweedale
Twentieth Century Society
Unichema Chemicals
Unilever Research Port Sunlight
Unilever UK Home and Personal Care
Union Street Day Resource Centre
United Co-operatives Ltd
Venture Housing Association
Villa Medical Centre
Wainhomes (North West) Limited
Wallasey Civic Society
Wallasey Village Community Partnership
Wardell Armstrong
Wellington Road CAAC

CAAC
Residents Association
1
Badger Group
Jst
Commerce

Wirral Federation of Tenants & Residents
Associations
Wirral Footpaths and Open Spaces
Society
Wirral Green Belt Council
Wirral Green Party
Wirral Hackey Section
Wirral Hospitals Trust
Wirral Investment Network
Wirral LA21 Forum

Wirral Methodist Housing Association
Wirral Metropolitan College
Wirral Partnership Homes
Wirral PCT, Public Health Department
Wirral Transport Users Association
Woodford Group
Woodland Trust