

Interreg Work Programme 5: Local Partners Meeting

Minutes

Gower Estates Offices, Royal Albert Dock, 11th January 2019

Attendees

Sue Grindrod, GSE/RAD (SG)

Peter Sandman, LEP (PS)

Janet Dugdale, NML (JD)

Ian Pollitt, Peel (IP)

Daniel Greenhalgh, CRT (DG)

Steve Sherlock, LEP (SS)

Andrew Croft, (AC) CBA

Lizzie West, CBA

Apologies

Peter Skates, LCC

Lesley Woodbridge, LCC (LW)

Julia Bennett Smith, CBA

1. Opening & Introductions

- PS & SG welcomed all attendees, commenting on the positive support the project has received from partners.
- Apologies were noted
- Review of previous Minutes – action agreed on modified delivery schedule.
- PS introduced the agenda and intention for the session to present progress, sound opinion and gain input into the management plan methodology to be presented by CBA.

2. Project Update (Liverpool Local Enterprise Partnership)

- PS provide the group with a brief update on the progress of the project in terms of overarching management and administration. This included notifying the group that the second progress report had been submitted along with the financial claim (in late December) and was with the FLC for evaluation.
- PS also provided a verbal update on the progress of WP6, including the progress of partner plans for their respective projects in Southport and Port Sunlight respectively.
- PS also noted that a meeting has been organised with Historic England in early February to explore the opportunities for partnership or engagement in the project.
- PS provided a summary of the intentions for WPs 4 & 5 and handed over to AC.

3. Director Plan Methodology: Presentation (Introduction - Chris Blandford Associates)

- AC thanked PS and summarised that the Evolutionary Study was well advanced, subject to an additional week from the date of the meeting for circulation and finalisation.
- AC reiterated that the aim of this presentation session was to illustrate the approach being taken under WP5, to sense check with partners and to mine additional input, ideas and feedback.
- AC added that as a general principle, the Director Plan is very much the big picture with the subsequent and bespoke management plan very much for partners to take and deliver.
- SG enquired about the overarching schedule, to which AC replied that CBNA are on track for delivery of both components by the end of March 2019.
- SG enquired whether the plans would include budget. AC responded that headline budgets would be included.
- SG enquired whether this project would therefore support heritage bids within the city. PS responded that both the Evolutionary Study and plans will provide narrative on the story of the area and the themes that can be used to inform future bid development and stimulate investment.
- SG added that current interpretation material is poor and a good example (e.g. Jesse Hartley).
- AC concurred, observing that in general, there is a perception that Liverpool is not a “heritage destination”.
- PS closed the debate noting that all these considerations need to be captured, joined up and factored within this project.

(AC BEGAN THE PRESENTATION)

- AC presented slides on the key geography and identified waterfront areas that have been identified further to 5 key character areas within the Evolutionary Study and analysis to date.
- AC’s commentary provided an overview of what had been learned about each, it’s assets, topography, built environment and levels of access (road, river, canal and foot) as a big picture with a view to assess tourism development, the parameters and potential within each.
- PS added the importance of identifying the opportunities against each identified theme.
- AC added as each slide progressed, that as partners discussed these observations, there was the need to discuss their knowledge and / or involvement with each in terms pipelines, projects or proposals.
- SG agreed, noting to the group that the recent HLF project bid (led by the City and involving Gower estates and NML) and that this project should be used to inform the next round of funding bids, where the waterfront is speaking with one voice, and with a singular / cohesive approach to development.
- JD added that in regard to HLF, future bids must give sufficient consideration to Inclusion as a key criterion. SS added that a key part of the Interreg MMIAH specification is to embed social inclusion and engagement as a core criterion for delivery.
- Returning to the identified area slides, IP noted that each is different in the sense that there are varying levels of content offer in each, adding that Peel are already engaged in developing a Masterplan that is expected to be delivered within the next 10 weeks. Transport linkages and access were again discussed as a significant are for consideration – AC added that the natural line of the waterfront offers a potential transport route.
- SG concurred, adding that this project should be sufficiently future-proofed to recognise development plans that are in progress.
- IP also added that in terms of green space, there is a 10-acre park site located between areas 3 to 4&5. SG added these would be good in terms of wayfinding and interpretation placement and serve as a connector between areas for visitors to move along. AC added there is work to do in terms of developing physical interventions on site bring areas to life.

- AG welcomed this idea, agreeing that a park can mitigate the distances from area 3 to 4 and 5 further north.
- IP noted that in a wider context, this whole part of the city will change – adding that a wide-ranging piece of work needs to be done in terms of wayfinding and routing, however there is a challenge around potential diversions and closures causing disruption and aversion to change.
- JD added whether connectivity around and between the 5 areas should be referenced and highlighted.
- AC acknowledged these points adding that Director Plans will recognise the prioritisation and phasing of development per area, recognising that these will be nonlinear (given the number of concurrent plans).
- JD commented that this approach makes sense and is congruent with NML's intentions around the Dock area (e.g. Pier Master's House) but should also encompass the underutilised space at Pier Head.
- IP added that phasing is necessary to ensure long term interests for those potentially to live and work in identified residential developments on the waterfront within a 20-year planning framework.
- SG noted that, given the point on long term investment and development, there should be representation from the city, however PS noted that P. Skates has been engaged and informed of project progress.

CHARACTER AREA WORKSHOP

- Given the time limits on the meeting, AC volunteered that half an hour should be spent directly on idea capture.

Areas 1 & 2)

- SG opened with examples of engagement with Everton in the Community as an example of where outreach has enhanced the position of the Royal Albert dock as being perceived as a part of the local community. IP added that the new Royal status has also augmented the reputation and interest in the Dock.
- SG commented that an area / theme for development is around celebrating the unsung heroes – the intellectual context – by highlighting the role and place of figures such as Jesse Hartley. AC questioned what is next for RAD, and SG added that since the Heseltine Report, considerable effort has been made to think forward beyond the 175 plan, at the future and legacy past '21.
- DG also highlighted the need to consider how people are encouraged onto the water and to exploit the line of connectivity between Stanley Dock and Albert Dock.
- SG added that it would be good to understand the status of the proposed fixed bridges that would extend the (foot) connectivity to the city centre.
- JD commented that it would be good to pick this up with CBA as a part of one to one sessions, especially around NML's plans for the estate in around the Dock (MMM, Pier Master's House). Additionally, future planning around Canning Docks (Area 2) would be well informed by this project.

Area 3)

- IP commented the Princes Dock has a masterplan in place, IP to share the link with AC prior to their one to one meeting.

Area 4)

- IP indicated there are notional discussions around a new visitor centre, and that Everton have expressed interest in being involved with the project.
- IP also added that the plans for investment and development include 600 new apartments, a new energy centre and car parking off Great Howard Street. There will also be on site training and apprenticeships included (c.40).

- SG added that overall there needs to be an overarching heritage strategy that draws in IP's / Peel's plans.

Area 5)

- AC & IP noted that the Stanley locks enable passage from the canal to the Stanley Docks and should be considered for touristic development.
- IP noted that Harcourt are the main developer and that none of the development work is under Council ownership or control.
- IP stated that in considering prioritisation, the development of the Tobacco warehouse "is being taken care of already."
- In closing, SG added that Duke's Dock is also an area for consideration.

4. Next Steps.

- AC commented that CBA will now be directly in touch with partner so arrange the one to one follow up sessions. Lizzie will schedule slots (to include the City Council).
- The next meeting is confirmed for the 7th February, Peel / IP to host. CBA will present back the Director Plan (this being the week prior to the INTERREG meeting in Cadiz).

7. AOB

No other matters arising.