

Public Consultation

On 9th May 2018, Port Sunlight Village Trust (PSVT) opened public consultation on the draft Port Sunlight Conservation Plan (CMP), which had been adopted by PSVT's board of trustees in February 2018. Stakeholders were notified by post or email about the consultation, including the dates for the consultation, location and availability of draft documents to review and methods for submitting feedback.

Consultation notification also included a short explanation about the document itself. "The document includes information on the history, significance, conditions and risks for the heritage in the village. The plan concludes with aims, objectives and an action plan outlining our strategy for the heritage of Port Sunlight."

The documents were available to download on-line: <http://portsunlightvillage.com/the-trust/public-consultation-conservation-management-plan/>.

Paper copies of the CMP were available to review during normal business hours at the Community Hub at Bridge Cottage, 23 Park Road and at the PSVT Offices at 23 King George's Drive. Both sites are wheelchair accessible. PSVT posted about the public consultation on social media, including Facebook and Twitter. Public consultation closed on 13th June 2018, with a total of 19 responses recorded.

The following parties received notification of public consultation for the draft Port Sunlight CMP:

- All Port Sunlight residents received a letter from Paul Harris, CEO of PSVT through their post box.
- PSVT staff, trustees and volunteers
- Family Housing Association
- Sanctuary Housing Association
- Church Drive School Local councillors
 - Joe Walsh
 - Irene Williams
 - Christina Muspratt
 - Tony Cottier
 - Jerry Williams (Heritage Champion)
 - Warren Ward
- Local MP: Alison McGovern
- Port Sunlight Groups and Societies
- Liverpool Local Enterprise Partnership (LEP)
- Christ Church (Port Sunlight)
- Port Sunlight River Park
- Stiwdio Owens, Landscape Architecture
- Conservation Areas Wirral
- Network Rail
- Unilever Art, Archives and Records Management
- The Harris, Preston
- Town and Country Planning Association
- Civic Voice
- National Museums Liverpool – Lady Lever Art Gallery

- The Tree Council
- Wirral Council officers
 - Jessica Malpas, Conservation Officer
 - Joanne Storey, Principal Planning Officer
 - Eileen Wilshaw, Heritage Officer
 - Will Meredith, Archivist, Wirral Archives
 - Andrew Fraser, Forward Planning
 - Gwenda Murray, Design and Contract Services Manager
- Historic England
 - Christina Sinclair, Historic Environment Planning Advisor
 - Marie Smallwood, Inspector of Historic Buildings and Areas, NW
 - Darren Ratcliffe, Historic Places Adviser, NW
- Insall Associates
- Building Surveying Department, University of Salford
- Village businesses
 - Paddock Johnson Partnership
 - Hulme Hall
 - Lyceum Club
 - Lever Club
 - Tudor Rose Tea Room
 - Orbis
 - Railway Inn
 - Bridge Inn
 - Port Sunlight Garden Centre
 - Gladstone Theatre
 - Leverhulme Hotel
 - NatWest Bank
 - Employees Purchase Facility
- Museum Development North West

Summary of Consultation Feedback

Following is a table summarising consultation feedback. In many instances, responses to consultation feedback can be found in the draft CMP itself. References are included in the Table of Consultation Feedback and Responses below.

PSVT appreciates that the CMP is a lengthy and at times technical document. To improve the plan, PSVT has:

- 1) Revised the CMP to better reference detailed conditions survey information and actions for heritage that are found in the appendices
- 2) Revised the format of the Action Plan (Chapter 7 of the main report) to clarify priority

In a few instances, consultation feedback provided new insight into challenges, risks and opportunities for the heritage in Port Sunlight. This feedback has been incorporated into the revised and final CMP. Reference to the amended section of the CMP is included in the table below.

Lastly, some feedback was inappropriate for the CMP. This feedback was not incorporated into the final CMP. An explanation is provided in the table below.

Table of Consultation Feedback and Responses

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
1	More emphasis on maintenance / improvement of landscaped gardens is required in the CMP. Aside from point 1.3, no reference in the Action Plan to improved maintenance of landscapes (ie weed control).	Many of the actions listed under Aims 1 and 2 include improvements to landscape. See 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 2.5. Appendices 5 and 5.1 address condition of landscape and detailed actions/strategies for improvement. Appendix 12 is PSVT’s landscape management policy		
2	Speeding and traffic in the village. Wants PSVT to work with WC to lower speed limits to restrict access to the village.	Action 2.6b: Work with stakeholders to develop initiatives to reduce speeding in Port Sunlight. Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight		
3	Expressed concern over inconsistent protection and maintenance of terrace houses (ie minor and more significant enforcement issues such as	Objective 2.1 Work with stakeholders to resolve heritage enforcement issues Objective 1.4 Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	different paint colours used on front doors, cat flap installed at a front door, uPVC windows).	their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
4	Traffic through the village. Cites parking on Greendale Road and Park Road and traffic on Bolton Road as the biggest issues, particularly as there are no pedestrian crossings.	Action 2.6b: Work with stakeholders to develop initiatives to reduce speeding in Port Sunlight); Action 4.2b: Explore options to implement pedestrian crossings at key areas to enable residents to easily and safely access facilities and Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight		
5	Dog fouling	Action 2.6a: Introduce signage and bins to reduce dog fouling in Port Sunlight.		
6	Cigarette butts from Unilever workers in the courtyards behind houses on Wood Street/Bridge Street and in the Dell	Objective 2.6: Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan. Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
7	Lorries and heavy goods vehicles using village roads	Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	and even pavements (particularly on Bridge Street)	Port Sunlight. Objective 1.4 Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
8	Concerned over the deteriorated conditions of the founder’s tomb	Care and maintenance of the Founder’s Tomb is the responsibility of the Leverhulme Estate. As PSVT supports all stakeholders, see Action 1.3e Implement cyclical conditions surveys and maintenance and restoration programmes for residential properties, monuments and memorials, public realm and community and commercial buildings and Objective 1.4 Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		Monuments and memorials are a key strand of PSVT’s 3 year Fundraising Strategy.
9	Draining and flooding – concern that there is no current/recent hydrological information. What will be done in short/long term to address these issues?	Assessment and strategies for repair and improvement will be part of Action 1.3b: Commission a hydrological survey of the village to better understand the conditions, maintenance and repair work		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
		required.		
10	Transport strategy – new bus routes introduced without consultation with community or PSVT and lack of response from PSVT when concerns were raised.	Objective 4:3 – Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight. Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
11	Failure to remove redundant bus stops	Objective 4.3 – Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight. Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.	Action 2.1d added to final CMP: Work with key stakeholders to remove redundant public realm clutter, including broken street lights, redundant bus stops, bollards and sign posts.	
12	Asks how PSVT will ‘realise the potential of PS as a leading visitor attraction without adversely impacting the heritage and residents?’	Objective 2.2: Mitigate the impact of visitor activity on the community and the heritage. Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight; Action 2.3b: Develop and implement a site		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
		<p>master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; Objective 2.4: Ensure all new developments are in keeping with the proportions, palette and character of the conservation area, but discernible as modern improvements; Action 3.3b: Undertake a feasibility study for a new museum proposition; Action 4.3a: Assess car parking needs for all village stakeholders and identify opportunities for development and 4.4e Position Port Sunlight Museum as the gateway attraction to the village. Mitigating the impact of visitor and commercial activity on the heritage and community is one of PSVT’s strategic aims for the next 5 years.</p>		
13	Asks why 10 buildings are not explicitly included in the CMP (ie Leverhulme Hotel and LLAG).		Final CMP amended to clarify. These buildings are included in the CMP, but they were	

Port Sunlight CMP Public Consultation

Planning Committee Appendix 3

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
			not surveyed and are not owned by PSVT.	
14	PSVT financial accounts should be made public.			As a charity, PSVT is required to submit an annual report and a set of audited accounts to the Charity Commission. These are available to download, along with summary financial information, at www.charitycommission.gov.uk . Annual accounts are also filed with Companies House and are available to the public.
15	How are members of Board elected?			Board members are recruited in accordance with PSVT's Code of Governance. Positions are advertised externally. Candidates are short-listed against the role criteria and formal interviews are conducted by the Chair and CEO.
16	How are conflicts of interest managed?			PSVT has a Conflict of Interest Policy and Procedure which has been approved by Board. Board members are required to declare

Port Sunlight CMP Public Consultation

Planning Committee Appendix 3

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
				any conflict of interest: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On appointment; • Annually as part of a governance review; • At the start of every Board meeting (quarterly); and • When matters arise. These are formally minuted.
17	Are board meeting minutes available to the public?			As a charity and private landlord, PSVT is not required to publish minutes of Board meetings. The Trustees' annual report contains information on governance and management of the organisation; this is available to view at www.charitycommission.gov.uk .
18	Why is the Unilever covenant ending and how much financial support will be lost as a result?			Unilever's ambition for PSVT was for it to become financially self-sustaining over a period of time. PSVT received a grant of approximately £600,000 per annum from Unilever to support

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
				their ambition for the organisation. The final payment was in 2017/18, as planned. For a number of years, PSVT has generated a small surplus over and above the covenant payment.
19	Where is the proposed site for the new museum?	See Action 2.3b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; Objective 2.4: Ensure all new developments are in keeping with the proportions, palette and character of the conservation area, but discernible as modern improvements; 3.3b: Undertake a feasibility study for a new museum proposition; and 4.4e Position Port Sunlight Museum as the gateway attraction to the village.		No decisions will be taken without public consultation and the commissioning of a site master plan.
20	What is the role of WBC in the CMP?		Chapter 8 of the final CMP revised to clarify WBC's role.	
21	Why does the CMP need to be		Chapter 8 of the	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	adopted by WBC?		final CMP revised to describe why WBC adopts the CMP.	
22	Will further consultation be held?	See Objective 1.4 Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight		Public consultation on the draft CMP ended on 13 th June 2018.
23	How will CMP progress be reported and disseminated to residents?		Chapter 8 of the final CMP was revised to clarify. The policies, risks and actions outlined in chapters five, six and seven will be reviewed and updated annually to inform the budget-setting and cyclical maintenance and repair programmes for the following year. This information will be shared with stakeholders.	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
			An interim review of the plan will take place in autumn 2023 - five years after its initiation – and will be followed by a full review and update in 2028. The heritage directorate will be responsible for undertaking these reviews.	
24	Comments on the wide array of enforcement issues at the backs of houses and inconsistent enforcement / lack of enforcement for heritage issues. Thinks these enforcement issues should be properly addressed or ‘he’ll join them’ by replacing his old wood windows with plastic ones since there is no real enforcement action to prevent him from doing so. Specifically cites WC and Jess	Objective 2.1: Work with stakeholders to resolve heritage enforcement issues. Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		Please note that replacing historic wood windows, appropriate to the design and character of a listed house with uPVC windows without Consent from WBC is a breach of statutory law and a criminal offense. Enforcement action, including fines and other penalties have no time limit. Restrictive covenants agreed with PSVT also require owners to receive written permission before undertaking work to alter

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	Malpas lack of response on enforcement issues as a major risk for Port Sunlight.			their homes. Doing so without permission is a breach of the covenant and could result in legal action.
25	Resident takes issue with/objects to the 2016 residents' survey as being part of the 'CMP consultation process'.	No action.		The residents' survey was not part of the formal CMP consultation process. Rather, the 2016 residents' survey was background research conducted to better understand village demographics and residents' views on the village and inform all PSVT future planning. The survey only formed part of resident engagement. There were also consultation activities hosted in Bridge Cottage as part of the Arts Council England-funded resilience project throughout 2017-18. Lastly, PSVT hosted CMP consultation events for residents in 2017 and formal consultation in 2018.
26	Notes that the CMP is too long for residents to read and suggests a summary would be	Executive summary		A full-colour, illustrated executive summary has been produced (and was available

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	useful.			during public consultation) for residents’ use. Each household will receive a printed copy of this document once the CMP is finalised and adopted by WC.
27	Notes that there appears to be ‘no rationale for the decision not to plant a few trees in the front of the cottages most affected by Network Rail’s tree felling activities.’ Notes that the call for feedback and shared response is false rhetoric since recommendations (ie planting trees in front of houses on Greendale Road) were ignored.	No action.		Query was not ignored but dealt with separately, outside of the CMP consultation. This response included justification for decision-making.
28	Questions and objects to the justification for the decision not to plant trees on Greendale Road as arbitrary and inconsistent.	No action.		Justification for the decision was given in a separate query, outside of CMP consultation.
29	Believes the decision to not plant trees in front of cottages along Greendale Road goes	No action.		Justification for the decision was given in a separate query, separately from the CMP

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	against the CMP as the trees would ‘conserve and enhance the landscape for generations to come.’			consultation. Replanting along the railway line opposite Greendale Road will be discussed at a public consultation event hosted by the landowner, Network Rail.
30	Terrible views revealed after Network Rail have caused residents to suffer from depression and therefore the action not to plant trees fails to ‘improve the quality of life for residents.’	No action.		Replanting along the railway line will be discussed at a public consultation event hosted by the landowner, Network Rail.
31	Concerned about ability and willingness of residents to do regular maintenance work and cites ‘exterior decorating’ as one of the key issues. Notes he’s working to develop a long-term paint coating that could help support owners and PSVT.	Objectives 1.1 – Be a centre of excellence for heritage conservation and champion best practice materials, methods and standards; and 1.3 – Deliver a coordinated and consistent programme of maintenance, conservation and improvement for all heritage.		
32	Particularly concerned about landscape maintenance (poor and inconsistent maintenance)	Many of the actions listed under Aim 1 include improvements to landscape. See 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	as the landscape has suffered in recent years – cites foot-tall grass and weeds competing with tulip displays.	and 2.5. Appendices 5 and 5.1 address condition of landscape and detailed actions/strategies for improvement. Appendix 12 is PSVT’s landscape management policy.		
33	Water/Wharf Street development site is derelict and unsightly. Disappointing for residents and visitors to see such a neglected spot owned by PSVT.	See Objective 2.3 – Develop 21 st – century facilities and services. Particularly Actions b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; and e: Complete the Wharf Street development for new family housing in Port Sunlight.		PSVT will consider options to improve the appearance of the site.
34	Concerned that so much information about maintenance, listed buildings and community issues in general are shared on line since he believes that most village residents either do not have on-line access or the skills to access information on-line.		Final CMP amended to include Action 4.1f: Print hand-outs of digital information in large type font to improve access for stakeholders.	
35	Concern over the derelict and	See Objective 2.3 – Develop 21 st –		PSVT will consider options to

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	unsightly Wharf/Water Street development site. Neglected and ugly appearance are unfortunately for residents and visitors.	century facilities and services. Particularly Actions b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; and e: Complete the Wharf Street development for new family housing in Port Sunlight		improve the appearance of the site.
36	Offer of support (loaning personal items for displays) for a future museum.			No action required.
37	Historic England “welcomes the publication of this document which will help ensure the long term management of the conservation area’s historic and architectural interest including also ensuring the preservation and enhancement of Port Sunlight’s various heritage assets.’			No action required.
38	“I could discern no clear Short, Medium and Long Term Objectives, Outputs, Strategies,	See Heritage Aims and Objectives (Executive Summary); Chapter 5 (Protecting the Heritage); Chapter 7		Costs are not included in the action plan. Budgets will be developed annually to cover

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	Activities and Costs together comprising the Management Plan’	(Action Plan); Appendices 5, 5.1 Landscape Conditions Survey and Action Plan; and 6 Monuments and Memorials Survey and treatment recommendations.		costs and special projects will be subject to grant funding and/or other grant aid. PSVT has developed a Fundraising Strategy to support this work.
39	Suggests that the information contained in the appendices should be summarised	Information in the main appendices (1, 4, 5, 5.1, 6, and 11-14) were summarised in main report and executive summary.	The final CMP was amended to include references to the appendices to clarify content.	
40	Specific stakeholder input should be clearly identified to resolve complex issues	Chapter 7 (Action Plan) cites stakeholder responsibility.		
41	Document lacks consistent page numbers and wants the appendices to have page numbers		The final CMP was amended to add page numbers and section headings to the appendices.	
42	Questions whether the access roads behind houses are really owned/maintained by WBC (as it says in the CMP). Suggests they are not and wonders if WBC provide funding for maintenance.		The final CMP was amended to clarify ownership of access roads.	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
43	<p>“The provision of the Highways Act(s) relating to road misuse do not apply to unadopted roads. The plan should therefore make legal provision for the Trust to have corresponding powers of service road enforcement over inter alia: - the control of overhanging vegetation; the permanent siting of wheelie bins on the road; the use of service roads and adjacent grassed areas as party venues. Notes that other legislation – such as public utility street works and public also do not apply to private streets, so the Trust needs to address these issues as well to meet their conservation objectives.</p>	<p>Refer to Objective 2.6- Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan.</p>		<p>PSVT already liaise with Wirral Council over enforcement issues, such as for fly tipping and unattended cars. Issues of this nature are dealt with in PSVT’s Estate Management Plan.</p>
44	<p>Notes that Appendix 4 makes no note of chimney pot types appropriate for the houses.</p>	<p>See Action 1.1c: Develop a strategy for reinstating lost heritage sites and features. Also see Action 2.4a: Develop design guidelines for new</p>		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
		work, extensions and additions and public realm.		
45	Concerned about the loss of the ‘northern bowling green’ and inadequate proposals for the space now and in future. Cites youth and men using the space to play football and how this is anti-social use and often results in littering and inconvenience for residents in the area.	Proposals for landscapes are not finalised by the adoption of the CMP. See Actions 2.3b: Development and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; 2.5b: Map sites identified for improved biodiversity and assess feasibility; and Objective 2.6: Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan.		Use of this space will be considered as part of a site master plan for the village which will be commissioned by PSVT in 2019/20. No decisions will be taken without community consultation.
46	Objects to proposal to provide a five a side soccer pitch for Area 6 as the associated fencing, noise and traffic would be totally unacceptable to residents. Does not want this recommendation included in the CMP.	Proposals for landscapes are not finalised by the adoption of the CMP. See Actions 2.3b: Development and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces ; 2.5b: Map sites identified for improved biodiversity and assess feasibility; and Objective 2.6: Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan.		Use of this space will be considered as part of a site master plan for the village which will be commissioned by PSVT in 2019/20. No decisions will be taken without community consultation.

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
		Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight.		
47	A resident of Character Area 5 / Block 3 objects to proposals to change the use of the northern bowling green from its existing use (green space as a public garden) to a community garden, which the writer feels would ‘directly affect the property value of the residents whose properties overlook it.’ The writer also notes that ‘there is no need to reinstate a new bowling green in this area as it would not be used.’ Lastly, the writer notes that residents were not consulted on a change of use proposal for the site and is concerned about increased noise and traffic for the area.	Proposed developments for landscapes are not finalised by the adoption of the CMP. See Actions 2.3b: Development and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; 2.5b: Map sites identified for improved biodiversity and assess feasibility; and Objective 2.6: Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan. Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight.		Use of this space will be considered as part of a site master plan for the village which will be commissioned by PSVT in 2019/20. No decisions will be taken without community consultation.
48	Would like clarification regarding designation as ‘limited opportunity for		Final CMP revised to include biodiversity	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	biodiversity.’		definitions and examples.	
49	Notes that PSVT tenants do not respect the restrictions in place for alterations or enhancements of the listed houses nor for nuisance/anti-social behaviour. Believes that PSVT is ‘extremely lenient- no regular visits of the properties are arranged to check that both the inside of the property and outside areas are properly maintained.’ Wants the same level of care required by private owners and private landlords to be upheld by PSVT.	See Objective 1.1: Be a centre of excellence for heritage conservation and champion best practice materials, methods and standards; Objective 1.3: Deliver a coordinated and consistent programme of maintenance, conservation and improvement for all heritage; Objective 2.1: Work with stakeholders to resolve heritage enforcement issues and Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
50	Agrees with point 1.2 in the Action Plan and asks if heritage skills tradespeople can be listed in the PSVT residents’ handbook.			No action- an up to date list of heritage skills tradespeople will be made available from PSVT offices, Bridge Cottage and on the Resident Website.
51	Concerns about 1.3 - flooding and drainage. Was told by WC	Assessment and strategies for repair and improvement will be part of		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	that there was no problem, but then Councillor Ward stepped in and had the drain on Corniche Road cleared – resolving the problem. Would like a similar solution for the flooding areas on Church Drive opposite the Bridge Inn and behind Christ Church	Action 1.3b: Commission a hydrological survey of the village to better understand the conditions, maintenance and repair work required.		
52	Concerned about foul air from the drains to the front and rear of Corniche Road.	Assessment and strategies for repair and improvement will be part of Action 1.3b: Commission a hydrological survey of the village to better understand the conditions, maintenance and repair work required.		
53	Poor street lighting and broken/uneven pavements. Would like the modern lamp posts replaced throughout the village, particularly on Water Street and elsewhere.	Three actions under Objective 1.5: Develop and maintain public realm features that are appropriate for the Port Sunlight Conservation Area clarify PSVT’s strategy to improve all public realm features in the village.		
54	Would like a 20 mph speed limit in PS as it is a residential	Objective 4.3- Develop and implement a transport strategy for		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	area. Would like speed restriction signs at the entry points of the village. Suggests mini roundabouts at all junctions with Bolton Road.	Port Sunlight. Objective 4.4 Improve signage, information and wayfinding around the site.		
55	Telephone and post boxes – require painting/decorating!	Objective 1.5: Develop and maintain public realm features that are appropriate for the Port Sunlight Conservation Area; and Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		Although telephone and post boxes in the village do not belong to PSVT, Actions 1.4 and 1.5 will help assist consistent maintenance of public realm items belonging to other village stakeholders.
56	Objects to tree cutting along rail banks and new generator box proposed.	No action.		Replanting along the railway line will be discussed at a public consultation event hosted by the landowner, Network Rail.
57	Objects to the derelict and ugly space remaining after removal of the bus shelter on Greendale Road	Objective 1.5: Develop and maintain public realm features that are appropriate for the Port Sunlight Conservation Area. Objective 4.3: Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight.		
58	Wants to know where the new	See Action 2.3b: Develop and		Also see Strategic Aims &

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	museum would go and how parking would be managed and accommodated.	implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; Objective 2.4: Ensure all new developments are in keeping with the proportions, palette and character of the conservation area, but discernible as modern improvements; Action 3.3b: Undertake a feasibility study for a new museum proposition; and Action 4.4e Position Port Sunlight Museum as the gateway attraction to the village.		Objectives in the Executive Summary.
59	Objects to buses travelling through the village, particularly on Central Road. Notes that Merseytravel are planning bus reroutes over the next five years and would like PSVT to be consulted/feedback/object to any plans for buses to run through the village.	Objective 4.3- Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight; and Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
60	Concerns that the actions/recommendations regarding landscape	See Appendices 2 and 3 for a review of built heritage actions and landscape management actions		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	improvements and building stock from the 2006/7 CMP have not been addressed so does not feel like PSVT will be able to accomplish actions in 2018 CMP.	from the 2006 CMP.		
61	Concerned that there is no governance review of PSVT itself identified in the action plan – no mention of its “statutory standards, trustee selection, transparency and accountability to the key village stakeholders – the residents.”			Over the last 3 years PSVT has worked with external consultants and auditors to review our policies, procedures and operating model. A governance review was one of the first undertakings. A new code of governance has been introduced in line with Charity Commission and best practice. As a private landlord and charity PSVT is not accountable to residents.
62	Asks if the structure of PSVT (“charitable company with only Trustees holding voting rights”) should be continued going forward. Asks if wider voting membership (offer voting to all owners of village properties) would be more			Over the last 3 years PSVT has worked with external consultants and auditors to review our policies, procedures and operating model. As a private landlord and charity PSVT is satisfied that its operating model continues to be appropriate.

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	appropriate. Notes that no current trustees are village residents and no ‘key PSVT staff’ are village residents. Asks if this is ‘an issue.’			Some improvements have been made in terms of Governance and the staffing structure. A new Code of Governance has been introduced and a skills audit for Board members has recently been completed. PSVT is aware that there is currently no village resident on the Board and recruitment will commence shortly to address this need and any skills gaps. 10% of our workforce reside in the village and a further 75% reside in Wirral. 60% of our Board members are from Wirral with 40% coming from the wider Liverpool City Region.
63	Asks that the Port Sunlight Residents’ Group be re-established (notes it started in 2015 but ended in 2016).	Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders, both within the village and along the village boundaries to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight. Objective 2.6 Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan.		The residents’ meetings have not concluded. They were treated as part of the Arts Council England project in 2017/18. There were a significant number of resident meetings during this time to inform the Conservation Management Plan, Strategic

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
				Plan and Community Engagement Strategy. A resident communications strategy will be launched in 2018/19 as a result of the Arts Council England project findings. This will include public meetings.
64	Asks that minutes of Trustee meetings be published on the website.			PSVT is not required to publish minutes of Board meetings. The Trustees’ annual report contains information on governance and management of the organisation; this is available to view at www.charitycommission.gov.uk .
65	Noise levels from Lever Club and Lyceum Club have not been addressed in the action plan.	Objective 2.6 Ensure the successful implementation of an anti-social behaviour plan.		
66	No practical strategies to protect residents from tourists (i.e. restricting access to footpaths leading from pavements to houses) are proposed.	Mitigating the impact of visitor and commercial activity on the heritage and community is one of PSVT’s strategic aims for the next 5 years. These are found in the executive summary of the CMP.	Final CMP amended to include a new Action 2.2c.: Develop and implement visitor etiquette.	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
67	Suggests that Unilever open a small part of its factory for tourists and visitors.	Objective 3.3 Tell the complete story of Port Sunlight’s significance. Action 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		
68	No mention of tree planting and garden maintenance in action plan for short / immediate term.	Many of the actions listed under Aim 1 include improvements to landscape. See 1.1, 1.2, 1.3, 1.4, 1.5 and 2.5. Appendices 5 and 5.1 address condition of landscape and detailed actions/strategies for improvement. Appendix 12 is PSVT’s landscape management policy		
69	Asks that landscape team make their own compost.	Action 1.3f: Develop and implement new horticultural standards and embrace new efficiencies where possible. Objective 2.5: Improve PSVT’s environmental credentials. PSVT has also developed an Environmental Policy which looks at issues such as composting- this can be found in Appendix 13 of the CMP.		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
70	Says that the CMP is a report and not a plan. No time scale for actions proposed.	Target dates for achieving objectives are included in the Action Plan found in Chapter 7 of the main report.		
71	Believes the CMP to a comprehensive study of PS – its history, current conditions and plans for the future. As a resident, “I am committed to my part and look forward to further understanding my role.”	No action required.		
72	Pleased to see actions proposed to improve access to suitable heritage contractors.	No action required.		
73	Would like resident’s consultation group / meetings to resume as found them a useful way to engage with PSVT.	Objective 1.4: Engage stakeholders to inspire and increase awareness of their role in the sustainability of Port Sunlight.		The residents’ meetings have not concluded. They were treated as part of the Arts Council England project in 2017/18. There were a significant number of resident meetings during this time to inform the Conservation Management Plan, Strategic Plan and Community Engagement Strategy. A resident communications strategy will be

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
				launched in 2018/19 as a result of the Arts Council England project findings. This will include public meetings.
74	“Found PSVT staff to be committed and working hard to preserve this very special place that I feel lucky to call home.”	No action required.		
75	“The whole document is very impressive and it is a great credit to the team for putting it together. It is also well presented – so many congratulations!”	No action required.		
76	Would like to know more about the new museum: why it is required and where it would go.	See Action 2.3b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; Objective 2.4: Ensure all new developments are in keeping with the proportions, palette and character of the conservation area, but discernible as modern improvements; 3.3b: Undertake a feasibility study for a new museum		We wish to increase access to historical collections relating to Port Sunlight and to tell a much broader story of the village’s significance. We need more space to achieve this. We have ambitions to realise the potential of the site as a visitor destination and to grow domestic and international visitors; we feel a flagship museum would support

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
		proposition; and 4.4e Position Port Sunlight Museum as the gateway attraction to the village.		this ambition. Increasing income from visitor and other commercial activity is also essential to the sustainability of PSVT and the village; this will require space and infrastructure.
77	Pleased to see public realm features, particularly signage, are a priority for improvement as existing signs are not suitable for the conservation area.	No action.		
78	Pleased to see proposals to engage with WC about street lighting, paving and other public realm aspects to ensure suitable fixtures for the conservation area.	No action.		
79	P. 13 on Executive Summary – revise ‘block’ to ‘superblock.’		Revised.	
80	Objects to retention of redundant bus stops and Stagecoach introducing bus lines through the village without public consultation.	Objective 4.3- Develop and implement a transport strategy for Port Sunlight. Objective 4.1: Ensure accessibility is at the heart of everything we do.		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	Objects to using excuse of ‘elderly residents’ in the village to justify bus lines through the village (writer describes herself as a senior citizen).	Action 2.1d: Work with key stakeholders to remove redundant fixtures, including broken street lights, bus stops, bollards and sign posts.		
81	Concerned about location of new museum and associated parking and how this might impact on residents.	See Action 2.3b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial and community buildings and open spaces; Objective 2.4: Ensure all new developments are in keeping with the proportions, palette and character of the conservation area, but discernible as modern improvements; 3.3b: Undertake a feasibility study for a new museum proposition; and 4.4e Position Port Sunlight Museum as the gateway attraction to the village. Mitigating the impact of visitor and commercial activity on the heritage and community is one of PSVT’s strategic aims for the next 5 years.		
82	Would like to know what is	The Church Hall is on long-term		

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
	proposed for the Church Hall.	lease with Christ Church. Action 2.3b: Develop and implement a site master plan for the use of all commercial community buildings and open spaces.		
83	Would like to support green initiatives (ie solar panels, rainwater storage, et al).	Objective 2.5: Improve PSVT’s environmental credentials. Also see Appendix 13- Environmental Policy.		
84	Would like to review PSVT’s financial accounts.			As a charity, PSVT is required to submit an annual report and a set of audited accounts to the Charity Commission. These are available to download, along with summary financial information, at www.charitycommission.gov.uk . Annual accounts are also filed with Companies House and are available to the public.
85	Would like to review other consultation comments and PSVT’s feedback. Wants to know how this will be shared with residents.			Consultation feedback and responses will be published along with the final CMP. This will be available to review at PSVT’s office and Bridge

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
				Cottage and to download from www.portsunlightresidents.com
86	Notes lack of reference to information in the appendices.		Final CMP amended to include cross references from main report and executive summary to appendices.	
87	Notes lack of map / site plan chronology. Asks that appendix 10 be expanded to show development and loss of buildings over time.		Final CMP amended to include map/site plan chronology. to show evolution of village over time.	
88	Asks for paragraphs to be numbered for ease of use / reference.		Chapters 5 and 6 of the final CMP were amended PSVT to include paragraph numbers.	
89	Asks for a written description of the boundary roads and a map of the conservation area to be included (in Chapter 2, Section 2.2) in the main report.		Final CMP amended to include this information.	
90	Asks for a definition of a conservation area to be provided.		PSVT notes that the definition was included in Chapter 5.	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
			However, the final CMP was amended to include the definition in Chapter 2 instead.	
91	For Section 4.4 Biodiversity, asks for an introductory paragraph that directs people to the appendices (landscape surveys and action plans) and clarifies what the different designations mean.		Final CMP amended to include explanatory information and examples.	
92	For Section 5, asks that subject headings be amended and paragraphs numbered.		Final CMP amended to address concerns.	
93	Asks that requirements for heritage statements be included in Chapter 5.		Chapter 5 of the Final CMP amended to include heritage statements requirements.	
94	For Chapter 6 (Risks), recommended amends to risk (high cost of maintaining listed houses) to clarify responsibilities and penalties with regard to the care and alteration of listed sites. Asked that PSVT emphasise there is no time limit for illegal works to be enforced against.		Final CMP amended to clarify.	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
95	Requests that the action plan is amended / colour coded to show priority or Y1/2 actions.		Action Plan in the Final CMP amended to highlight actions critical to the sustainability of the heritage and/or PSVT.	
96	Requests that ‘resource’ (ie funding) be identified for actions.			PSVT will not amend the action plan to identify resource as this is not typical practice for CMP’s.
97	Notes that the action plan includes development of numerous strategies and other planning documents. Questioned PSVT’s ability to develop these plans and move beyond the planning phase.		Several of the strategic documents mentioned in the action plan have been adopted. The Action Plan in the final CMP will be amended to reflect progress since February 2018.	
98	Asks for examples of/clarification around what is included in the transport strategy recommended in the Action Plan.		Action Plan of the final CMP was amended to include examples of work covered by the transport strategy.	
99	Asks for a Monuments and Memorials Policy.		Action Plan of the final CMP was amended to include	

	Consultation feedback	Citation – issue addressed in existing CMP	CMP amended (citation).	Justification for not amending the CMP to address this feedback
			development and implementation of a policy on the care and enhancement of monuments and memorials.	
100	Asks that Chapter 7 (Action Plan) be amended to indicate Wirral Council responsibility for line item 4.2 (pedestrian crossings).		Final CMP amended.	