

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247214	LPIO-12382		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247492	LPIO-12476		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1240843	LPIO-12645		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247578	LPIO-12843		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247510	LPIO-12967		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1243700	LPIO-1301	yes								
1246335	LPIO-13089		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246853	LPIO-13359		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246852	LPIO-13481		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247746	LPIO-13635		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1244629	LPIO-1372		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the fundamental issue of Council figures on housing needs to be re-assessed as they are quite out of context with regards to the Wirral. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1242183	LPIO-13952		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247218	LPIO-14048		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247219	LPIO-14153		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247220	LPIO-14251		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247222	LPIO-14382		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247226	LPIO-14470		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247245	LPIO-14560		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246827	LPIO-14689		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1239377	LPIO-1470	yes	Employment land should be sourced by regenerating old dockland and industrial areas. If the Council revised their housing needs figures to more realistic quantities based on what it knows about Wirral, then with a little more effort, there should be enough brownfield employment land for both new industry and housing.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1238043	LPIO-1480	yes								
1247246	LPIO-15309		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247248	LPIO-15409		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247251	LPIO-15526		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247252	LPIO-15618		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1242519	LPIO-1562	yes								
1247274	LPIO-15708		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1238835	LPIO-1581	yes	It would make sense to re-cycle any and all brownfield sites for whatever purposes are appropriate. Clearly, a regeneration of the Wirral docklands areas area a priority for the regeneration of the borough. Therefore, once the industrial target has been met, we need to utilise any remaining brownfield land accordingly. As mentioned earlier, the suggested 12,000 units is an over-exaggeration. Wirral Borough Council needs to re-think their plans and use any and all funding appropriately, in order to maximise all financial returns.							
1247275	LPIO-15815		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247935	LPIO-15887		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1244969	LPIO-1594	yes	I would still like to comment. Regular review of the local plan to 2035 and beyond will allow the balance of employment and housing land to complement each other as more brown field land is identified and brought forward aided by close association with the Owners of brown field and WBC. This would seem to be a sensible approach and one that has not been adhered closely to in the past. This is failing the people of Wirral by not regenerating and recycling land which should not be left to future generations to address, real opportunities exist now.							
1247936	LPIO-15964		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1244898	LPIO-1606	yes	Most definitely - see my response to Q2.6a All Council Growth scenarios, Studies and Reports over recent years have been grossly exaggerated wish-lists blown up in glossy brochures, bearing little resemblance to reality. Actual results have been disappointing and Birkenhead continues to decline. The Council should have looked and must now look at opportunities along our emptying high streets and vast tracts of land set aside (and idle for years) for future business which may not come. Look to use these assets for things that are real and in demand, including Housing. If there ever is a boom time in the future, we may have to consider releasing Green Belt but certainly not until then. Meanwhile, the Council's absurd clinging on to a nonsense Housing Need figure of 12,000 houses to be added to existing Stock (in addition to all conversion and other gains and replacements) risks landowners and developers forcing through green belt release when there is sufficient brownfield and non-green belt opportunities and capacity for both Housing and all Other Uses.							
1247287	LPIO-16184		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247344	LPIO-16271		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247349	LPIO-16359		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247353	LPIO-16446		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1247354	LPIO-16535		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247434	LPIO-16631		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247436	LPIO-16744		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247437	LPIO-16847		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247439	LPIO-16848		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247960	LPIO-17167		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247962	LPIO-17254		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247966	LPIO-17359		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247971	LPIO-17461		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247126	LPIO-17554		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247979	LPIO-17656		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247980	LPIO-17657		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245069	LPIO-1782	no	Why would there be a need to build new housing is a) the population is not increasing and b) there were no more employment opportunities. To build houses on potential employment areas is not the answer.							
1245502	LPIO-17846		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247541	LPIO-17948		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245060	LPIO-1795	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247539	LPIO-18050		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1237857	LPIO-18128		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1247996	LPIO-18207		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1241669	LPIO-183	yes								
1238379	LPIO-1905		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures for housing are unrealistically high. There should therefore be well enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1245083	LPIO-2012	yes	We should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1237870	LPIO-2054	yes	If the Council are going to regenerate BROWNFIELD SITES ONLY then I am in agreement. The present figures quoted by the Council are, however, way off. We have enough Brownfield Sites in Wirral to accommodate future regeneration. WE DO NOT NEED TO BUILD ON GREENBELT LAND.							
1238036	LPIO-2099	yes								
1238156	LPIO-21	yes	Yes - consistent with my comments in response to the previous question, the changing nature of employment means that clear boundaries as to what constitutes "employment land" and "housing land" are perhaps less relevant than they were in the second half part of the last century.							
1246851	LPIO-21141		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246918	LPIO-21233		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246924	LPIO-21234		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246928	LPIO-21235		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245112	LPIO-2128	yes								
1246920	LPIO-21495		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246926	LPIO-21496		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1244826	LPIO-2377	no	Employment land around the docklands and run-down urban areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, Wirral Borough Council figures on housing are completely exorbitant. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1248794	LPIO-23834		In line with government guidance, we support the re-designation of potentially surplus employment land for alternative uses, particularly for new housing development in suitable locations. This will directly assist the Council in meeting its significant need and requirement for new homes, which is currently constrained by the availability of land within the urban area and is consequently placing pressure on the Council to consider releasing green field and Green Belt land for housing. We have reviewed the Council's Local Plan evidence base and recognise that the Council has started the process of applying this approach to some of the existing employment land in the Borough, particularly within the Hind Street area of Birkenhead. We support the Council's proposals and would encourage the Council to extend this approach to the land north of Hind Street and west of Jackson Street to encompass all of the land identified to be included within the Hind Street strategic mixed site (figure A2.3 Local Plan Issues and Options document). In doing so, we would ask the Council to recognise the importance of key local employers to the success of mixed use areas, particularly in the Hind Street area where it would be appropriate to reorganise land uses, including the relocation of existing users to more appropriate locations within the strategic mixed use area boundary. This is something that the Council's own assessment in the ELOS recognises, recommending that opportunities to deliver employment as part of a mix of uses be explored by the Council and partners if viable so as to create a vibrant community, opportunities for small business space, and create local and highly accessible employment opportunities in a central and significant area.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684986						
1242185	LPIO-23880	yes	Yes, it would be logical to allow surplus employment land to be used for other suitable land uses, such as housing, depending on factors such as public open space deficiency and biodiversity. We agree an additional margin should be added for flexibility but recommend this is capped at 20 hectares.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006				
1242185	LPIO-23881	yes	Yes, it would be logical to allow surplus employment land to be used for other suitable land uses, such as housing, depending on factors such as public open space deficiency and biodiversity. We agree an additional margin should be added for flexibility but recommend this is capped at 20 hectares.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684263	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5657006				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248520	LPIO-24308		In line with government guidance, we support the re-designation of potentially surplus employment land for alternative uses, particularly for new housing development in suitable locations. This will directly assist the Council in meeting its significant need and requirement for new homes, which is currently constrained by the availability of land within the urban area and is consequently placing pressure on the Council to consider releasing greenfield and Green Belt land for housing. We have reviewed the Council's Local Plan evidence base and recognise that the Council has started the process of applying this approach to some of the existing employment land in the Borough, particularly within the Hind Street area of Birkenhead. We support the Council's proposals and would encourage the Council to extend this approach to the land north of Hind Street and west of Jackson Street to encompass all of the land identified to be included within the Hind Street Strategic Mixed site (figure A2.3 Local Plan Issues and Options document). In doing so, we would ask the Council to recognise the importance of existing key local employers, to the success of mixed use areas, particularly in the Hind Street area where it would be appropriate to reorganise land uses, including the relocation of existing users to more appropriate locations within the strategic mixed use area boundary. This is something that the Council's own assessment in the ELOS recognises, recommending that opportunities to deliver employment as part of a mix of uses be explored by the Council and partners if viable, so as to create a vibrant community, opportunities for small business space, and create local and highly accessible employment opportunities in a central and significant area.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684265						
1248525	LPIO-24323		We reserve the right to comment on the individual merits of the alternative methodologies for calculating employment land. We strongly agree that the Council should designate surplus employment land in the Borough for alternative use, including new housing, which would contribute positively to the Council's for urban regeneration and renewal.							
1248542	LPIO-24348		The Council has to identify a broad range of sites in the urban area if it is to meet its housing requirement over the plan period. For this reason, we believe that it would be prudent to fully explore the potential for the re-designation of previously developed employment land for housing. The evidence presented in relation to economic need is an uncertain 'science'. In contrast, the calculations surrounding housing need is well tested and the standard methodology has been stated by the Government as the way which minimum housing targets should be calculated. Wirral Council also has a history of under provision of housing, which needs to be remedied. The re-designation of employment land for housing could assist the Council in making up the previous shortfall before greenfield development is required	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684894						
1237647	LPIO-246	yes	Care should be taken to reserve land for development opportunities, rather than re-allocating all "surplus" employment land.							
1248626	LPIO-24627		In line with Government guidance, support the re-designation of potentially surplus employment land for alternative uses, particularly for new housing development in suitable locations. This will directly assist the Council in meeting its significant need and requirement for new homes, which is currently constrained by the availability of land within the urban area and is consequently placing pressure on the Council to consider releasing greenfield and Green Belt land for housing.							
1242697	LPIO-24645		The land should be ready for either use – employment or housing. Use as housing would be consistent with the preferred option not to release Green Belt.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659118	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659119	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659120	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5659121			
1248749	LPIO-24810		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684847	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684848	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684845				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248769	LPIO-24932		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5659045	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684957	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5659039	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5659038	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684956		
1248823	LPIO-25035		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5674317	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684865	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684849				
1248832	LPIO-25139		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684857	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5659562					
1248833	LPIO-25249		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5661125	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5661100	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5661124	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5661120			
1248546 Wirral Wildlife	LPIO-2535	yes	Should the 5-yearly reviews reveal that there is not uptake for this amount of industry, then it would be beneficial to re-zone for mixed use developments, where people can live within walking/cycling distance of their workplace. This would reduce their carbon footprint. Retail is changing yearly, needing less shops, and to tackle climate change we need to reduce consumption of material goods. There may well be more retail space become available e.g. the modern group of shops on New Chester Road opposite Carlett Park, Eastham is now mostly vacant. Rather than letting this retail property stand idle and become derelict, as has happened in New Ferry, surplus retail should be released for other uses, including different employment uses and housing, providing work and housing in close proximity to reduce the need to travel. It is essential to reduce overall travel as well as switch to more sustainable modes if we are to meet climate change commitments.							
1248956	LPIO-25351		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5684852	https://wirral-consult-objective.co.uk/file/5677474					

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1248986	LPIO-25445		Do not encourage the use of a lower growth scenario. The Council has a growth strategy in place which looks to regenerate Birkenhead and the 'urban conurbation'. The provision of a low employment growth strategy has the potential to create gaps in the job market and could risk investment opportunities in Wirral. The inability to provide sufficient employment opportunities could lead to significant out migration to surrounding authorities and dramatic impact on the economy of the Wirral. The employment strategy needs to align with the growth strategy of the region, to ensure sustainable development of the region. The under provision of job opportunities in the Wirral will lead to more workers having to commute further distances to access job opportunities. Recognise that the past trends scenario results in the highest level of employment land required when compared to the SHELMA baseline and growth scenarios, so taking forward the past trends scenario within the Plan is a positive approach to jobs growth, that we encourage. The issue we have is that the housing requirement, based on the standard method, is not aligned with the significant job growth envisaged in the past completion scenario. Inconsistencies between the housing requirement and employment land requirement, would have consequences for commuter or migration patterns.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662722	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662725	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5662770				
1244896	LPIO-2550	yes	Most definitely - see my response to Q2.6a All Council Growth scenarios, Studies and Reports over recent years have been grossly exaggerated wish-lists blown up in glossy brochures, bearing little resemblance to reality. Actual results have been disappointing and Birkenhead continues to decline. The Council should have looked and must now look at opportunities along our emptying high streets and vast tracts of land set aside (and idle for years) for future business which may not come. Look to use these assets for things that are real and in demand, including Housing. If there ever is a boom time in the future, we may have to consider releasing Green Belt but certainly not until then. Meanwhile, the Council's absurd clinging on to a nonsense Housing Need figure of 12,000 houses to be added to existing Stock (in addition to all conversion and other gains and replacements) risks landowners and developers forcing through green belt release when there is sufficient brownfield and non-green belt opportunities and capacity for both Housing and all Other Uses.							
1249015	LPIO-25562		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684897						
1249070	LPIO-25632		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684896	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5679650					
1246458	LPIO-25685		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246459	LPIO-25686		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1249100	LPIO-25862		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677514	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677512	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684898	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684949	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677509		
1249100	LPIO-25862		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684951	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677510	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5684895	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677508	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677511		
1249100	LPIO-25862		Even if the Council did apply lower growth rates, this does not mean that employment sites would be suitable for housing. The suitability of each site would still need to be assessed because a suitable employment site does not always equate to a suitable residential site.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677513	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677516	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/5677507				

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1249746	LPIO-26389 1 of 2		We consider that the basic premise of this question is flawed as employment land may become surplus because specific sites are unsuitable for a variety of reasons, rather than because there is an excessive quantity available. Firstly, we do not agree that the Council should contemplate constraining economic development and associated regeneration. This would be the inevitable result of failing to facilitate previous take-up levels through ensuring the availability of appropriate sites. As set out in NPPF, the planning system includes an overarching economic objective "to help build a strong, responsive and competitive economy, by ensuring that sufficient land of the right types is available in the right places and at the right time to support growth, innovation and improved productivity". Paragraph 8 of the Framework specifies that this is one of the objectives which must be pursued in order to achieve sustainable development, and a Plan which failed to satisfy the requirement for employment land would not be positively prepared and thereby 'sound' under paragraph 35. Secondly, the question presents a false choice. This matter is addressed in section 11 of the Framework, which advocates making effective use of land. Often, land of poor quality for continued employment use is previously developed and within the existing urban area. Paragraph 118 advises that planning policies should: give substantial weight to the value of using suitable brownfield land within settlements for homes and other identified needs, and support appropriate opportunities to remediate despoiled, degraded, derelict, contaminated or unstable land; promote and support the development of under-utilised land and buildings, especially if this would help to meet identified needs for housing where land supply is constrained and available sites could be used more effectively.	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/33	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/37	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/35	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/38	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/39	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/36	https://wirral-consult.objective.co.uk/file/56836/57
1249746	LPIO-26389 2 of 2		The Framework supports regular reviews of both the land allocated for development and of land availability. Where there is no reasonable prospect of land coming forward for an allocated use, this should be reallocated for a more deliverable use that can help to address identified needs. Planning Practice Guidance (ID: 2a-02920190220) highlights how there may be a mismatch between quantitative and qualitative supply of and demand for employment sites, which should be identified through a proper analysis of supply and demand. In the context of Wirral, lack of demand arises primarily because of the deficiencies of specific sites rather than due to an absence of need within a given economic sector. Given the complex nature of many brownfield sites, redevelopment for employment is likely to require gap funding. Where these opportunities are in secondary locations away from the strategic road network and constrained by sensitive uses on adjoining land, they are highly unlikely to receive the investment required. It can only hinder economic growth if such sites are relied upon to meet employment land needs, yet are unlikely to come forward because of unduly optimistic assumptions. An example is land at the far north of the Wirral International Business Park (SHLAA2072), which is the subject of a separate representation to the 'Call for Sites' exercise. This would naturally form Phase 2 of a recent residential development, and would otherwise be constrained by the presence of existing housing to the west and south, even if it were to be viable and attractive to the market, of which there is no evidence.							
1245180	LPIO-2649	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing							
1237944	LPIO-265	no	This land is needed to provide much needed green space to meet Environmental requirements (e.g UK targets for CO2 reduction). If the land is needed for future employment or housing needs within the 15 years, then it is available. Suggest tree planting, as it is quick, cheap, and low maintenance, and less need to undertake major Works to make the land suitable for residential use in the short term, plus they are financial investment for the land owner. Rather than face the expensive redevelopment costs of brownfield sites for housing, the planted trees can be harvested as a 'cash crop' later, while also removing local air pollution during the years the trees are growing.							
1245058	LPIO-2680	yes								
1245073	LPIO-2690	yes	So long as the land in question is brownfield land I absolutely agree. Having new home constructed in the close proximity to new employment businesses makes perfect sense. It reduces the need for travelling and helps the Council meet its climate change objectives. It makes the homes attractive to new employees and is more likely to result in a higher proportion of affordable homes. It is also likely to improve the neighbourhood of the employment areas and create new communities.							
1241891	LPIO-278	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing							
1245159	LPIO-2956	no	We should retain that land for future employment growth in the future beyond the end date of the local plan.							
1241315	LPIO-3024	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing							
1245289	LPIO-3035	yes								
1245287	LPIO-3044	no	Not if the housing need can be satisfied by the proposed housing sites							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1237904	LPIO-3151	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245346	LPIO-3248	yes								
1238549	LPIO-336	yes								
1240653	LPIO-3423	yes								
1241770	LPIO-3424	yes								
1245437	LPIO-3503	yes	It is imperative that surplus employment land is used for residential rather than green belt. Once the council recalculates a reasonable figure of houses needed, this should be catered for on brown belt only.							
1245457	LPIO-3583	yes	The figures need to be realistic though. Regeneration of former industrial land should suffice if you accept that 12k new homes is not at all realistic.							
1237667	LPIO-3663	yes								
1245443	LPIO-3677	yes	This would be an excellent solution to using our greenbelt and heritage sites							
1245288	LPIO-3696	yes								
1237827	LPIO-3767	yes								
1245496	LPIO-3855	yes								
1242359	LPIO-390	yes	There are many good sites with great views along the Mersey that are currently largely commercial and industrial. It would be a good idea to have residential accommodation on these sites.							
1245498	LPIO-3924	yes	definitely, this will aid in the regeneration of these neglected areas and with good design of homes and services potentially uplift/improve the areas permanently benefitting current residents and the entire borough.							
1245501	LPIO-3973	yes	Employment land in once industrial areas such as the docklands and along the Mersey banks should be regenerated. Yet, as the proposed housing requirement put forward by Wirral Council is vastly over inflated, there are ample brownfield employment land sites for both industry and housing.							
1240939	LPIO-4099	yes								
1245638	LPIO-4202	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas, should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245663	LPIO-4244	yes								
1241868	LPIO-4289	yes	Any surplus brownfield employment land could be used for housing.							
1237724	LPIO-4308	yes	Providing this can be done in a way to provide attractive, perhaps waterside residences. Care should be taken not to leave large tracts of unutilised land which continue to blight the area. People being rehoused may be some of the most needy and should to be given the very best start and supported in their new situation to make the very best of a new and attractive location.							
1244720	LPIO-4558	no	Using land designated for industrial uses should only be used for housing/recreation if that "surplus" land was brownfield.							
1242528	LPIO-465	no	all spare land should be allowed to regenerate to encourage an increase in usable habitat							
1237696	LPIO-4670	yes								
1241495	LPIO-4691	yes	Yes, surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses including, where suitable, new housing. Retail is changing. As more people shop online and out of town high street shops become vacant. This surplus retail property should be released for other uses including housing.							
1237873	LPIO-4812	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1245607	LPIO-4837	yes								
1241661	LPIO-4911	yes								
1243171	LPIO-4938	yes	WFPOSPS would reserve the right to challenge any development that impeded a public footpath, and in general we would urge that each new development site would have access to an open space (preferable a green space)							

Person ID	ID	Question 2.7 - If the Council were to calculate the need for employment land based on the lower Baseline or Growth scenarios, do you believe that potentially surplus employment land should be re-designated for alternative uses, including, where suitable, new housing development?	Question 2.7a - If No, please explain why (if you agree you can comment here):	Attachment 1	Attachment 2	Attachment 3	Attachment 4	Attachment 5	Attachment 6	Attachment 7
1246242	LPIO-7668		As above regeneration around the docklands is imperative. Peel Holdings are committed to developing 6000 homes @ Wirral Waters. However if the Council observes it's own housing figure from its Compendium of Statistics and Peel Holding are encouraged and supported by the Council then there is adequate brownfield for both housing and industry. Hence no need to build on Green Belt. As previously stated we do not agree with the Council's flawed projections.							
1246431	LPIO-7677	yes								
1246592	LPIO-7683	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246594	LPIO-7724	yes	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1240903	LPIO-7796	yes	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246591	LPIO-7878	yes								
1246598 Hoylake Vision	LPIO-8094	yes	Yes, as long as sufficient public amenity green space is included in line with a suitable and locally sensitive design code.							
1246605	LPIO-8109	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1243448	LPIO-813	yes								
1237882	LPIO-8244	no	Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing.							
1246612	LPIO-8246	yes	Although, if brownfield development were really pushed then employment and business opportunities would be needed next door to housing and both needs could be met on existing brownfield sites							
1245044	LPIO-8294	yes	Yes, recalculate the need for employment land, based on actual recent trends, and take Brexit, Climate Change and Coronavirus in to account. Use surplus employment land to create new sustainable communities including housing and smaller local businesses							
1244670	LPIO-8423		Employment land around the docklands and run down areas, once industrial areas should be regenerated. However, the Council figures on housing are completely extortionate. Therefore, we should have enough brownfield employment land for industry and housing							
1246624	LPIO-8521	yes	Surplus employment land should be primarily re-designated for housing. The greenbelt should not be touched							
1246544	LPIO-8536	yes	This is appropriate when there is likely to be increased working from home in the future. In addition, there seems to be significant redundant retail space, which could be used for suitable small new employment ventures with accommodation above; some new mixed-use development could be designed in this way							
1237832	LPIO-8587	yes								
1240872	LPIO-8592	no	No! perhaps this question highlights the issue with this local plan. The local plan is about doing what is right for the Wirral NOT just finding land to build more houses on! If there are no jobs to support the demand then why build the houses. Simply reducing employment land to build houses only exacerbates Wirral's issues even more. Only build what is required based on facts. The Growth data is grossly over estimated and undeliverable. Remove the Wirral from LCR. It adds no value and just saps Wirral's resources and ability to grow.							
1246631	LPIO-8655	yes	A fundamental principle should surely be that it is much better to maximise re-use and re-development of land that has already been built on, rather than developing green-field sites. Once the latter have been used, it is impossible to return them to their previous state, however much planners in the future may wish to. With the country and possibly the entire world facing a significant economic downturn, not to mention likely changes in the pattern of working and use of workspaces in the next few years, it would seem entirely sensible to re-designate potentially surplus employment land for alternative uses.							
1246638	LPIO-8670	yes								
1238116	LPIO-888	yes								
1246651	LPIO-8887	no	Q 2.7 answered in ERROR please disregard							

