

Policy CS8 – Priorities for Leasowe, Moreton, Upton, Greasby and Woodchurch

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
<p>There is no realistic commercial market evidence to maintain or promote Moreton for the priority sectors identified in point 2 of Policy CS8. The current concentration of food manufacturing facilities reflects a historic bespoke development in the early 1950's. The economy, market perception, locational and logistical requirements of modern manufacturing businesses are materially different. The Council's Employment Land and Premises Study accepts that the uses are highly specialised and are unlikely to attract a single occupier. There is no robust market evidence that the site is suitable for Small and Medium-sized Enterprises (SMEs).</p>	<p>No change is recommended, as Policy CS8 only seeks to “maximise the economic contribution of the industrial complexes....to maintain accessible local employment opportunities” for the uses specified. The Wirral Employment Land and Premises Study recommends that all employment land in west Wirral should be retained and the research that informed the Study demonstrated a rapid growth in SME's, supported by the number of enquiries made to the (then) Mersey Partnership and Invest Wirral and Tarran Industrial estate continues to be a successful location for a wide range of SME's.</p>
<p>Point 9 of Policy CS8 should also refer to "other biodiversity assets".</p>	<p>Accepted. It is recommended that Point 9 of Policy CS8 is amended to read: “Maintain and enhance <u>biodiversity assets</u>, the national and international nature conservation value of the intertidal foreshore to the north of the area and <u>its</u> supporting habitats.”</p>
<p>Champions Business Park in Upton is highly unlikely to meet the requirements of the industries specified in point 2 of Policy CS8. Focusing on B1, B2 and B8 uses undermines the wider potential of the area to attract other business activities, generate employment and contribute towards the revitalisation of the economy.</p>	<p>No change is recommended, as Policy CS17 – Protection of Employment Land, already provides for the consideration of alternative uses on employment sites.</p>
<p>The Core Strategy should include explicit coverage of heritage assets at risk as required by paragraph 126 of the National Planning Policy Framework.</p>	<p>No change is recommended to Policy CS8, as there were no entries in the 2012 Heritage at Risk Register within this Settlement Area and Policy CS43 – Design, Heritage and Amenity provides for the proposals that will “safeguard the future of heritage at risk” across the Borough as a whole, including within Settlement Area 5.</p>
<p>The Council will need to maintain a deliverable supply of housing land. In light of the inability to demonstrate a five year supply of housing land, it is important that additional deliverable sites are brought forward now.</p>	<p>No change is recommended, as Policy CS8 is only intended to outline the overall priorities for the promotion of sustainable development within the Settlement Area and the forthcoming Strategic Housing Market Assessment will determine the Council's position in relation to future housing need.</p>
<p>Point 2 of Policy CS8 should be amended to include reference to paragraph 22 of the National Planning Policy Framework, which says that applications for alternative uses should be permitted where there is no longer a reasonable prospect of a site being used for employment purposes.</p>	<p>No change is recommended, as Policy CS17 – Protection of Employment Land, already provides for the consideration of alternative uses on employment sites.</p>

Policy CS8 – Priorities for Leasowe, Moreton, Upton, Greasby and Woodchurch

Summary of Comments Received	Recommended Response
There should be a greater emphasis towards more sustainable growth in Settlement Area 5 which is being consigned to an unsustainably low level of growth. Infill housing development will not deliver enough jobs and Policy CS8 will not meet the needs of the young, working age or elderly population.	No change is recommended, as Policy CS8 is only intended to outline the overall priorities for the promotion of sustainable development in the Settlement Area.
The commitment to 'support greater use' of the Borderlands railway line has been omitted from Policy CS8.	No change is recommended, as the works required will fall within the boundaries of Settlement Area 3 – Suburban Birkenhead and Settlement Area 8 – Rural Areas.
Point 10 of Policy CS8 should be rephrased to read: <u>“Consider the availability of water and wastewater infrastructure by working with utility providers to promote a coordinated approach to the delivery of development and the delivery of future infrastructure works.”</u> to remove the reference to local limitations in the supply of water and / or disposal of waste water. 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 10 of Policy CS8 is deleted as Policy CS42 – Development Management, already requires development to be adequately served by essential local infrastructure.
Maintaining the physical separation of Greasby has been omitted from Point 12 of Policy CS8.	Accepted. It is recommended that Point 12 of Policy CS8 is amended to read: <u>“Maintain the physical separation between Leasowe and Wallasey; Moreton, Upton and Woodchurch and Birkenhead; Moreton and Hoylake; Greasby, West Kirby and Irby; and the distinctiveness of the remaining rural villages at Frankby, Saughall Massie and Landican.”</u>
Support of the priorities for this settlement area but Policy CS8 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.