

Policy CS4 – Priorities for Wallasey

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
Point 2 of Policy CS4 should refer to integration with the new city neighbourhoods at Wirral Waters as a whole, rather than just East Float.	Accepted. It is recommended that Point 2 of Policy CS4 is amended to read: “Support integration with the new city neighbourhoods at <u>Wirral Waters</u> , while maintaining a clear interface between the residential suburbs and the commercial areas to the south in Settlement Area 2.” For consistency, it is recommended that the same change should also be made to Policy CS6 – Suburban Birkenhead.
Policy CS4 provides the necessary positive strategy to address the conservation and enhancement of the historic environment. The Core Strategy should, however, include explicit coverage of Heritage at Risk as required by Paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework. The 2012 Heritage at Risk register includes St James Church and Fort Perch Rock New Brighton.	No change is recommended, as Policy CS43 – Design, Heritage and Amenity already provides for proposals that will “safeguard the future of heritage at risk” and the importance of Fort Perch Rock is already referred to under point 9 of Policy CS4.
The urban coastal resort of New Brighton should be re-designated as a Town Centre, on the same level as Liscard, to continue to focus investment following the completion of the recent waterfront regeneration project and to include Victoria Road Traditional Suburban Centre.	No change is recommended, as the Marine Point development is an out-of-centre retail and leisure development. Paragraph 21.12 of the Core Strategy clearly indicates that existing out-of-centre retail parks are not regarded as “centres” for the purposes of Policy CS25 – Hierarchy of Retail Centres, and that new development in these locations will only be permitted subject to Policy CS29 – Criteria for Edge-of-Centre and Out-of-Centre Facilities, including the sequential approach and an assessment of impact on existing centres. The existing Unitary Development Plan identifies New Brighton waterfront as a Tourist Development Site and this approach is expected to be carried forward into a site-specific Local Plan. The degree of separation between the Marine Point development and New Brighton (Victoria Road) Local Centre and the sizeable intervening residential area, where the introduction of town centre uses would not be appropriate, make it inappropriate to include the Marine Point development within an expanded local centre boundary alongside the Local Centre at Victoria Road.
Policy CS4 will not successfully address the problems of loss of population, out-migration, transport infrastructure and the need for additional open space.	No change is recommended, as Policy CS4 is only intended to outline the overall priorities for the promotion of sustainable development within the Settlement Area.
Reducing the noise along major roads that link Wallasey with other areas could be done by ensuring that traffic complies with the relevant speed limits.	No change is recommended, as the enforcement of traffic speed falls outside the control of the planning system.

Policy CS4 – Priorities for Wallasey

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
More detail on the levels of development expected within each Settlement Area should be provided.	No change is recommended, as Policy CS4 is intended to outline the overall priorities for the promotion of sustainable development within the Settlement Area rather than the quantities of development involved. The provision of detailed numbers would be over detailed and inflexible and was opposed by respondents to previous consultations. Further information on the potential capacity of the Settlement Area is, however, available within the supporting evidence base documents and has been used to identify likely future infrastructure requirements.
The location specific references to additional pitch requirements should be taken out of Policy CS4, until a revised Playing Pitch Strategy has been completed.	Accepted. It is recommended that point 11 of Policy CS4 is amended to read: “Maintain and improve the provision of open space, to increase the <u>number of allotments</u> and natural and semi natural greenspace with biodiversity value, and strengthen the provision of green infrastructure without compromising other open space functions.”
Point 12 of Policy CS4 should be amended to read: “Reduce flood risks along the coast; from the Birket and its tributaries; and from surface water, <u>and to consider the availability of water and wastewater infrastructure by working with utility providers to promote a coordinated approach to the delivery of development with the delivery of future infrastructure works.</u> ” to remove the reference to local limitations in the supply of water and/or disposal of wastewater. An on-going dialogue will be maintained with the Council to provide information on infrastructure capacity and the delivery of new infrastructure and improvement works.	Accepted but it is recommended that point 12 of Policy CS4 is amended to read: “Reduce flood risks along the coast; from the Birket and its tributaries; and from surface water;” as Policy CS42 – Development Management already requires development to be adequately served by essential local infrastructure.
Support the priorities for this settlement area but Policy CS4 could be strengthened by identifying the broad quantum of development to be focused in key locations.	No change is recommended, as the provision of detailed numbers would be over-detailed and inflexible and was opposed by respondents to previous consultations. Further information on the potential capacity of the Settlement Area is however available within the supporting evidence base documents and has been used to identify likely future infrastructure requirements in consultation with infrastructure providers.
Cycle paths must actually be rideable. The route from Cross Lane behind B and Q is often flooded and in Winter, is pitch black at peak times.	No change is recommended as the ongoing maintenance of existing cycle paths falls outside the planning system. This comment has, however, been passed to the Head of Environment and Regulation.