

Hoylake Vision

(Hoylake Community Planning Forum)

Consultation Statement

SUBMISSION DRAFT – ELECTRONIC VERSION

September 2015

Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended) (the 1990 Act)

Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012 (as amended) (the Regulations)

Submission Date: 18 September 2015

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION		Page 3
2. INITIAL CONSULTATION SURVEY: <i>WHAT'S YOUR VISION?</i> – OCTOBER 2012 TO JANUARY 2013		Page 7
3. PUBLIC CONSULTATION OPEN DAYS – MARCH 2012		Page 12
4. ISSUES-BASED PUBLIC MEETINGS		Page 13
5. OTHER PUBLIC EVENTS: WALK THE PLAN		Page 14
6. OTHER CONSULTATION AND PROMOTION CHANNELS		Page 15
7. PRE-DRAFT CONSULTATION: WHO HAS BEEN CONSULTED?		Page 16
8. HOW PEOPLE HAVE BEEN CONSULTED		Page 17
9. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION AND PROMOTION OF THE REFERENDUM		Page 18
10. HOW THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED		Page 19
11. CONCLUSION		Page 21
APPENDIX I	Methodology for analysis of <i>What's Your Vision?</i> consultation responses	Page 22
APPENDIX II	Issues upon which NO CLEAR CONSENSUS was reached	Page 23
APPENDIX III	Issues upon which A CLEAR CONSENSUS was achieved	Page 25
APPENDIX IV	List of statutory consultees	Page 32
APPENDIX V	<i>Hoylake Vision</i>: formal documentation	Page 39
APPENDIX VI	Text of pre-submission consultation public notice	Page 42
APPENDIX VII	Transcriptions of pre-submission consultation responses	Page 43
APPENDIX VIII	Analysis of pre-submission consultation responses	Page 58

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. This Consultation Statement (CS) has been prepared to fulfil the legal obligations of s.15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations, which sets out what a CS must contain, namely:

- Details of the persons and bodies who were consulted about the proposed neighbourhood development plan;
- An explanation of how they were consulted;
- A summary of the main issues and concerns raised by those persons consulted;
- A description of how these issues and concerns have been considered and, where relevant, addressed in the neighbourhood development plan.

1.2. A much greater level of consultation has been undertaken than the legislation requires, and this is set out in detail in the appendices and online resources for which links are provided in the text. It is not our intention to unnecessarily replicate the content of these detailed sources.

1.3. The aims of the Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) consultation process were:

- To ‘front-load’ consultation, so that the NDP would be informed by the views of local people and other stakeholders from the start of the process;
- To ensure that consultation events took place at critical points in the process where decisions needed to be taken;
- To engage with as wide a range of people as possible, using a variety of events and communication techniques, and
- To ensure that the results of consultation events were fed back to local people and made available to read in both hard copy and via electronic media as soon as possible after the event.

- 1.4. The initial stages of consultation were undertaken by *Hoyle Village Life*, a community group established in late 2009, which successfully applied for Neighbourhood Planning Frontrunner status in 2011 under the terms of the Localism Bill. When the Regulations came into force in 2012, *Hoyle Village Life* had to be formally redesignated as a “qualifying body”. This new body is formally named *Hoyle Community Planning Forum* (the Forum) but is known colloquially as *Hoyle Vision*. At the time of redesignation, the Forum had 43 members (including the original *Hoyle Village Life* membership). It is governed by a management committee of 12. Following the statutory designation process, which was managed by *The Metropolitan Borough of Wirral* (the Council), the Forum has conducted all subsequent consultations relating to the NDP.
- 1.5. The consultation referred to in this document has therefore been undertaken by either *Hoyle Village Life* as a Neighbourhood Planning Frontrunner or subsequently by the Forum in partnership with its consultant, *IBI Taylor Young*, with support from *Planning Aid England* and *Locality*.
- 1.6. The following consultation events and activities have taken place:

Initial consultation survey: *What’s Your Vision?*

- **October to December 2012** – Billboard campaign to promote *What’s Your Vision?* survey.
- **December 2012 to January 2013** – *What’s Your Vision?* survey. Published online and in hard copy. 500 forms were completed and 5,000 additional comments were received, collated and published.

Public consultation open days

- HOYLAKE COMMUNITY CENTRE, HOYLE ROAD – Saturday 24 March 2012, 13:00-15:00 and 19:00-21:30;
- HOYLAKE CHAPEL, STATION ROAD – Monday 26 March 2012, 19:00-21:30;
- HOYLAKE CHAPEL, STATION ROAD – Tuesday 27 March 2012, 13:00-15:00;
- ST LUKE’S CHURCH, MARKET STREET – Wednesday 28 March 2012, 13:00-15:00 and 19:30-21:30;
- MELROSE HALL, MELROSE AVENUE – Saturday 31 March 2012, 13:00-15:00 and 19:00-21:30;

- ST HILDEBURGH'S CHURCH, STANLEY ROAD – Wednesday 11 April 2012, 12:00noon-14:00, and
- ST HILDEBURGH'S CHURCH, STANLEY ROAD – Thursday 12 April, 19:00-21:30.

Issues-based public meetings

- ST LUKE'S CHURCH, MARKET STREET – Thursday 21 February 2013, ***Conversation: The Beach***
- ST LUKE'S CHURCH, MARKET STREET – Thursday 25 April 2013, ***Conversation: The Future of Hoylake at Night***

Other public events: *Walk The Plan*

- Guided public perambulation – Saturday 18 May 2013

Other consultation and promotion channels

- Websites www.hoylakevision.org.uk and www.hoylakevillage.org.uk, both operated and maintained by members of the Forum;
- On-screen advertisements at [Hoylake Community Cinema](#);
- General communications updates via other organisations (e.g. *HELP shop, Hoylake Business Network, Hoylake Town Team*, and
- *Hoylake Village* social media channels, including Facebook (1,600+) and Twitter (2,200+).

- 1.7. The pre-submission consultation period commenced on 26 January 2015 and ended on 11 March 2015. A public notice was published in two consecutive issues of the *Wirral Globe* newspaper (21 and 28 January 2015) and on its website. The notice was also reproduced on the *Hoylake Vision* website. The text of the notice, which complies with Regulation 14 of the Regulations, can be found at Appendix VI.
- 1.8. Subject to any statutory limits upon expenditure, future planned consultation for the purpose of promoting the referendum is likely to include:

- A billboard campaign;
- Social media;
- Distribution of a 1-page Executive Summary of the NDP, and
- Media coverage.

1.9. The CS provides an overview of each of the above stages and activities of consultation in accordance with s.15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations. Full details are provided in the appendices and online sources linked to in the text.

2. INITIAL CONSULTATION SURVEY: WHAT'S YOUR VISION? – OCTOBER 2012 TO JANUARY 2013

2.1. A hard copy survey form was sent to every household and business in Hoylake. The exercise was supported by a billboard campaign, national radio coverage and a high profile social media promotion. The survey asked a series of questions under the following thematic headings, as well as inviting additional comments and suggestions:

- [IMPROVING THE HIGH STREET](#)
- [IMPROVING HOYLAKE'S OPEN SPACES](#)
- [GETTING AROUND HOYLAKE](#)
- [SPECIAL BUILDINGS AND PLACES](#)
- [HOYLAKE AT NIGHT](#)
- [CELEBRATING AND PROMOTING HOYLAKE](#)
- [INDUSTRY AROUND CARR LANE](#)
- [HOMES IN HOYLAKE](#)
- [ADDITIONAL COMMENTS](#)

2.2. There was an excellent response rate. Over 550 forms were completed and returned online and in hard copy, representing over 10% of Hoylake households within the NDP area. In addition to responses to the questions from the survey, there were over 5,000 comments received, ranging from the very broad down to highly specific details. All of these were collated and published on the website and a summary of comments and survey responses published in hard copy. Comments were received from individuals as well as a wide range of businesses and organisations. Click on any of the themes listed above to see all of the responses received transcribed in full.

Improving the High Street (i.e. the town centre)

Improving Hoylake town centre was identified as an important task by the Forum. It was agreed among the participating residents that there is a need to:

- Encourage a higher standard of shopfront design with more traditional signage and canopies;
- Continue the pavement improvements along the rest of Market Street and outside Hoylake station, and
- Encourage retail/leisure business at street level with other uses (e.g. offices or flats) on upper floors.

Getting Around Hoylake

Improving accessibility in Hoylake was identified as an important task by the Forum. It was agreed among the participating residents that there is a need for:

- Easier, quicker and safer ways for the whole community to cross Market Street, Birkenhead Road and the railway line;
- More pedestrian crossings, and
- Better public transport.

Hoylake at Night

Opinion about the night time economy is very divided, and the issue provokes strong views.

- Bars and restaurants should be supported because they attract more people to Hoylake, fill shop units and boost the local economy;
- Better quality bars are needed;
- Increased noise would disturb residents' peace;
- There are already too many bars in Hoylake;
- Later licences should be allowed in specific locations to help Hoylake compete with other towns;
- The night time economy should be better managed, with bar owners and authorities working together more closely to develop a more neighbourly management style;

- Developing alternative uses. For example, a new cinema (or expansion of the existing *Hoylelake Community Cinema*), facilities for young people, an arts venue, along with later opening cafes, shops and services, and
- Later running public transport and taxis to allow people to leave Hoylelake more quickly at night and not hang around to disturb residents.

As with the revival of the town centre, issues surrounding the night time economy are complex and inter-related. A successful evening economy can be a huge asset for a town but the impact of activity upon local residents must also be considered, particularly late at night. There is public support for a more diverse evening economy, with a particular focus on the twilight (i.e. 17:00-19:00) and a 'family friendly' evening economy. There is also strong support for better co-ordination between interested parties (e.g. leisure operators and the Police).

Improving Hoylelake's Open Spaces

- Lack of adequate facilities and activities for young people;
- More play areas for smaller children and recreation areas for older children;
- Improve existing parks and play areas (especially Queens Park) and institute continuous maintenance programmes for playground equipment;
- The promenade is 'sterile' with nothing to attract people. We need somewhere to eat, have an ice cream and shelter from the wind;
- Better maintenance of the promenade, including road and pavement surfaces, lighting, shelters and railings, and
- Divided opinion about a skate park. Many want a skate park for younger people. Others express concerns about attracting trouble and how to manage safety issues.

Special Buildings and Places

- Institute greater protection for and enhancement of older buildings;
- Prevent the demolition of any more landmark features (e.g. *Horn Arcade*, cinemas, public baths etc.);

- Find new uses for empty and underused buildings (e.g. The Quadrant, the promenade toilet block and the old lifeboat station), and
- Hoylake should be promoting its special features and successes more.

This section links well with other themes, such as promoting Hoylake. A clear identity is needed which will guide many of the ideas. There is an emphasis on the conservation of buildings and current controls to protect our built heritage need to be examined to see how robust current policies are.

Celebrating and Promoting Hoylake

- Hoylake needs a clearly defined identity;
- Promote the special features of the area and the town through developing the arts, music, traditional seaside foods (ice cream, fish and chips, seafood), dining out, outdoor sports, birdwatching, golf events, Lifeboat Museum, and Viking heritage;
- Promote Hoylake to the mainstream media (i.e. magazines, brochures, film-making);
- More visitor attractions (e.g. an arts centre, markets, and more cinema nights), and
- Make more of the promenade as an attraction, with environmental improvements and more facilities.

Most responses suggest that the community wants to attract more people to Hoylake, thereby boosting the local economy. There is an understanding that Hoylake needs to be better promoted.

Homes in Hoylake

- Attract young people and young families by providing affordable housing;
- Vacant land should be developed for uses other than residential;
- Shops on the periphery of the town centre and the upper floors of all shops should be converted into residential use;
- Older, larger buildings should not be demolished to make way for new, higher density development, and

- Hoylake does not have the infrastructure (i.e. schools, play areas, car parking and facilities for young people) to support more housing.

Many people feel that there needs to be more provision for young people and families; a concern which appears in a number of other sections. There is also a concern that Hoylake could become too crammed with residential buildings, when one of the main attractors of the area at present is a sense of space.

Industry around Carr Lane

- Carr Lane Industrial Estate is vital to the local economy;
- Encourage the development of creative manufacturing businesses to ensure that Hoylake maintains a strong economic base for the future of employment in the area;
- Promote the Carr Lane Industrial Estate much more (e.g. clearer signage, a map board of businesses, a promotional guide to encourage businesses to locate there);
- Improve access across the railway line and/or develop a new road access from the south;
- Better connections between residential areas of Hoylake and the Carr Lane Industrial Estate;
- Institute a major upgrade of buildings, the public realm and business infrastructure on the Carr Lane Industrial Estate, and
- Improve the quality of homes and the residential environment around Carr Lane.

These issues can only be addressed through conversations with businesses, property owners and residents.

3. PUBLIC CONSULTATION OPEN DAYS – MARCH 2012

- 3.1. A total of ten events were held at various times on different days and at several venues around Hoylake. All feedback was subsequently recorded and added to the *What's Your Vision?* survey results. All of these responses were uploaded to the *Hoylake Vision* website during May 2012.
- 3.2. The open days were the first face-to-face public consultation events about the NDP, following on from responses to the *What's Your Vision?* survey. Display boards invited people to comment by leaving written comments. Maps of the NDP area were on display and advisors from *Planning Aid England* and *Locality* were on hand to help throughout. Also displayed was work undertaken by two *University of Liverpool (Department of Civic Design)* student teams that was initiated by *Hoylake Village Life* in 2011. The results of their work were presented on display panels and as interactive electronic presentations.¹
- 3.3. The primary aims of the open days were: 1) to report back on the results of the *What's Your Vision?* survey to the general public, and 2) to identify any further issues, concerns and hopes for the future, which would further inform the thematic underpinning of the NDP. Attendance at these sessions was low, although there was excellent interaction between volunteers and those members of the public who did attend. Many left comments and expressed interest in becoming involved. The majority of people who attended were Hoylake residents, although some landowners and developers attended too.

¹ See <http://www.hoylakevision.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2012/11/Hoylake-B-report.pdf> and <https://prezi.com/-w9rflsozne1/transforming-hoylake/>

4. ISSUES-BASED PUBLIC MEETINGS

- 4.1. In order to further fire the imagination of local people and encourage greater participation, we held two public meetings on issues where the survey demonstrated that there was no clear consensus. Beach management and the night time economy were chosen as two issues that raise ongoing concerns in the community, demonstrated by a polarisation of views, and high levels of comments in response to the survey. Although the issues cannot be directly influenced by any policy the plan may develop (since both are dealt with under existing legislation and planning rules), both meetings were very well attended, which led to greater awareness of the NDP amongst participants and an enhanced understanding on the part of the Forum of differing points of view on the issues.

5. OTHER PUBLIC EVENTS: WALK THE PLAN

- 5.1. A public walk was attended by several local people. Participants walked through the town, inviting comment on the issues raised in the *What's Your Vision?* survey and looking at areas highlighted in the draft NDP that offer potential development opportunities. All comments received were added to the *Hoylake Vision* [website](#).

6. OTHER CONSULTATION AND PROMOTION CHANNELS

- 6.1. The Forum has employed a website, accessed at: www.hoylakevision.org.uk and associated social media to promote the NDP. Through these channels news of meetings and events spread quickly through the community, reaching approximately 25% of households directly and with immediacy. The support of other organisations including the *HELP shop*, public library and local businesses in making available hard copy notices of meetings has been invaluable for those residents and businesses who do not use electronic communications and/or social media. The NDP and the work of the Forum has also been promoted by on-screen advertisements at [Hoylake Community Cinema](#), which reaches between about 80 and up to 130 people per screening.

7. PRE-DRAFT CONSULTATION: WHO HAS BEEN CONSULTED

7.1. The aims of the initial consultation stage was to raise awareness of the forthcoming draft NDP and to reach as many local households and businesses as possible, seeking their views as to how the NDP content should be developed. The pre-draft consultation was also publicised in the following ways:

- A 10-minute feature on BBC Radio 4's *The World Tonight* presented by Charlotte Ashton on the topic of Localism, with a focus on Hoylake;
- A 3-month long billboard campaign;
- Regular articles and updates on the *Hoylake Village Life* website;
- Regular promotion on associated social media channels;
- Press releases to local media;
- 5,000 hard copies of the *What's Your Vision?* survey delivered to every household in Hoylake, and
- On-screen advertisements in the monthly *Hoylake Community Cinema* programme (last Friday of every month).

8. HOW PEOPLE HAVE BEEN CONSULTED

- 8.1. The main way for people to contribute was through the *What's Your Vision?* survey. However, comments were received through other channels (i.e. social media, websites and via the HELP shop). Forum meetings were held at physical locations, at which members were encouraged to raise concerns or feed ideas into the NDP. There is a strong network of community groups in Hoylake and feedback was received from many of its constituent groups.
- 8.2. The *Hoylake Village Life* e-mail list contains over 1,200 addresses, which enables free and rapid communication by e-mail with approximately 10% of the community. This continues to be used alongside social media and other channels to promote the availability of the draft NDP.
- 8.3. A one page 'executive summary' of the draft NDP was distributed during the pre-submission consultation stage.

9. PRE-SUBMISSION CONSULTATION AND PROMOTION OF THE REFERENDUM

- 9.1. The pre-submission consultation period commenced on 26 January 2015 and ended on 11 March 2015. A public notice was published in two consecutive issues of the *Wirral Globe* newspaper (21 and 28 January 2015) and on its website. The notice was also reproduced on the *Hoylake Vision* website. The text of the notice, which complies with Regulation 14 of the Regulations, can be found at Appendix VI.
- 9.2. The comments received during the pre-submission consultation period are transcribed at Appendix VII and are also reproduced on the *Hoylake Vision* website.
- 9.3. Members of *The Forum* voted in favour of submitting the NDP to the Council at a meeting held on 12 May 2015.² The submission draft NDP was formally submitted to the Council on 18 September 2015.
- 9.4. Subject to any statutory limits upon expenditure, future planned consultation for the purpose of promoting the referendum is likely to include:
 - A billboard campaign;
 - Social media;
 - Distribution of a 1-page Executive Summary of the NDP, and
 - Media coverage.

² To allow for the greatest possible involvement, postal voting was permitted

10. HOW THE ISSUES AND CONCERNS HAVE BEEN CONSIDERED

- 10.1. All consultation responses – formal and informal, electronic, analogue and verbal – have been collated and published on the *Hoylake Vision* website. Once the bulk of responses to the *What's Your Vision?* survey were received an exercise was undertaken to establish where consensus existed and where there was none. The methodology used is explained at Appendix I below. Appendices II and III show the raw data sorted by whether consensus exists or not, following the application of the methodology.
- 10.2. Where consensus does not exist consultation continues but the areas where consensus does exist offer the best hope for planning positively for the future of Hoylake and preparing policies that will gain the support of a majority of those voting at the referendum.
- 10.3. These areas of consensus have been used by the Forum's consultants, *IBI Taylor Young*, to refine the themes around which the NDP Vision, Objectives, Policies and Priorities have been developed. Thus, there is a clear evidential link between outcomes of the consultation process and the framework upon which the NDP has been constructed.
- 10.4. The six themes of the NDP are:
- **Improving the Town Centre**
 - **The Promenade and Recreation**
 - **Getting Around Hoylake**
 - **Special Buildings and Places**
 - **Homes in Hoylake**
 - **Enhancing Carr Lane Industrial Estate**
- 10.5. All pre-submission draft consultation responses were analysed and those considered to contain substantive issues

were discussed by the Forum and, where appropriate, changes to the draft NDP were made. The table at Appendix VIII summarises this process.

11. CONCLUSION

11.1. This CS, along with its supporting appended information and links are considered to comply with s.15(2) of Part 5 of the Regulations.

APPENDIX I
Methodology for analysis of *What's Your Vision?* consultation responses

Respondents were asked to prioritise actions against 8 pre-populated themes and to add their own actions on any other, self-selected, theme. The priorities were:

- Priority level 1: VERY LOW or STRONGLY DISAGREE**
- Priority level 2: LOW or DISAGREE**
- Priority level 3: NEUTRAL**
- Priority level 4: HIGH or AGREE**
- Priority level 5: IMMEDIATE or STRONGLY AGREE**

A CLEAR CONSENSUS (either in agreement or disagreement) is deemed to have been reached where the difference between the sum of percentages in priorities 1 and 2 and the sum of percentages in priorities 4 and 5 is greater than 10 percentage points.

NO CLEAR CONSENSUS (either in agreement or disagreement) is deemed to have been reached where the difference between the sum of percentages in priorities 1 and 2 and the sum of percentages in priorities 4 and 5 is 10 percentage points or less.

APPENDIX II
Issues upon which NO CLEAR CONSENSUS was reached

No more solid roller shutters on shops

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	119	23.24%
2	92	17.97%
3	110	21.48%
4	80	15.63%
5	111	21.68%

More street furniture, eg. seating or cycle racks

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	61	11.78%
2	117	22.59%
3	146	28.19%
4	118	22.78%
5	76	14.67%

Better pavement lighting

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	67	13.06%
2	93	18.13%
3	153	29.82%
4	112	21.83%
5	88	17.15%

Allowing the beach to evolve naturally and encouraging more wildlife

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	179	34.82%
2	52	10.12%
3	94	18.29%
4	73	14.20%
5	116	22.57%

Better signage to car parks, and places such as the Promenade and the railway stations

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	112	21.54%
2	105	20.19%
3	129	24.81%
4	89	17.12%
5	85	16.35%

Supporting later licenses for individual bars, pubs and restaurants provided that residents are not affected

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	144	27.69%
2	69	13.27%
3	94	18.08%
4	77	14.81%
5	136	26.15%

Speed restrictions for traffic

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	122	23.42%
2	60	11.52%
3	139	26.68%
4	95	18.23%
5	105	20.15%

A supply of affordable homes with low cost rent or purchase prices

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	102	19.77%
2	72	13.95%
3	118	22.87%
4	88	17.05%
5	136	26.36%

APPENDIX III
Issues upon which A CLEAR CONSENSUS was achieved

Higher standards of shopfront design

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	41	7.93%
2	56	10.83%
3	142	27.47%
4	151	29.21%
5	127	24.56%

Traditional awnings and canopies on shopfronts

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	59	11.37%
2	87	16.76%
3	129	24.86%
4	133	25.63%
5	111	21.39%

More traditional shopfront signage

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	60	11.63%
2	79	15.31%
3	148	28.68%
4	138	26.74%
5	91	17.64%

Continuing the pavement improvements along the rest of the high street and outside Hoylake Station

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	35	6.72%
2	57	10.94%
3	90	17.27%
4	146	28.02%
5	193	37.04%

Encouraging retail/leisure businesses at street level with other uses (eg offices or flats) at upper floors

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	42	8.09%
2	39	7.51%
3	139	26.78%
4	141	27.17%
5	158	30.44%

Supporting a properly constructed skateboard park somewhere in Hoylake

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	92	17.56%
2	66	12.60%
3	95	18.13%
4	101	19.27%
5	170	32.44%

Creating an area along the promenade for outdoor sports/activities for the young and not so young

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	34	6.46%
2	35	6.65%
3	66	12.55%
4	153	29.09%
5	238	45.25%

Creating better quality play areas and more activities for all age groups

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	26	4.92%
2	38	7.20%
3	92	17.42%
4	156	29.55%
5	216	40.91%

Making it easier, quicker and safer for the whole community to cross the high street and railway line

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	65	12.38%
2	63	12.00%
3	101	19.24%
4	121	23.05%
5	175	33.33%

More signs and plaques showing places and buildings of special historical, cultural or natural interest

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	57	10.90%
2	85	16.25%
3	137	26.20%
4	134	25.62%
5	110	21.03%

Better public transport

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	73	13.98%
2	78	14.94%
3	138	26.44%
4	74	14.18%
5	159	30.46%

Introducing greater controls to protect buildings and places of historical, cultural and natural importance

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	37	7.09%
2	59	11.30%
3	107	20.50%
4	140	26.82%
5	179	34.29%

Enhancing the appearance of buildings and places through creative lighting

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	61	11.75%
2	50	9.63%
3	109	21.00%
4	150	28.90%
5	149	28.71%

Attracting other uses which do not rely on alcohol consumption, such as a cinema, arts venues, and later shopping

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	25	4.71%
2	11	2.07%
3	45	8.47%
4	92	17.33%
5	358	67.42%

Improving communication between bar owners, residents and local authorities to shape the future of the night time economy together

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	27	5.12%
2	29	5.50%
3	114	21.63%
4	142	26.94%
5	215	40.80%

Promoting Hoylake to the wider region to attract more visitors

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	30	5.69%
2	33	6.26%
3	84	15.94%
4	146	27.70%
5	234	44.40%

Generating more civic pride in Hoylake through better quality signs and other displays celebrating Hoylake

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	55	10.48%
2	40	7.62%
3	97	18.48%
4	146	27.81%
5	187	35.62%

More arts festivals, film nights, street parties and other events

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	18	3.42%
2	28	5.31%
3	84	15.94%
4	122	23.15%
5	275	52.18%

Displaying a clear identity for Hoylake, such as at main approaches to Hoylake

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	45	8.59%
2	34	6.49%
3	102	19.47%
4	140	26.72%
5	203	38.74%

Targeting investment to promote, improve and develop the manufacturing base of the industrial estate

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	38	7.25%
2	45	8.59%
3	104	19.85%
4	141	26.91%
5	196	37.40%

Improving the environment around the industrial estate

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	28	5.32%
2	36	6.84%
3	82	15.59%
4	149	28.33%
5	231	43.92%

Encouraging alternative uses at the industrial estate, such as indoor leisure or wholesale retail

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	43	8.21%
2	41	7.82%
3	68	12.98%
4	161	30.73%
5	211	40.27%

Improving access for the whole community to, and within, the industrial estate

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	47	8.99%
2	62	11.85%
3	128	24.47%
4	120	22.94%
5	166	31.74%

Encouraging the use of upper floors in the High Street for flats

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	49	9.39%
2	53	10.15%
3	114	21.84%
4	134	25.67%
5	172	32.95%

Encouraging the reuse of vacant buildings, land or larger dwellings into residential development

Priority level	Count	Percent
1	61	11.78%
2	43	8.30%
3	102	19.69%
4	129	24.90%
5	183	35.33%

APPENDIX IV

List of statutory consultees (provided by the Council)

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
SP Manweb	Louise Edwards		Louise.Edwards@sppowersystems.com
Airwave MMO2	Sir or Madam		Suite H Arlington Business Park, Millshaw Park Lane, LEEDS. LS11 0NE
B SKY B Telecommunications			crsupport@bskyb.com
British Telecommunications	Mr Green	Chief Executive of Group Strategy and Operations	BT Centre, 81 Newgate Street, LONDON. EC1A 7AJ
Civil Aviation Authority	Mr Siepmann	UK Aerodrome Standards Department	aerodromes@caa.co.uk
Dwr Cymru Welsh Water	Sir or Madam	Lead Forward Plans Officer, Developer Services	Forward.Plans@dwrcymru.com
English Heritage (NW)	Ms Hrycan	Regional Planner	emily.hrycan@english-heritage.org.uk
Environment Agency	Mr Sayce	The Planning Liaison Officer	stephen.sayce@environment-agency.gov.uk

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
Flintshire County Council	Mr Roberts	Head of Planning Policy	andy.roberts@flintshire.gov.uk
Fusion Online Limited	Madam		pamelafusion@aol.co.uk
Health & Safety Executive	John Moran		john.moran@hse.gsi.gov.uk
Highways Agency	Mr Lee	Asset Development Team Leader	steven.lee@highways.gsi.gov.uk
Homes and Communities Agency	Ms Hill	FAO Area Manager, Merseyside & Cheshire	4 th Floor, 1 Piccadilly Gardens, MANCHESTER. M1 1RG
Hutchinson 3G UK Ltd	Sir or Madam		TechnicalCustomerSupport@three.co.uk
Liverpool City Region LEP	Sir or Madam		info@liverpoolLEP.org
Marine Management Organisation	Ms Atkinson	FAO Stakeholder and Networks Officer	angela.atkinson@marinemanagement.org.uk
Merseyside Police & Crime Commissioner	Sir or Madam		info@merseysidepcc.info
Merseytravel	Mr Cook		steve.cook@merseytravel.gov.uk
Mobile Operators	Sir or Madam		info@ukmoa.org

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
Association			
National Grid	Ms Millington	FAO Design Manager, Network Planning	lorna.millington@uk.ngrid.com
National Health Service Commissioning Board	Sir or Madam		england.contactus@nhs.net
NATS	Sir or Madam		nerlsafeguarding@nats.co.uk
Natural England, Consultation Service	Sir or Madam	FAO Kate Wheeler, Lead Advisor	consultations@naturalengland.org.uk
Natural Resources Wales	Sir or Madam	FAO Planning and Resources	Penrhosgarnedd, BANGOR. LL57 2DW
Nature Connected	Mr Ben-Tovim		info@natureconnected.org
Network Rail (Planning)	Ms Clarke	FAO Town Planning Team LNW	townplanningLNW@networkrail.co.uk
NTL	Sir or Madam		NTL House, Bartley Wood Business Park, Bartley Way, HOOK, Hampshire. RG279UP
O2 Telefonica UK	Sir or Madam	FAO Core Strategy Team/EMF Enquiries	CTIL, 1330 The Exchange, Arlington Business Park, THEALE, Berkshire. RG7 4SA
Office of Rail Regulation	Sir or Madam	FAO Customer	contact.cct@orr.gsi.gov.uk

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
		Correspondence Team	
Scottish Power	Mr Boyer		john.boyer@scottishpower.com
Secretary of State for Transport	Sir or Madam		Great Minster House, 76 Marsham Street, LONDON. SW1P 4DR
Sefton MBC	Mrs Gowing	FAO Head of Planning Services	jane.gowing@sefton.gov.uk
T Mobile (UK) Ltd	Sir or Madam		networkinfo@t-mobile.co.uk
Talk Talk Communications			customerservices@talktalkbusiness.co.uk
United Utilities (Developer Services and Planning)	Mr Sherratt	FAO Local Development Framework Assessor	planning.liaison@uuplc.co.uk
Vodafone Ltd	Sir or Madam		emf.advisoryunit@vodafone.co.uk
Wirral Clinical Commissioning Group	Mr Edwards	FAO Director of Corporate Affairs	paulewards4@nhs.net
The Coal Authority		The Planning Liaison manager	thecoalauthority@coal.gov.uk
Alliance Commissioning Consortia	Mr Stewart		iainstewart@nhs.net
Cheshire & Wirral	Ms Cuminsky	FAO Chief	info@cwpl.nhs.uk

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
Partnership NHS Trust		Executive	
NHS Cheshire, Warrington and Wirral	Ms Doran	FAO Chief Executive	Quayside, Greenalls Avenue, Stockton Heath, WARRINGTON. WA4 6HL
NHS North West	Sir or Madam		4 th Floor, 3 Piccadilly Place, MANCHESTER. M1 3BN
NHS Property Services	Ms Cohen		Local.plans.north@property.nhs.uk
NHS Trust Development Authority	Sir or Madam		ntda.communications@nhs.net
NHS Wirral	Mr Coleman	FAO Head of Primary Care	Old Market House, Hamilton Street, BIRKENHEAD. CH41 5AL
NW Ambulance Service	Mr Baker	FAO Estates and Capital Projects	Ladybridge Hall, 399 Chorley New Road, Heaton, BOLTON. BL1 5DD
NW Commissioning Support Unit	Sir or Madam	FAO Corporate Support Manager	anna.coyle@nhs.net
NW Commissioning Support Unit	Sir or Madam		1829 Building, Countess of Chester Health Park, Liverpool Road, CHESTER. CH2 1HJ
Wirral Commissioning Consortia Group	Ms Quigley		intouch@wirral.nhs.uk
Wirral Community NHS Trust	Mr Gilby	FAO Chief Executive	foryouwithyou@wirralct.nhs.uk
Wirral GP Commissioning	Ms Campbell		christinecampbell5@nhs.net

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
Consortia			
Wirral Health Commissioning Consortia	Mr Cooper		andrew.cooper5@nhs.net
Wirral Public Health	Helen	FAO Public Health Speciality Registrar	helenarmitage@wirral.gov.uk
Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority	Dr Atkins	FAO Chief Executive	1 Preston Street, CARNFORTH, Lancashire. LA5 9BY
Merseyside Environmental Advisory Service	Dr Jemmett		Paul.Slinn@eas.sefton.gov.uk
Merseyside Recycling & Waste Authority	Mr Beer		carlbeer@merseysidewda.gov.uk
Church Commissioners	Mr Andrew		webmaster@churchofengland.org
Diocese of Chester	Mr Marriott		Church House, Lower Lane, Aldford, CHESTER. CH3 6HP
Diocese of Shrewsbury	Mr O'Brien	FAO Property Manager	peter.obrien@dioceseofshrewsbury.org
Methodist Church Property Division	Sir or Madam		Central Buildings, Oldham Street, MANCHESTER. M1 1JQ
NW Baptist Association	Reverend Funnell		Resource Centre, Fleet Street, WIGAN. WN5

Consultee	Contact Name	Role	Means of informing consultee
			ODS
Roman Catholic Bishops Conference	Sir or Madam	Cttee for Church Art and Heritage	39 Eccleston Square, LONDON. SW1V 1BX
Salvation Army	Major Lorraine O'Neil		Lorraine.O'Neil@salvationarmy.org.uk
Wirral Jehovah's Witnesses	Mr Williams		garethwilliams100@yahoo.co.uk
Disabled Motorists Federation	Mr Lyne	FAO Vice President	peter@plyne.orangehome.co.uk
WIRED	Sir or Madam		contact@wired.me.uk
Wirral Association for Disability	Sir or Madam		Liscard Crescent, LISCARD, Wirral. CH44 1AE
Wirral Autistic Society	Mr Ryan		2 Grisedale Road, Old Hall Estate, BROMBOROUGH, Wirral. CH62 3QA
Wirral Disabled Peoples Partnership	Sir or Madam	FAO Margaret Jones	25 Selkirk Avenue, EASTHAM, Wirral. CH62 8DT
Wirral Multicultural Organisation	Lady Chan		Wirral Multicultural Centre, 111 Conway Street, BIRKENHEAD. CH41 4AF
Job Centre Plus	Ms McDonald		249 St Mary's Road, Garston, LIVERPOOL. L19 0NF
Wirral Chamber of Commerce	Ms Basnett		info@wirralchamber.co.uk

APPENDIX V
The Forum: formal documentation

Description of Document	Electronic Link to Document
First meeting of <i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> , 20 July 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 16 August 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 18 September 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 8 October 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 31 October 2012	Minutes
Second meeting of <i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> , 15 November 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 13 December 2012	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 24 January 2013	Minutes
Conversation: the beach, <i>The Forum</i> , 21 February 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 15 March 2013	Minutes
Conversation: the future of Hoylake at night, <i>The Forum</i> , 25 April 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 16 May 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 27 June 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 8 August 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 19 September 2013	Minutes

<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> annual general meeting, 17 October 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 27 November 2013	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 14 January 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 24 February 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 24 March 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 24 April 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 14 August 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 24 September 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 28 October 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> annual general meeting (Powerpoint presentation), 6 November 2014	Presentation (may not work with some web browsers)
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> annual general meeting (minutes), 6 November 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 10 December 2014	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 14 January 2015	Minutes
<i>Hoylelake Community Planning Forum</i> management committee meeting, 4 February 2015	Minutes
Neighbourhood Planning Vanguard Plan Boundary, Hoylelake Village Life, 14 February 2011	Map
Neighbourhood Planning Vanguard Proposal, <i>Wirral Council</i> , 14 February 2011	Submission
Hoylelake Village Life Neighbourhood Planning Vanguard Pilot information sheet, <i>Wirral Council</i> , 14 February 2011	Supporting document
New Plans for Wirral Neighbourhoods (Press release), <i>Wirral Council</i> , February 2012	Press release

Letter explaining redesignation requirements, <i>Wirral Council</i> , 27 April 2012	Letter
Formal designation of <i>Hoyle Community Planning Forum</i> , <i>Wirral Council</i> , 18 September 2012	Notice
Adopted constitution, <i>Hoyle Community Planning Forum</i> , 20 July 2012	Constitution
Response to <i>Wirral Council</i> request for clarification of redesignation details, <i>Hoyle Village Life</i> , 25 August 2012	Supporting document
Formal notice of redesignation application, <i>Wirral Council</i> , 24 October 2012	Notice
Application/Confirmation of Membership Form, <i>Hoyle Neighbourhood Planning Forum</i>	Form
Planning Aid in Action: Hoyle Village Life Front Runner, <i>Planning Aid England</i> , 2011	Press release
Town, District & Local Centre Action Plan for Hoyle meeting invitation, <i>Wirral Council</i> , 28 August 2013	Letter

APPENDIX VI

Text of pre-submission consultation public notice

PUBLIC NOTICE

Regulation 14, Town & Country Planning, England, The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012

Preparation of the Hoylake Neighbourhood Plan has reached the pre-submission consultation stage. Public consultation will commence on Monday 26 January 2015 and will run until Wednesday 11 March 2015. Copies of the draft plan will be available to view at the following locations: Hoyle Road Community Centre; Hoylake Library; Hoylake Help Shop; Melrose Hall, and St Luke's Church. An electronic version will be available at www.hoylakevision.org.uk. Written comments on the content of the plan should be submitted via the website or on the forms provided at the five venues above and posted to: NDP consultation, c/o Ventura House, 8 Market Street, Hoylake. CH47 2AE

APPENDIX VII

Transcriptions of pre-submission consultation responses

Ref: PSC.001
Status: Unknown
Date and place: 19 January 2015, *Hoylelake Vision* website
Representation:
"boo to the downgrade"

Ref: PSC.002
Status: Unknown
Date and place: 20 January 2015, *Hoylelake Vision* website
Representation:
"please email me if you support my efforts to suppress spartina on our beach."

Ref: PSC.003
Status: Unknown
Date and place: 20 January 2015, *Hoylelake Vision* website
Representation:
"Page 27 quotes – "Whilst Hoylelake's.south.westerly.to.north.easterly road connections (A540, A553 and the seafront promenade) are strong; the connections between them are weaker. Although plentiful, they comprise residential streets

unable to sustain high traffic flows. This is a significant issue because good connections are required to link the railway, the town centre and the promenade. Connections are typically poorly signposted and difficult for visitors to navigate. Thought must also be given to the possible negative impacts upon the living conditions of residents of promoting increased use of these streets by vehicles, cyclists and pedestrians. A strategy is needed to better link the railway, town centre and promenade at key points.”

The Map 2 identifies Alderley road as one road this priority would affect. I would like to know bearing in mind the limited room available what these plans may consist of and how such plans would support the residents who have parking requirements etc. Two initiatives which I would find potentially supportive are residents only parking and imposition of a one way scheme on this road (Market St to Prom) this would ease congestion and support cyclists in navigating a clearer and less congested route without causing disruption to the daily needs of the residents.

*I would expect direct consultation with residents of these roads before any formal detailed proposals are put forward.
Thank you”*

Ref: PSC.004

Status: Resident in the Neighbourhood Development Plan area

Date and place: 24 January 2015, Hoylake Library

Representation:

“Re: page 24: “For example, the desire for a properly constructed skate park has been identified by some [who?] residents”. If any attempt is made to site this in the Parade Gardens (Meols Parade) there would be an outcry from all the residents in this area. What is most valued is the peace and tranquillity of the gardens. A skate park would seriously destroy this.”

Ref: PSC.005
Status: Resident in the Neighbourhood Development Plan area
Date and place: 27 January 2015, *The Parade Community Centre*

Representation:

"Theme 2 - Page 9. I am concerned as to what is being planned for the promenade in Hoylake. I hope it won't spoil the peaceful and quiet nature of this area. This is the charm of Hoylake and of course attracts many and varied flocks of birds. I and many other residents here do not want another West Kirby! You cannot retain Hoylake's tranquillity and do all the things outlined in Theme 2."

Ref: PSC.006
Status: Unknown
Date and place: 29 January 2015, by e-mail

Representation:

"I suppose I am a little surprised to have come across a document which plans to change so much of what is good about the Hoylake area. I have not had adequate time to take in all of the proposals but suffice it to say that some of them do not make good environmental sense and some actively decrease quality of life for current residents. For instance, the idea that 30% housing increase will have a beneficial effect on Hoylake is highly questionable. Doctors, schools and social care are already struggling to keep up with the current population of the area so how would increasing the local population improve the area at all? There may be a marginal increase of profit for some businesses but even that is called into question by the suggestion of making additional cafes etc available on the promenade. Current Market Street businesses would then suffer. Environmentally the coast and promenade does not need an increase of tourists. The promenade is already very active at the weekends with walkers and cyclists competing for space on the promenade. Additionally any car park would defeat the whole idea of "vista" improvement. There are more than adequate transport facilities by train and

road and adding a further carbon footprint to the area is to be decried. The whole reason visitors like to come to the Hoylake coast is because it remains natural and unspoilt and not littered by such things as extra cafes and toilets. There are already toilet facilities which simply need to be properly renovated and maintained by the council. Additionally the promenade and its gardens are a true reflection of its Victorian ethos and simply need proper maintenance of the current tennis courts, basketball court and toilets. The gardens are well maintained by local supporters. The idea of overcrowding these facilities with tourists is bizarre in the extreme as the current residents would cease to be able to benefit from them. The concept of becoming a "Victim of Your Own Success" is one which many communities have now experienced and deeply regret. The idea of an improved touristy Hoylake may sound good but the reality will be something very different. Additionally it should be kept in mind that even businesses in West Kirby are struggling as many small businesses are not able to afford the rentals and so the shop spaces become Charity Shops. Count the increase in this year alone! Also every time you increase the population in small communities then supermarkets move which put local and small business out of business! They also use up every available green space and create parking problems and road congestion which would be inevitable for Hoylake with its maze of little residential streets. Manrique had the right idea about keeping the character of an area. Limit painting choices of the businesses so that the character (in this case Victorian not Canarian) is maintained. Again, look at what has happened in West Kirby. A lovely Victorian crescent now has shop fronts of every gaudy colour surrounding it: bright red, blue and yellow! Whatever are the council thinking of in allowing these bright colours in a Victorian town which attracts visitors because of its quaintness? I sincerely hope Hoylake does not develop in the same way (A Betting shop in garish colours already spoils Market street with its cafe culture. I am sure that many of your committee wish to maintain and improve Hoylake as a unique Victorian Town with the improved pavements and natural beach facilities. I am equally sure that there may be many who can see how to make a profit from the whole venture. Many thanks for reading these concerns."

Ref: PSC.007
Status: Statutory consultee
Date and place: 20 February 2015, by e-mail
Representation:

“On this occasion English Heritage do not wish to make further representation on the Hoylake NP pre-submission draft.”

Ref: PSC.008
Status: Statutory consultee
Date and place: 27 February 2015, by e-mail
Representation:

“The Coal Authority is a non-departmental public body which works to protect the public and the environment in coal mining areas. Our statutory role in the planning system is to provide advice about new development in the coalfield areas and also protect coal resources from unnecessary sterilisation by encouraging their extraction, where practical, prior to the permanent surface development commencing. As you will be aware the neighbourhood plan area is outside of the defined coalfield and therefore The Coal Authority has no specific comments to make on the Neighbourhood Plan. In the spirit of ensuring efficiency of resources and proportionality it will not be necessary for you to provide The Coal Authority with any future drafts or updates to the emerging Neighbourhood Plan. This letter can be used as evidence for the legal and procedural consultation requirements. The Coal Authority wishes the plan team every success with the preparation of the Neighbourhood Plan.”

Ref: PSC.009
Status: Person carrying on business in the Neighbourhood Development Plan area

Date and place: 5 March 2015, verbal comments recorded contemporaneously

Representation:

“The NDP policies are too restrictive and not adventurous enough to attract a significant developer. A major development (residential or commercial) is necessary for there to be a step change in investment in the high street and to attract a decent level of S106 monies to allow improvements. The promenade is massively undeveloped and there should be encouragement (or at the very least no impediment to) the notion of residential and leisure development along North Parade - perhaps at the expense of some of the older existing properties. The NDP should encourage a significant residential (c.100 homes) over the railway line on a scale which would justify/amortise the cost of building a bridge. This would be on Council owned land currently part of the municipal golf course which could be reduced to a nine hole facility. The town centre proposals may not go far enough. By having a policy of encouraging residential use of properties above shops there is a danger of these becoming the province of landlords for Houses in Multiple Occupation and going down market (people don't generally like living above a shop unless they are the owner). There is good potential to develop the Carr Lane area over the railway line. There is a need to improve the leisure amenity offer (sports facilities, better pitches etc). The NDP must be considered to be a strategic document for Hoylake Plc - in other words to think of Hoylake as an entity with a brave plan for the future, otherwise development opportunities will go elsewhere.”

Ref: PSC.010

Status: Resident in the Neighbourhood Development Plan area

Date and place: 8 March 2015, Hoylake Vision website

Representation:

“Policy DI1. Character Buildings. Objection on the grounds that this does not meet the basic conditions for a Neighbourhood Plan policy because it does not have due regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State, specifically the NPPF and the NPPG. The evidence base accompanying the pre-submission

plan does not adequately justify the identification of buildings for a more restrictive policy than those in place at a national level and as part of the adopted and emerging Local Plan. Such a policy should be based on technical analysis and clear reasoning but this is not provided. My house (Appendix 1, building 35) is proposed to be covered by this policy yet there is no explanation as to why it is considered to make a significant contribution to the architectural or historic value of the neighbourhood other than some local people said they liked its alluring appearance. The whole street is of the same historical era yet is generally not proposed for protection. Furthermore, what value is there in stating that proposed changes must not 'materially diminish the significant character of the building' when national and local policies are in place to manage this?"

Ref: PSC.011
Status: Statutory consultee
Date and place: 10 March 2015, by e-mail
Representation:

"Thank you for consultation received on 21 January 2015. Natural England is a non-departmental public body. Our statutory purpose is to ensure that the natural environment is conserved, enhanced, and managed for the benefit of present and future generations, thereby contributing to sustainable development. Natural England notes that this Neighbourhood Plan is advancing ahead of Wirral Local Plan. As such, the Local Planning Authority should ensure consistency with the Sustainability Appraisal (SA) and Habitats Regulations Assessment (HRA) of the Local Plan to outline any environmental issues as a result of the development of sites in Hoylake. As a reminder where a Neighbourhood Plan could lead to significant environmental effects it will be necessary to screen the Plan in relation to the Habitats & Species Regulations (as amended) 2010 (the 'Habitats Regulations') and the Environment Assessment of Plans and Programmes Regulations 2004. One of the basic conditions that will be tested at Examination is whether the making of the plan is compatible with European obligations and this includes requirements relating to the Habitats Directive and SEA Directive.

In relation to the Habitats Regulations, a Neighbourhood Plan cannot progress if it would result in a likely significant effect on any European Site (see Schedule 2, The Neighbourhood Planning (General) Regulations 2012). Therefore reduction and/or avoidance measures may need to be incorporated into the Neighbourhood Plan to ensure compliance with the Regulations. A screening exercise should be undertaken if there is any doubt about the effects of the Plan on European protected sites. This will be particularly important if a Neighbourhood Plan is to progress before a Local Plan has been adopted and/or the Neighbourhood Plan proposes development which has not been assessed and/or included in the HRA for the Local Plan. In addition to the HRA process, if environmental effects are predicted a SEA screening exercise should also be undertaken. A SEA may be required where:

- a neighbourhood plan allocates sites for development*
- a neighbourhood plan contain sensitive natural assets that may be affected by the plan*
- a neighbourhood plan may have significant effects that have not already been considered and dealt with in the Sustainability Appraisal for the Local Plan.*

Natural England would like to see the natural environment better reflected in the Neighbourhood Plan, presently there is no mention of biodiversity and we would encourage more consideration given to protecting and enhancing the natural environment and wildlife habitats."

Ref: PSC.012
Status: Statutory consultee
Date and place: 10 March 2015, by e-mail
Representation:

“Thank you for your request to provide a representation on the Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan consultation document. When consulted on land-use planning matters, the HSE where possible will make representations to ensure that compatible development within the consultation zones of major hazard installations and major accident hazard pipelines (MAHPs) is achieved. We have concluded that we have no representations to make on this occasion. This is because our records show that the Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan boundary and the land within does not encroach on the consultation zones of major hazard installations or MAHPs. As no encroachment has been detected, the HSE does not need to be informed of the next stages in the adoption of the Hoylake Neighbourhood Development Plan.”

Ref: PSC.013
Status: Statutory consultee
Date and place: 11 March 2015, by e-mail
Representation:

“Your policy H3 Infill Development or Neighbourhood Development Plan should include text to cover the identification and protection of underground utilities infrastructure assets. The design, type and/or location of any development; [its hardstandings; landscaping; boundary walls etc.] should have consideration for their impact on underground utilities infrastructure assets; their ongoing protection; operation and future maintenance. This should not be limited to the service they provide to the existing property, but also the service they provide to the surrounding community and environment. Checks should be undertaken to identify the location of any underground utility infrastructure assets; a diversion may be required at the developer’s expense; these can be expensive and could result in the development becoming unviable. The building over and/or construction activities near/adjacent to water mains or critical sewers will not be permitted and therefore may result in an abortive project. Please note: Following the recent transfer of private sewers to Water and Sewerage Companies in England and Wales, not all sewers are currently shown on the statutory sewer records. You should

be aware that, on occasion, gaps are left between properties; this is due to the presence of underground utility infrastructure assets. We will not allow the building over or near to these assets and development will not be acceptable in these locations. Water and sewerage companies have a legal right of access to their assets; this can be for operational and/or maintenance activities; therefore we will not permit the building over and/or near of our infrastructure assets. Legal action may be taken to remove any obstacles [at the developer's expense] that prevents us from carrying out our statutory duties."

Ref: PSC.014
Status: Unknown
Date and place: 11 March 2015, Hoylake Vision website
Representation:

"I write with reference to the Pre-Submission Consultation Draft of the above document dated January 2015. I set out below my comments in respect of that document.

On pages 2 and 3 the document makes reference to conformity with the NPPF and that the Neighbourhood Development Plan (NDP) must not promote less development than that in the District Plan and be based on a robust evidence base. The emerging Core Strategy has yet to be finalised and has not been submitted to the Secretary of State for consideration. The existing Unitary Development Plan is currently 15 yrs out of date. We consider that by its very nature the proposed NDP is out of date in respect of matters of meeting housing and employment land needs. In this regard it should be made clear within the document that the NDP does not seek to meet the needs of housing and employment land as required by the Framework.

In this respect there are six themes identified on page 4 which includes "Homes in Hoylake" and "Enhancing Carr Lane Industrial Estate". It identifies these are the issues and priorities identified as important by people who live and work in

Hoylelake. However, as the document does not seek to meet the needs for employment or housing the documents scope and purpose should be qualified. Without the qualification, the NDP cannot meet the first basic condition (a) which is to have to have:

“regard to national policies and advice contained in guidance issued by the Secretary of State”

Nor can the NDP claim to meet the condition that it contributes to the achievement of sustainable development. The NDP cannot claim to provide for housing or employment land which meets the needs of the community. In terms of housing, the only robust, albeit it significantly out of date, evidence on which housing numbers can be calculated is contained in the Strategic Housing Market Assessment (SHMA 2010). This is referred to on page 12 and recognises a requirement of 153 new dwelling per annum in Hoylelake. However, it fails to identify that this requirement is solely for affordable housing and does not represent the full objectively assessed needs of all forms of housing.

It should also be noted that reference is made to the Strategic Housing Land Availability Assessment 2012 (SHLAA) as to capacity of sites in Hoylelake and West Kirby albeit that the latter is not included within the NDP area. Indeed, there is no indication of housing land supply in Hoylelake. Reference is made to the planning consent for 32 dwellings at Hoose Court, but not to the fact that these were replacement dwellings and that there was actually a net reduction in housing as a result of this scheme. This has since been completed but it should be noted that this development actually accounted for a net loss of 7 dwelling compared to those previously on the site.

Of the 90 dwellings on Category 1 sites identified in the SHLAA in Hoylelake and West Kirby 32 are those that have already been completed at Hoose Court. Of the balance, none of those sites fall within the proposed NDP boundary. A fuller examination of the data available would have highlighted this discrepancy and should have resulted in much greater emphasis being placed on it in the proposed document. Not least to ensure compliance with Wirral Councils published Housing Strategy which states a key objective is “increasing the availability of housing and delivering affordable homes”.

On page 7 reference is made to the fact that, based on the 2011 Census, another piece of robust evidence, there are more teenagers than the national average. This something to be welcomed for the future of the community and is lauded in the Vision statement but where are they going to be housed if they wish to remain in the place of their birth.

Page 13 the NDP identifies by way of a summation of this section states 'The priority is to maintain Hoylake as an attractive residential environment for its existing and projected population'. Again the question is begged but not answered, is how is the need for accommodation going to be accommodated.

On page 14 the documents sets out matters around previous consultation under the heading "Developing a Consensus". Whilst the efforts of Hoylake Vision to engage with the local community are to be applauded nevertheless with a response rate of 550 households representing only 10% of the total available the concept of consensus seems a misuse of the English Language. Thereafter the use of percentages throughout the body of the document rather than actual numbers in order to justify policy direction brings the concept of democracy (the greatest good for the greatest number) to a new low in local politics.

Pages 15 and 16 set out the vision and objectives for Hoylake. The vision sets out nothing in respect of housing, and its only reference to employment is to the continued role of Carr Lane Industrial Estate. There are 9 main objectives constituting this vision. These make no reference in any way to addressing the needs for housing and specifically the provision of affordable homes. These must be needed in order to create a sustainable community which is a significant shortcoming of the document and illustrates its limited scope as set out above. This is 'the golden thread of the NPPF' and has been totally ignored in this NDP and thereby will almost certainly render the whole exercise as invalid.

Overall there appears to be a blatant disregard of what is both a local and national issue, the provision of homes where people would like to live. The general tenor of the document is one of preserving the district in aspic rather than recognising that communities are vibrant entities that require 21st century solution to 21st century problems. The recognition of Edwardian Villas is one thing but how many mid twenty year old couples with two children can afford to live in one? The age profile of the local councillors is a reflection of this moribund and out of touch approach.

Policy HS6 refers to the qualified acceptability of residential uses above shops, a fact that is hardly going to provide for meeting the needs for all forms of housing.

Pages 35 to 37 address the theme “Homes in Hoylake”. On page 35 lip service is paid to the above by including the following statement ‘Even so both the availability and affordability of housing remain a national and local priority’. However the NDP fails to address this recognised need in the entire document in any way. It adds salt to the wound by stating the following ‘There is a strong indication that Hoylake is an increasingly popular place for younger families to live and that consequently the town is likely to increase in population rather than decrease.’

Reference is made to the emerging Core Strategy and the fact that housing needs will be met by infill development. However, this is not borne out in any evidence on housing land supply that supports either the Core Strategy or the NDP. Indeed this assertion runs completely contrary to the subsequent Policy H3 which indicates that infill development will only be permitted in “exceptional circumstances”. An example is given as development required to allow an elderly or disabled person to continue to live in their home. This is assumed to be a reference to annex accommodation, rather than additional dwellings. Either which way, it indicates both the limited prospects for additional infill development to meet identified housing needs.

In the unlikely event that such infill sites might address some of the requirement, abiding by the policies D11 and D12 on page 33 would in any event render any scheme as uneconomic. For by definition the only buildings with sufficient curtilage to provide infill sites would be those praised as contributing to the character of Hoylake. In addition they would also be debarred by the conditions of policy H3 on page 36.

Further the CS indicates that the area could accommodate 193-308 new homes but to achieve the higher figure would involve providing new houses on Greenfield sites. The figures provide at the beginning of this document indicate the non existence of any Category 1 developable sites in Hoylake. Rather than duck the issue the NDP and emerging Core Strategy need to address the housing and employment land crisis that is looming. If necessary they should recognise that greenfield sites and even Green Belt sites may need to be considered.

Pages 38 to 40 relate to “Enhancing Carr Lane Industrial Estate”. The whole concept proposed in this section simply beggars belief. There are a number of examples of the ill thought out approach but surely the most bizarre is that associated with the potential development of the frequently announced but non delivered World Class 5 Star Golf Resort. It is suggested that if this goes ahead it would facilitate the opening of Carr Lane into Saughall Massie Road, thereby alleviating the congestion at the Meols Drive-Kings Gap roundabout.

I am certain that the well heeled tourists at whom such a development is targeted will really welcome the sight of 40 tonne articulated lorries trundling across the middle of the fairway as they prepare to tee off!!! In addition the residents in the dismissively entitled ‘small residential development to the east’ all 150 households of them will be very pleased to see these same lorries passing within 10ft of their bedroom windows.

This ill conceived approach is followed through to the improbable wording of the proposed policies. Policy CL1 seeks to introduce a sequential approach to local employment development. This policy test is found nowhere in national or local

policy and flies in the face of the ambition to create new jobs. Indeed it is directly contrary to other policies in the NDP which seek to allow employment uses in the town centre. The policy has no regard to the commercial realities of business and the locations that they need to successfully operate. The application of such policies will represent a noose around the neck of any commercial prospects for employment growth in Hoylake.

As a point of detail, it is considered that the NDP should be the subject of an Sustainability Appraisal / Strategic Environmental Assessment as well as Habitat Regulation Assessment bearing in mind the potential implications for national and internationally designated sites.

At Appendix 1, a character appraisal is set out which comprises snapshot images of various buildings. Many otherwise notable buildings are omitted and the text does not in itself adequately describe the character of Hoylake. Nor does it identify opportunities for new development to improve that character. Indeed, the plan has not been drawn in a positive manner as required by the Framework and fundamentally fails to address any development needs of the community.

If you have any queries regarding these comments please do not hesitate to contact me.”

APPENDIX VIII
Analysis of pre-submission consultation responses

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
PSC.001	Opposes proposed redesignation of Hoylake from Key Town Centre to District Centre	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.002	Seeks support for spartina grass removal campaign	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.003	Supports consultation relating to restricted parking and one way system in Alderley Road	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.004	Opposes building a skate park in Parade Gardens (Meols Parade)	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.005	Opposes development of the promenade	NO	Acknowledge with thanks

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
PSC.006	Opposes increase in residential population. Opposes tourism development; Supports a restricted palette of colours for shopfronts	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.007	No representations to make	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.008	No representations to make	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.009	Considers policies too restrictive and not adventurous enough; supports more investment in the town centre; development of the promenade, and residential development on the Carr Lane Industrial Estate and nearby Green Belt land. NDP should be a strategic, brave plan for the future.	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.010	Objects to Policy DI1 because it does not have regard to NPPF and NPPG. Not adequately justified by the	YES	Acknowledge with thanks and undertake to alter Policy DI1 to read: "DI1. Character Buildings: The extension or alteration of

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
	evidence base. No technical analysis or clear reasoning. Requirement not to 'materially diminish the significant character of the building' unnecessary because it duplicates existing national and local policies.		any building <i>displaying the significant characteristic features typified by the examples in Appendix 1 of this Plan</i> will be permitted unless the proposed change(s) would materially diminish the significant character of the building. Proposals must identify how the design would preserve or enhance the significant character of the building". Commit to commissioning research aimed at producing a local list of significant buildings.
PSC.011	Reminders about necessity for NDP to be consistent with European Law. Wishes to see the natural environment better reflected in NDP polices, specifically biodiversity and protection and enhancement the natural environment and wildlife habitats	NO	Acknowledge with thanks and point out that: 1) Policy CL2 supports improvement of land in need of landscape renewal; 2) the Council is satisfied that the NDP complies with European Law, and 3) "Protecting Wildlife and Habitats" is addressed on page 5 of the draft NDP. NB – subsequent changes to the Habitats

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
			Regulations 2010 led to this response being revised and Policy NC1 was added.
PSC.012	No representations to make	NO	Acknowledge with thanks
PSC.013	Policy H3 should refer to the identification and protection of “underground utilities infrastructure assets” and explain the development constraints imposed by law in relation to these.	NO	Acknowledge with thanks and explain that NDP Policies do not remove the need to consult United Utilities when individual planning applications are made and that the normal development management process would continue to be followed within the NDP area.
PSC.014	The entire NDP is both premature in relation to the emerging CS and delinquent because UDP policies are so out-of-date. Housing and employment policies do not comply with the NPPF. Basing policy development upon a 10% consultation response rate is undemocratic. Policies H3, DI1 and DI2 conspire to make new housing	YES	Acknowledge with thanks and undertake to alter Policy DI1 to read: “DI1. Character Buildings: The extension or alteration of any building <i>displaying the significant characteristic features typified by the examples in Appendix 1 of this Plan</i> will be permitted unless the proposed change(s) would materially diminish the significant character of the building.

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
	<p>development almost impossible. The sequential test contained within Policy CL1 has no parallel in national policy and has no regard to commercial reality. Appendix 1 does not adequately describe the character of Hoylake.</p>		<p>Proposals must identify how the design would preserve or enhance the significant character of the building”. Also, commit to commissioning research aimed at producing a local list of significant buildings. Explain that in <i>R (BDW Trading (trading as Barratt Homes)) v Cheshire West & Chester Council [2014] EWHC 1470 (Admin)</i> the court found that there is “nothing akin to a soundness testing requirement” in the 2012 Regulations. Therefore, the NDP does not have to found “sound” in relation to housing or employment land allocations. As to the twin arguments of prematurity (in relation to the Local Plan Core Strategy) and delinquency (in relation to the UDP), <i>R (Gladman Developments Ltd) v Aylesbury Vale District Council [2014] EWHC 4323 (Admin)</i> made it clear that if a housing DPD for the NDP area were to be adopted then</p>

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
			NDP policies would have to be altered to take account of it. However there is nothing in the amendments to s.38 of the 2004 Act to prevent the NDP from formulating its own housing policies.
PSC.015	Vision Statement: consider broadening the scope of the Vision to reflect elements of the NDP relating to housing, recreation, transport and environmental protection which are not directly referenced in it.	NO	Acknowledge with thanks. Seek clarification of this comment. These issues are referenced in the 9 objectives. Clarification sought and response states: "...these other elements of the plan are captured elsewhere in the [Sustainability Appraisal] under the assessment of the individual NDP Themes and the summary of the headline findings in 4.3 is generally very positive..."
PSC.016	Theme 2 – the promenade and recreation: Amend policies to more clearly reference coastal defence role	NO	Acknowledge with thanks. Seek clarification of this comment. Coastal defence is a strategic issue which the NDP cannot address directly in its policies.

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
			<p>Clarification sought and response states: “I agree that Flood and coastal erosion risk management is largely a strategic matter addressed in the Shoreline Management Plan and other documents, but for completeness a brief reference to the coastal defence role could be included within the Issues and opportunities section and a reference included in the final paragraph of BR1 along the lines of <i>“Development that would have a detrimental effect on the character or coastal defence function of the promenade or adjacent internationally important nature sites will not be permitted”</i>”.</p>
PSC.017	Theme 2 – the promenade and recreation: Reflect plan object 9 within Policy BR1	NO	Acknowledge with thanks. Objective 9 is referenced in the “objectives met” section of Policy BR1 and these issues are referred to in the supporting text.

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
PSC.018	Theme 4 – a distinctive identity: Include reference to renewables in Policy DI2	YES	Acknowledge with thanks and undertake to alter Policy DI2 to read: “All proposals for new buildings and for the extension or alteration of existing buildings, whether inside or outside the Conservation Areas, must respond to the distinctive character of the area in terms of their size, design and materials of construction. Where development is likely to affect the significance of any heritage asset identified on the Proposals Map, whether listed or not, the proposal must specify how it would preserve or enhance that significance <i>and should, where appropriate, promote high levels of sustainability</i> ”.
PSC.019	Theme 5 – Homes in Hoylake: Provide additional clarity on what might constitute “exceptional circumstances” in Policy H3.	YES	Acknowledge with thanks and undertake to alter Policy H3 to read: “Infill development of existing residential areas and the residential development of garden

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
			<p>land, whether sub-divided or not, is likely to prejudice the distinctive character of Hoylake and will not be supported unless [DELETE exceptional circumstances can be demonstrated. An example of an exceptional circumstance is development required to allow an elderly or disabled person to continue living independently in their own home DELETE] <i>proposals are able to demonstrate that substantial new social, economic or environmental benefits would be achieved.</i>" This prevents the need for a long list of exceptions to be agreed and allows carbon reduction and renewables to be taken into account.</p>
PSC.020	Theme 5 – Homes in Hoylake: Widen scope of policy in context of amendments to DI2 and/or refer to higher tier plan/NPPF.	YES	Acknowledge with thanks (cf. amended Policy DI2 in response to PSC.019 above).

Ref	Substance	Substantive?	Proposed action
PSC.021	Theme 6 – Enhancing Carr Lane Industrial Estate: Extend scope of protection of residential amenity to sites within the Industrial Estate not just those locations considered through the sequential test.	YES	Acknowledge with thanks and undertake to alter Policy CL1 to read: “Proposals for local employment development (Use Classes B1, B2, B8 and sui generis) shall be subject to a sequential test, with suitable and available sites within the existing Carr Lane Industrial Estate being the sequentially most preferable. Only if there are no suitable and available sites within the Carr Lane Industrial Estate will proposals for other sites be considered. <i>In all cases, proposals must demonstrate that they</i> [DELETE subject to the proposal being able to demonstrate that it DELETE] would have no significantly adverse effect upon either the living conditions of occupants of nearby buildings with a residential use or the distinctive character of the area.”