**Waterfront Neighbourhood Area Consultation – Responses Received**

| **Forename** | **Surname** | **Organisation** | **Comment** |
| --- | --- | --- | --- |
| Darren | Ratcliffe | Historic England | Thank you for consulting Historic England on the Neighbourhood Boundary maps for Liverpool Waterfront and the Baltic Triangle Neighbourhood Plan areas. We have no comment to make on these boundaries. Please reconsult Historic England when policies have been drafted for these areas. |
| Stephen | Cooper | Resident (outside boundary) | For some time in its stalled state their was an attempt to construct a 22 story tower block in front of our homes on Grafton street at the junction of Beresford road. We are on the boarder of the area according to your map but will be very affected by any thing constructed on it in front of us at Height. Please see photograph attached take from bedroom window of Brunswick business park. I suppose this means the restarting of projects by stealth regardless of people living close by. |
| Mike | Cadwallader | Resident (outside boundary) | We live in Tower Building, 22 Water Street. We are east of The Strand. As far as I can see on your enclosed map, we are no longer part of the “Waterfront” area. Is this so? Please advise in which area of the City we are now classed. Sorry, I couldn’t get anywhere on the council/consultation site. |
| Nick | Vagianos | Restaurant Owner | I own a restaurant on waterloo road and we recently received a letter about the planning for the Baltic triangle neighbourhood area.  I am confused as to what this means or how it will affect my business.  I would be grateful if you could clarify this for me. |
| Susan | Davidson | Marine Management Organisation | Thank you for inviting the Marine Management Organisation (MMO) to comment on the above consultation. I can confirm that the MMO has no comments to submit in relation to this consultation. |
| Brian | Davis | Resident | I have viewed the Waterfront neighbourhood area boundary plan indicated by the North and South Areas and it is appropriate and sensible. If there any proposals to reduce the area in size then I would appose strongly. As is described, the area is of historical significance and the boundary as described reflects this rich history of the waterfront area. Key for me is ensuring the balance between commercial and residential as we have a strong and developing mixed economy. The residents do keep the area ticking over when the tourists go home so it is critical for a full residential input into future waterfront planning. |
| David | Slattery | Resident | I have lived in the Wapping Quays development for the last 23 years and was for some time Chairman of the Residents Association. Much has changed over this period (mostly for the better) and the whole of the dock area, particularly around us has now become a significant tourist attraction for the City. Much of the river front is now restricted to pedestrian (and bicycle) access and the water attraction is now focused on the dock system. Making this dock system the focus for a unified plan therefore makes considerable sense from the City's point of view. I would be grateful if the Council would bear these matters in mind when making their decision on the way ahead for this local Planning group. In setting up a Neighbourhood Planning group it is intended to involve all those who live and work in the area as well as those with purely a business interest as their detailed knowledge and wider viewpoint can be invaluable in the planning process.  I understand that the Liverpool Waterside Business Partnership (LWBP) has challenged the extent of the original proposal put forward by Gerry Proctor on behalf of the Engage organisation. Their exclusion of any part of the area north of the Marina seems to be very restrictive regarding the central basis of the proposal. Queen's Dock, Wapping and indeed most of the dockside areas included in the original proposal have a great deal in common and are all of mixed use including business, entertainment and a significant element of residential. All these elements should be involved in the primary discussions at the start of the planning process not asked for their opinion after much of the work has already been done to produce a detailed plan. This is not the first time the LWBP has attempted to exclude the residential element of the area. When they were first formed they were named the Liverpool Waterfront Partnership but when the then Chairman of the Wapping Leaseholders Company sought to be a member, they immediately changed their name and said we were not eligible as we were not a trading organisation. There is in fact a considerable amount of important residential property scattered through the whole of the area under consideration and containing a good deal of local knowledge {and wisdom}.  Wapping Quays are a particular case in point. We, the leaseholders, are responsible for the east dock wall and are freeholders of our property. As such we perceive ourselves as stakeholders in what is developed around the neighbouring Kings Dock property but up till recently we have been totally ignored by the planning authority in respect of notification of any plans that may affect us. For some reason we are seen as NIMBYs and the enemy of any progress or development. This attitude towards the resident population is not only unjust but does nothing to encourage good relations.  I would be grateful if the Council would bear these matters in mind when making their decision on the way ahead for this local Planning group. |
| Stephen | Sayce | Environment Agency | Thank you for forwarding the above consultation received in this office 14th May 2015.  We have no objection in principle to designate the Waterfront as a designated neighbourhood area. We would, however, make the following comments; According to our flood maps much of the proposed area is located within flood zones 2 and 3 considered to be at medium and high risk of tidal flooding. This will need to be considered by the forum if they start progressing with policies and allocations.  Development in flood zone 3 should be avoided. However, where this has been justified as not possible new (and where available existing) development should be made resilient to the risks of flooding. Sea levels are predicted to rise as a result of climate change which will likely lead to increased flood events and flood levels. Therefore to ensuring new and existing development is sustainable climate change impacts will need to be considered when deciding flood resilience measures.  It should be noted that our flood outlines at this particular location are indicative only and not of sufficient accuracy to detail the flood risks at a site specific level.  Should the forum or your council wish to discuss this matter in more detail please do not hesitate to contact this office. |
| Louise | Dunning | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront |
| John | Kearns | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Sheila | Lane | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Ian | Pollitt | Peel Holidngs (Land and Property) | Peel are a company who believe that engagement between local communities is key to unlocking the full potential of Liverpool, especially along the waterfront and we have often had open discussions with Engage Liverpool about how to improve the waterfront. Ian Pollitt also sits on the Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership, a group that represents landowners, developers, destination owners and managers with a shared aim to promote the city centre waterfront as an international visitor destination.  Whilst Peel support the aspirations of Engage Liverpool to enable communities to play a stronger role in shaping the waterfront, Peel do have reservations over the extent of the boundaries for the proposed Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan. We also have reservations over yet another layer of planning to cover the waterfront when the Council is already advancing the Local Plan for the city in addition to the extant outline planning consent which covers Peel's 'Liverpool Waters' project (10O/2424). **Therefore, Peel feel that the inclusion of land from Princes Dock to Bramley Moor Dock is not necessary for this Neighbourhood Plan and we request that the red line boundary is amended to remove the entire area.** Through the introduction of the Localism Act 2011, a Neighbourhood Plan must meet a set of basic conditions *(set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended)* which include making sure that the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan of the local planning authority. In addition to this, a neighbourhood plan cannot oppose new development that the local planning authority has said is needed or has already approved and should be seen as 'pro-development'. The Localism Act 2011 also allows Neighbourhood Plans to establish general planning policies for the development and use of land in a neighbourhood.  The above shows this the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan does not need to include 'Liverpool Waters' as Liverpool City Council have allocated this land as a "Site for Various Types of Development" *(Liverpool Unitary Development Plan 2002 E6)* and the Liverpool Waters project has been identified as a major project within the Liverpool City Centre Strategic Investment Framework (2012). In addition to the above, the entire Liverpool Waters site has also become part of the "*Mersey Waters Enterprise Zone*". The Government led Enterprise Zone scheme offers a number of benefits that are not freely available in other areas of the UK and is used to attract new and existing business into the area, adding positive benefits across the wider economic area.  To this extent we would question why the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan includes Peel's estate seeing it already has a complex outline planning application (10O/2424) which is currently being progressed and has a project lifetime of 30 years where an initial masterplan is in place. Detailed public consultation on this proposal took place during the application progress and when future applications come through the planning process these will also go out to public consultation.  If Peel's Liverpool Waters was to be included within the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan then time and effort would be required from all parties to review this area of the plan which would be unproductive as Peel are focussed and intent on progressing with the Liverpool Waters scheme. Peel feel that the Neighbourhood Plan would introduce unnecessary local policy which is likely to delay and/or prevent investment and runs contrary to the intentions of Neighbourhood Plans set out in the Localism Act 2011.  To re-confirm, Peel would request that the red line boundary is amended so that land from Princes Dock to Bramley Moore Dock is not included within the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan.  We trust that our thoughts for the future of the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan are taken in the spirit intended. As outlined above, Peel will look to work and support Engage Liverpool into the future as we believe that together we can enable Liverpool Waterfront to reach its full potential. |
| Rachel | Bowden | Natural England | Thank you for notifying Natural England in respect of your Neighbourhood Planning Area dated 14/05/2015. 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 is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning. We must be consulted on draft Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning. We must be consulted on draft Natural England is a statutory consultee in neighbourhood planning. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Plans where the Town/Parish Council or Neighbourhood Forum considers our interests would be affected by the proposals. We must be consulted on draft Neighbourhood Development Orders and Community Right to Build Orders where proposals are likely to affect a Site of Special Scientific Interest or 20 hectares or more of Best and Most Versatile agricultural land. We must also be consulted on Strategic Environmental Assessments, Habitats Regulations Assessment screening and Environmental Impact Assessments, where these are required. Your local planning authority will be able to advise you further on environmental requirements.  The following is offered as general advice which may be of use in the preparation of your plan. Natural England, together with the Environment Agency, English Heritage and Forestry Commission has published joint advice on neighbourhood planning which sets out sources of environmental information and ideas on incorporating the environment into plans and development proposals. This is available at: https://www.gov.uk/consulting-on-neighbourhood-plans-and-development-orders Local environmental record centres hold a range of information on the natural environment. A list of local records centre is available at: http://www.nbn-nfbr.org.uk/nfbr.php  Protected landscapes If your neighbourhood planning area is within or adjacent to a National Park or Area of Outstanding Natural Beauty (AONB), we advise that you take account of the relevant National Park/AONB Management Plan for the area. For Areas of Outstanding Natural Beauty, you should seek the views of the AONB Partnership. National Character Areas (NCAs) divide England into 159 distinct natural areas. Each is defined by a unique combination of landscape, biodiversity, geodiversity and cultural and economic activity. Their boundaries follow natural lines in the landscape rather than administrative boundaries, making them a good decision making framework for the natural environment. http://www.naturalengland.org.uk/publications/nca/default.aspx  Protected species You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on protected species. To help you do this, Natural England has produced standing advice to help understand the impact of particular developments on protected or Biodiversity Action Plan species should they be identified as an issue. The standing advice also sets out when, following receipt of survey information, you should undertake further consultation with Natural England.  Natural England Standing Advice Local Wildlife Sites You should consider whether your plan or proposal has any impacts on local wildlife sites, eg Site of Nature Conservation Importance (SNCI) or Local Nature Reserve (LNR) or whether opportunities exist for enhancing such sites. If it appears there could be negative impacts then you should ensure you have sufficient information to fully understand the nature of the impacts of the proposal on the local wildlife site.  Best Most Versatile Agricultural Land Soil is a finite resource that fulfils many important functions and services (ecosystem services) for society, for example as a growing medium for food, timber and other crops, as a store for carbon and water, as a reservoir of biodiversity and as a buffer against pollution. It is therefore important that the soil resources are protected and used sustainably. Paragraph 112 of the National Planning Policy Framework states that: ‘Local planning authorities should take into account the economic and other benefits of the best and most versatile agricultural land. Where significant development of agricultural land is demonstrated to be necessary, local planning authorities should seek to use areas of poorer quality land in preference to that of a higher quality’. General mapped information on soil types is available as ‘Soilscapes’ on the www.magic.gov.uk and also from the LandIS website; http://www.landis.org.uk/index.cfm which contains more information about obtaining soil data.  Opportunities for enhancing the natural environment Neighbourhood plans and proposals may provide opportunities to enhance the character and local distinctiveness of the surrounding natural and built environment, use natural resources more sustainably and bring benefits for the local community, for example through green space provision and access to and contact with nature. Opportunities to incorporate features into new build or retro fitted buildings which are beneficial to wildlife, such as the incorporation of roosting opportunities for bats or the installation of bird nest boxes should also be considered as part of any new development proposal. Should the proposal be amended in a way which significantly affects its impact on the natural environment then, in accordance with Section 4 of the Natural Environment and Rural Communities Act 2006, Natural England should be consulted again at consultations@naturalengland.org.uk |
| Anna | Noble | Turley on behalf of Royal London Mutual Insurance Society Ltd | On behalf of Royal Mutual Insurance Society Ltd ("Royal London"), I am pleased to provide comments on the proposed designation of the Liverpool Waterfront as a Neighbourhood Area.  By way of background, Royal London owns the Royal Liver Building, which is located roughly centrally within the proposed neighbourhood area. The building is currently occupied as offices, but there are future aspirations to secure a more diverse range of uses within the building, particularly along the ground floor frontage to Georges Pierhead/Canada Boulevard and Mann Island. Both of these facades are key thoroughfares within the waterfront area, and the provision of active frontages will increase interest and enhance the appearance of the immediate surroundings.  Royal London welcomes the proposal to designate a neighbourhood area to cover Liverpool Waterfront. Royal London would welcome the opportunity to be involved in and consulted upon the draft neighbourhood plan as it progresses. |
| Matthew | Fox | Unknown | I support the establishment of a Waterfront Neighbourhood Forum with the proposed boundaries. I believe this forum will be hugely important for residents to be able to have their views heard over and above those of property developers who wish to impose ugly buildings on Liverpool. They don't have to live here; we do: our voices must be heard. |
|  | Fielding | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Claire | Slattery | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront area for all |
| M | Park | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Susan | Doyle | Resident | As a long standing resident of Liverpool Waterfront (Wapping Quays) I support ONE waterfront area. |
| Jane | Ennis | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Peter | Eccles | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Kathryn | Henaghan | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Francis | Darracott | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Annette and Jerry | Graham | Resident | As owners of Apt 21, Adler Way, City Quay, L3 4FX, we write in support of Gerry Proctor’s proposal to create a Neighbourhood Forum which can input to a Neighbourhood Plan for the Waterside and Baltic Dock areas |
| Heather | Raisbeck | Resident | I think this is a brilliant proposal and look forward to the formation of a Neighbourhood Forum hopefully leading to a Neighbourhood Plan. What makes Liverpool such a wonderful city, are the people. It’s only right that they should have a say and be consulted as to its future developments. |
| Mark | Jenkins | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Graham | Cook | Albert Dock Company Limited | We have been involved in the development and daily management of the Albert Dock Estate since its opening to the public, in time for the Tall Ships event, in 1984.  We take an active part in developments in and around the area. We work with the commercial tenants in all aspects relating to planning, English Heritage, and Licencing.  In addition, we work closely with ADRA, our recognised tenants' association, to enable the residential tenants to be as self-determining as possible.  We were founder members of the Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership and work closely with our partners on all aspects relating to the Liverpool waterfront area.  We were instrumental in forming the Albert Dock Partnership, a group which works together to share information and resource concerning repair, maintenance and planning for the estate.  We believe that we have been successful in these various ventures which have seen the Albert Dock Estate rise to become not only world famous but also world respected as a prize-winning regeneration project.  We consider that it would not only add an additional layer of bureaucracy but would also be counter-productive and could damage what is an effective partnership between all the interested parties.  Albert Dock Company Limited requests that the Albert Dock Estate be excluded from the proposed Waterfront Neighbourhood Area. |
| Nicholas | Hai | Arrowford Holdings Limited | My company has been actively involved in Liverpool for 33 years. Our involvement and £100m investment in the redevelopment of the Albert Dock kick started the revival of the Waterfront. We have always engaged with the local community and the various government authorities in defining and pursuing our activities.  Our vision was to provide a community where people could live, work and enjoy leisure time, while at the same time opening up the Waterfront to the wider community and to the international visitor. None of this would have been possible without the full cooperation of the City and the planning authorities not least because the Albert Dock comprises the nation's largest group of Grade 1 Listed Buildings. In producing the final product, we have always engaged with our neighbours and helped encourage those around us to succeed, whether it be new companies, the Arena, the Conference Centre or Liverpool 1 among others.  We believe that the comprehensive mix of uses at the Dock have been welcomed by the City as a whole and our efforts have resulted in helping to make the Waterfront a world recognised destination. Indeed, persuading the Tate to open their first gallery outside of London and attracting the Maritime Museum were only possible through the 'joined-up' thinking of a large number of organisations.  However, from our wide experience we believe that adequate platforms exist to enable meaningful and successful liaison and consultation between the various interests and owners. We also believe that including the Albert Dock in a Neighbourhood Area would be counter-productive in that it would add an additional and unnecessary layer of bureaucracy which would slow our decision-making which, by all accounts, has proven to have worked successfully.  We would respectfully request that you remove the Albert Dock from the proposed Neighbourhood Area. |
| Joan | Waters | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Steve | Fishwick | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area. |
| David | Bundred | Resident | I support One waterfront area |
| Matthew | Sobic | Savills on behalf of Gower Street Estates Ltd | This e-mail provides the formal consultation response in relation to the above on behalf of Gower Street Estates Limited who is the freehold owner of the Albert Dock.  Gower Street Estates objects to the inclusion of the Albert Dock within the proposed Neighbourhood Plan boundary of the Waterfront Neighbourhood Area. The Albert Dock is an important part of the City’s tourist, leisure and residential offer and our view is: 1.     The site is fully developed. 2.     Therefore, there are no development management opportunities that need to be covered by a further layer of planning policy. 3.     The Dock buildings are Grade I Listed, form part of a conversation area in the statutory development plan and forms a vital part of Liverpool’s UNESCO designed World Heritage Maritime Mercantile City. Accordingly, there are a number of statutory legislative designations that control and protect the site. 4.     In addition to close working existing relationships with Liverpool City Council, a number of community and business led groups already frequently meet to discuss and manage estate-related opportunities and issues. These groups include the Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership and the Albert Dock Partnership.  In the light of the above, it is considered that there is no requirement for any further planning control outside the long established controls set out in statutory development plan documents and planning legislation that controls the site. These controls along with the existing community and business led groups have resulted in the Albert Dock delivering a high quality award winning destination that contributes significantly to the cultural, social and economic heritage of Liverpool. To provide a further level of planning control where existing bodies who do not want to be party to the Neighbourhood Plan area and are actively managing and delivering a successful, high quality destination would seem to be at odds with the Government’s Localism Agenda that forms the basis of the Neighbourhood Plans. |
| Tricia | Campbell | Elliott Fletcher | I support ONE Waterfront area |
|  |  | Princes Dock Apartments | This is an email to say that the residents of Princes Dock Apartments, 1 William Jessop Way, Liverpool, L3 1DJ support the idea of residents on the waterfront deserve a say  in its future |
| Lindsay | Owens | Elliott Fletcher | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Sue | McCormack | Elliott Fletcher | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Carol | Metcalf | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Rhys | Davies | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Margaret | Ryan | Resident | I support ONE Waterfront plan |
| Gerry | Proctor | Engage Liverpool | I would like to support the proposition by Engage Liverpool to commence the process of delivering a Neighbourhood Plan for the Waterfront by agreeing to the Area Designation as submitted in the proposals. My reasons are as follows:  1.      Under the Localism Act communities are now invited to become a second tier of planning in every area of the country. The Plans drawn up in this process have statutory authority – which is presumably what is frightening some people.  2.      The Waterfront bears the scars of a piece-meal approach to planning in this important and sensitive area which demonstrates to everyone the need for one planning body at the most local level to draw up plans for the whole area taking into account the immense significance of the World Heritage Site status and working with the Local Plan to add value to this crucial area of the city.  3.      There is a need to take aggression, antagonism and opposition out of the planning system and introduce a collaborative and constructive approach which Neighbourhood Planning offers.  4.      Delivering a Neighbourhood Forum that is balanced and fully representative of the whole area is something the Council ought to support, encourage and assist. There is no possibility that something inferior and negative will be proposed as any Plan drafted has to pass an Independent Examiner test and a referendum of everyone affected in the designated area and alongside it.  5.      Liverpool’s Waterfront isn’t too large an area for a Neighbourhood Plan given the successful Yes vote in the Central Milton Keynes referendum for a much larger area and a voter turnout of over 112,000 people (84% Residents Yes and 88.3% Business Yes).  6.      It doesn’t make any sense at all to try and divide Liverpool’s Waterfront or indeed to take out the most important part of the area from any future Neighbourhood Plan. Liverpool needs to grasp the opportunity provided by this application and support one planning body that brings together everyone along the Waterfront to work together to draw up a plan that has the support and agreement of all stakeholders, businesses and residents.  7.      There is an unparalleled opportunity for the planning and political professionals to share their expertise and knowledge with those who also have a major stake in the future of the place where they live and work. This moment should be embraced not opposed.  8.      No landowner has anything to fear from this process as every plan must be growth-oriented and deliver significant prospects for future improvements and development. Significant landowners such as Peel and Liverpool City Council can only benefit from working alongside present residents and workers to ensure a high-quality Waterfront is delivered both to the north and south of the WHS area. The problem of course is such important and powerful groups are not used to working collaboratively with ordinary people. There is a lot to be gained however by shifting perceptions and sitting down to talk and share with people about their dreams and hopes for where they live, work and visit.  9.      This is a vital contribution to developing a participative democracy amongst a disengaged and disillusioned citizenry. For the first time real people will be given real power, albeit perceived by some as being on a small and perhaps trivial level.  10.  No-one from the City authorities or the Waterfront Business Community has so far come forward with proposals for any organisation that brings together everyone who cares about the Waterfront to take a long and careful look at what makes it successful and special, to protect and enhance the heritage and to plan carefully for future development in the places that are available. This Area Designation does just that for the first time in the City’s history and should not be rebuffed. Place Making should be at the heart of the Mayoral policy for the City and there is no better opportunity at the present time than that offered by Neighbourhood Planning which though hugely onerous, especially on those agreeing to take part in the Neighbourhood Forum, is already producing results which are being welcomed by businesses as well as residents in those parts of the country capable of embracing this new reality. |
| Janet | Murfit | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Stewart | Murfit | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Jean | Harper | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Natalie | Cookson | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Michael | Carran | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Matt | Gaynor | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Clare | Jones | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Michael | Fleming | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Joseph | Smith | BLOK Architecture | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Hugh | Harran | BLOK Architecture | I support One Waterfront area. It would be great to see a collaborative overarching vision occur through a dialogue between ALL who reside and work along the Liverpool waterfront. This would support the existing character of the place and, in my opinion only make it stronger. |
| John | Edwards | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Ian | Meadows | R S Clare & Co Ltd | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| John | Vogler | Resident | As a resident I support ONE Waterfront area. |
| Patricia | Ross | Resident | As a resident of the Waterfront area I support ONE WATERFRONTAREA.   We all need to be aware any decisions relating to our area and the right to have our say. |
| Rebecca | Pemberton | United Utilities | Thank you for your email notifying us of the intention to designate the above as a Neighbourhood Area. United Utilities does not wish to submit any formal comments at this stage, however wish to be kept informed and consulted with further should this designation be approved. It is important that United Utilities are kept aware of any future development plans and supporting policies to ensure we can facilitate the delivery of the necessary sustainable infrastructure at an appropriate time. Therefore we encourage further consultation with us once a draft Neighbourhood Plan has commenced as we may submit detailed comments at the Draft Plan public consultation stage. |
| Gerald | Andrews | ACC Liverpool | The ACC Liverpool Group currently operates three venues and one car park at King's Dock within the red line shown on the south section of the proposed Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Area Plan. King's Dock is currently partially developed with a Masterplan for future development in place which is adopted planning policy for Liverpool City Council. The ACC Liverpool Group understands the desire for a Neighbourhood Plan and welcomes the opportunity to be consulted on this important proposal.  As a Neighbourhood Plan cannot oppose development that a local planning authority has deemed required, and as such plans are in place for our facilities and wider King's Dock site, a Neighbourhood Plan is clearly not required to assist with development. The ACC Liverpool Group believes that the inclusion of King's Dock and the venues operated by the company within a Neighbourhood Plan which incorporates the primarily residential southern end of the 'Waterfront' makes no sense and is not beneficial to the development of the King's Dock estate. Planning controls currently in pace are in our view sensible and sufficient allowing for the flexibility and agility required for dynamic development within a market that can and does change. A Neighbourhood Plan is unlikely to contribute positively to the process. Rather, it would create further hoops and hurdles that any potential development may need to fulfil in order to gain approval. Current controls do this well enough. In addition, the ACC Liverpool Group already has and fosters close working relationships with a number of community and business led groups who meet regularly to discuss and manage the Waterfront and estate-related opportunities and issues. These groups include the Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership and Engage.  In light of the above, we see no requirement for any further planning control outside the long established controls set out in the statutory development plan documents and the planning legislation that controls the site. These controls, along with the existing community and business led groups, have resulted in the Kings Dock delivering high quality award winning venues that contribute significantly to the cultural, social, and economic heritage of Liverpool.  Taking the foregoing points into consideration we request that King's Dock, home to the ACC Liverpool Group venues, be excluded from the Waterfront Neighbourhood Area plan. |
| John | Jenkins | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront Area |
| Charlotte | Bretherton | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront Area |
| Sue | Grindrod | Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership CIC | The following provides the formal consultation response of Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership Community Interest Company (LWBP CIC) to the proposed 'Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan' which we understand is currently the subject of public consultation. We represent a group of landowners, developers, destination owners and managers along the length of Liverpool's waterfront who came together in 2008 to forma community interest company in 2013 with the shared aim to promote the city centre waterfront as an international visitor destination.  Whilst LWBP support the aspirations of the Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan to enable communities to play a stronger role in shaping the waterfront, we have reservations over the extent of the boundaries for the proposed Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan. We are concerned that the extended length of the proposed Waterfront Plan is unwieldy and bears no relationship to the number of neighbourhoods that would be covered by it. There is no rationale for why some areas for the waterfront have been covered and others have been excluded. It is our understanding that a Neighbourhood Plan must meet a set of basic conditions *(set out in paragraph 8(2) of Schedule 4B to the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 (as amended))* which include making sure that the plan is in general conformity with the strategic policies contained in the development plan of the local planning authority. In addition to this, a neighbourhood plan cannot oppose new development that the local planning authority has said is needed or has already approved and should be seen as 'pro-development'.  Neighbourhood plans are not permitted to include something that is at odds with the local plan, nor can they be used to oppose new development that the local authority has said is needed or has already approved. To this extent we would questions why the Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan includes for instance Albert Dock, the ACC Liverpool complex, the Pier Head, Princes Dock or why it is proposed to be extended to cover the entire Liverpool Waters estate? All these areas are already covered by planning policy, a series of extant planning consents and are subject to community engagement through community interest companies like the LWCP. We therefore believe that there is an opportunity to review the proposed boundary to make the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan more effective. In our opinion the southern boundary should be extended to include the former Liverpool Garden Festival site. This is an area of significant proposed housing that also has strong potential relationships with existing residential communities at City Quay and Armstrong Quay. We also support the Brunswick Dock area being included in the plan area given this area is likely to experience significant change in the coming years.  In terms of the northern boundary of the proposed Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan we would suggest that it extends only as far as Liverpool Marina at Coburg Dock. This would in our opinion form a natural end to the southern docks communities. Whilst there are residential blocks to the north, it can be argued that they have a stronger relationship with the core of the waterfront and the city centre. These blocks have their own characteristics which are different from the communities to the south.  To this end we would suggest that the Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan becomes the 'Liverpool Southern Docks Neighbourhood Plan' and the boundary is redrawn to reflect this proposal. |
| John | Dever | Unknown | I am writing to support the idea of being kept informed of planning applications etc on the Waterfront. |
| D | Wagg | Unknown | I SUPPORT ONE WATERFRONT AREA |
| Ian | Harrison | Unknown | I support ONE Waterfront area |
| Lee | McGaw | Resident | I support ONE waterfront area |
| Andrea | Nixon | Tate Liverpool | Tate Liverpool supports the aspirations of Engage Liverpool to enable communities to play a strong role in shaping the Liverpool Waterfront. However, we have reservations both about the proposed extent of the boundaries for the proposed Liverpool Waterfront Neighbourhood Plan and also about another layer of planning to cover the whole of the Waterfront. As expressed in the LWBP's initial response to the Plan, Tate Liverpool would suggest that a Plan is most required for the South Docks areas, and that this should then link into the work of the World Heritage Site Steering Group, the Mersey Waters Enterprise Zone and the Liverpool Waterfront Business Partnership. We do not therefore feel able to support the Plan as currently proposed but will review our position should a revised application come forward to cover the South Docks Area. |
| Lavinia | Cooke | Delifonseca Dockside | We would like to register our support for ONE Waterfront area. We believe it is vitally important to have a unified approach to planning along the waterfront, linking north to south in an effort to prevent piecemeal developments and communities. As recent events such as the Three Queens and the Rock & Roll Marathon have shown, there is a thriving community of like-minded businesses and residents all keen to be involved in highlighting what Liverpool has to offer and a strong Neighbourhood Planning Forum for the whole waterfront is an ideal way to bring those people together. We feel that it would be a wasted opportunity and a great shame if this area was to be separated into individual components and it would be detrimental to the communities within them. |