

Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework – Consultation Analysis

| Consultee | Section | Comment | Action Taken |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| Stantec | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>Summary statement: UM is a landowner and employer within the docks at Birkenhead and as such have a keen interest in the emerging vision that the Council has for its regeneration.</p> <p>To be clear, UM is not opposed to the regeneration of underutilised land within the dock estate. However, this needs to be done in such a way that safeguards the current, and future, occupiers of the docks area and recognises their role as part of an essential piece of national infrastructure.</p> | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. Were the plans to be re-examined, the full feedback from Stantec will be considered at that stage. |
| Merseyside Civic Society | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>Summary Statement: MCS is generally sympathetic to the proposals and the area, with appropriate investment in public transport and active travel, lends itself to high-density, mixed-use development, benefitting from superb river views. Parts of the area are vacant or underutilised and is currently uninviting. We also welcome that the scheme aims to foster a low-car, low-carbon community.</p> <p>Our key concerns and queries relate to connectivity, design standards, existing businesses, infrastructure and climate change.</p> | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. Were the plans to be re-examined, the full feedback from MCS will be considered at that stage. |
| United Utilities | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>Summary Statement: We strongly recommend that you fully understand any site constraints as soon as possible so that the implications of our assets on development and the construction process can be fully understood and agreed. You must engage with us to discuss our assets and the implications for your proposal.</p> <p>We also wish to draw to your attention the need to carefully consider landscaping proposals in the vicinity of our assets.</p> | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document |

| Consultee | Section | Comment | Action Taken |
|------------------|--------------------------------------|---|---|
| Orsted | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>Given the lifespan of Burbo Bank, Burbo Bank Extension and future energy opportunities that Ørsted may pursue, Ørsted's Facility should be identified as "not being made available for the foreseeable future" as opposed to the existing text that only refers to short or medium term future, this would align with the lifetime of the plan as Ørsted's commitments go beyond 2040. Furthermore Ørsted does not believe that the allocation of this additional high-density, high rise accommodation is aligned with the emerging Wirral Local Plan.</p> <p>Ørsted would like to see more emphasis that as Freeholder of their Kings Wharf premises, that it is in Ørsted's gift to determine when the site is no longer required. Ørsted, as a Statutory Undertaker, needs to protect it's position, ensure continued operations and provide security of the electricity supply for the region. As such the Framework will have no influence over Ørsted's own vision of creating a world that runs entirely on green energy. Ørsted's business is dependant on having direct water access to service its assets. Including wording referring to "these business look to relocate" on page 50 of the Framework clearly does not recognise the importance of Ørsted having direct water access or acknowledge the difficulty in securing an alternative port location. As such Ørsted will continue to provide high quality employment from their Kings Wharf premises regardless of the contents of the Framework.</p> <p>The Frameworks Alternative Proposal more accurately accounts for Ørsted's position in working under the assumption that the Ørsted site will not be made available for a long period of time, with the comprehensive development approach not being compromised by Ørsted's function but allows for future expansion when appropriate. Ørsted is supportive of this Alternative Proposal.</p> | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. Were the plans to be re-examined, the full feedback from Orsted will be considered at that stage. |
| Historic England | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>Summary Statement: Historic England supports the development of frameworks such as Scott's Quay that can help to guide proposals and manage change positively. The Scott's Quay neighbourhood has clear potential to accommodate change; and we support in principle many of the ideas outlined within the framework, including the vision. Most notably we welcome the ambition of the framework to unlock the area's waterfront. The framework recognises the real cultural and placemaking value of the waterfront setting, and aims to capitalise on this potential, including by enhancing views through and out over the River Mersey and Liverpool's historic waterfront.</p> <p>The 'vision massing' relating to the various sites includes high rise fingers at King's Wharf and landmark building at Alfred Dock. We recommend that this work is underpinned by a full understanding of the heritage significance of the area; to inform the proposals and help ensure that they are</p> | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. Were the plans to be re-examined, the full feedback from Historic England will be considered at that stage. |

| Consultee | Section | Comment | Action Taken |
|--------------------------|--------------------------------------|---|--|
| | | <p>appropriately tested. One of the main issues nationally in the location of some taller buildings has been a lack of understanding of the nature of the area around them, and the impact they would have on heritage assets and historic character of places; the very things that make places distinctive and that people cherish. This work would help enable change to be managed in a positive way.</p> | |
| Mersey Docks and Harbour | Scott's Quay Neighbourhood Framework | <p>In summary, there are three fundamental matters that need to be addressed prior to the adoption of the SQNF. In no particular order, these are:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Environment and Amenity - The Framework guidance and Neighbourhood Frameworks should align with the technical reports and evidence documents submitted as part of the Wirral Local Plan examination – specifically those relating to residential amenity and environmental impacts at the interface of the Scotts Quay Regeneration Area and operational port activities. 2. Alignment with the Local Plan - Presenting a strategic vision for residential development within site RA 2.2 at Scotts Quay directly contradicts the Statement of Common Ground agreed between Peel Ports Group and Wirral Council as part of the emerging Wirral Local Plan Regulation 19 consultation. 3. Undermining Port Operations - Proposing long-term future residential development of operational port land undermines the strategic plans for port investment and expansion, creating unnecessary uncertainty on future investment decisions. | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. Were the plans to be re-examined, the full feedback from Mersey Docks and Harbour will be considered at that stage.</p> |

PLACED

| PLACED Engagement | PLACED Additional Comments | | Action Taken |
|-------------------------|--|--|--|
| | Positive | Negative | |
| Community Benefits | <p>Affordable housing and social housing are needed in the area</p> <p>The new home designs should be of good quality to ensure the community feel pride of place and take care of the new spaces.</p> | | No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. |
| Inclusivity | | <p>The main concern was affordability, and participants worried that lower income households and first-time buyers would be excluded from this new neighbourhood. Participants also thought that most people cannot afford a mortgage in the current economic climate and felt like the existing community would not benefit from the project.</p> | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. The following suggestions were noted though:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • rent-to-buy schemes, • social housing, and • shared ownership options. |
| Facilities and Services | <p>Good services are needed to support people living in the area, along with infrastructure and supermarkets.</p> | | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. The following suggestions were noted though:</p> <p>There should be additional accommodation for homeless people away from family residential areas</p> |
| Architecture and design | | <p>The blocks of flats could affect the residents' sense of space, and could also limit the residents' access to green space. It was also said that areas dominated by Houses in Multiple Occupation (HMO) can feel unsafe.</p> | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. These concerns would be revisited in the future though, were the plans to develop. It was felt</p> |

| PLACED Engagement | PLACED Additional Comments | | Action Taken |
|----------------------------|---|--|---|
| | Positive | Negative | |
| | | <p>Keeping heritage buildings that represent the heritage of Birkenhead was raised by some. Others were concerned that the suggested architectural styles feel based on profit and don't fit what people want.</p> <p>The need for more parks and green space within neighbourhoods was also raised. Safety was another concern, participants asked that the project incorporates ways to manage anti-social behaviour.</p> | <p>more thought should be given to the style of architecture.</p> |
| Transport and Connectivity | <p>Cycle lanes were discussed, especially on zones bordering Birkenhead Road, where it was thought that dual cycle lanes and a separate walkway would encourage people to cycle more.</p> | <p>Transport issues were also noted, particularly poor connectivity at present and the potential to create an isolated community. Some raised concerns about specific areas feeling dangerous and suggested they need alternative solutions, such as the roundabout to Seacombe. Better transport infrastructure is needed to avoid isolation and car dependence.</p> <p>The roundabout at the south of the site, at Tower Road, needs better crossings for pedestrians.</p> | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. These concerns would be revisited in the future though, were the plans to develop. There is a need for a bus service that connects locals to the rest of Birkenhead. Also, there is a need for more transport infrastructure within the new homes to ensure good connectivity.</p> |
| Other | | <p>Some felt that the promenade needs investment before this project. Changing climate leading to sea levels rising was also a concern for the future of the project.</p> <p>More facilities are needed, including: retail, health and education. Community uses are needed, including: more for older people and community groups (for example sketch club).</p> | <p>No amendment to Neighbourhood Framework document, since the proposals are on hold at present. These concerns would be revisited in the future though, were the plans to develop. Other ideas which would be considered included art being in the project from the outset - incorporate art into designs, include spaces for community arts, celebrate the</p> |

| PLACED Engagement | PLACED Additional Comments | | Action Taken |
|-------------------|----------------------------|----------|--|
| | Positive | Negative | |
| | | | artistic and general heritage. Current business use also needs to be considered. |

Have Your Say Analysis

Out of the 73 responses obtained from Have Your Say on the Wirral Council website in relation to the support for the Neighbourhood Framework, 45 (61.6%) either agreed or strongly agreed with the proposals, with 19 (26.0%) either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing. Approximately 90% of respondents were resident on Wirral, with a variety of different options selected to justify people's opinions. The concerns for the project centred around the plans being too ambitious (35.6%) or there being a lack of capacity or resources to deliver it (32.9%). The most important considerations of those who responded to the survey were that the project creates a more attractive neighbourhood to visitors and locals (52.0%), and that it restored a sense of pride in the local community (45.3%). More than half of those surveyed felt that the project was deliverable, had a high standard of urban design and would encourage more businesses to come into the area.

There were numerous comments left by those who responded, which fell into a number of key themes. There was a strong desire for improvements in the transport system within the area, including cycle lanes, and that activities, such as cleaning and policing the area, need to be considered in order to maintain standards and reduce anti-social behaviour. There was also a strong feeling that more modern buildings would suit the area better and that the council needed to be transparent in all of their activities in the area. People stated their desire to feel safe, for the project to complete in a timely and cost-effective manner, whilst maintaining some existing businesses in the area and creating green spaces. Green spaces and utilising renewable and sustainable energy sources were important considerations for some respondents.