



United Nations
Educational, Scientific and
Cultural Organization

Organisation
des Nations Unies
pour l'éducation,
la science et la culture

World Heritage Patrimoine mondial

36 COM

Distribution limited / limitée

Paris, 1 June / 1 juin 2012
Original: English

UNITED NATIONS EDUCATIONAL,
SCIENTIFIC AND CULTURAL ORGANIZATION
ORGANISATION DES NATIONS UNIES
POUR L'EDUCATION, LA SCIENCE ET LA CULTURE

CONVENTION CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF THE WORLD
CULTURAL AND NATURAL HERITAGE

CONVENTION CONCERNANT LA PROTECTION DU PATRIMOINE
MONDIAL, CULTUREL ET NATUREL

WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE / COMITE DU PATRIMOINE MONDIAL

Thirty-sixth session / Trente-sixième session

Saint Petersburg, Russian Federation / Saint Pétersbourg, Fédération de Russie
24 June – 6 July 2012 / 24 juin – 6 juillet 2012

Item 7 of the Provisional Agenda: State of conservation of properties inscribed on the World Heritage List and/or on the List of World Heritage in Danger.

Point 7 de l'Ordre du jour provisoire: Etat de conservation de biens inscrits sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial et/ou sur la Liste du patrimoine mondial en péril

MISSION REPORT / RAPPORT DE MISSION

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland)
(C 1150)

Liverpool – Port marchand (Royaume-Uni de Grande Bretagne et d'Irlande du Nord) (C 1150)

14-16 November 2011

This mission report should be read in conjunction with Document:
Ce rapport de mission doit être lu conjointement avec le document suivant:

WHC-12/36.COM/7B.Add

Acknowledgements

The mission would like to thank Mr Paul Blaker, Head of World Heritage at the Department for Culture, Media and Sports, for welcoming and informing the mission in Liverpool on behalf of the national authorities of the United Kingdom, as well as Mr Frank Prendergast, Lord Mayor of Liverpool, Mr Joe Anderson, Leader of the Council, Mr Nick Kavannagh, Director of Regeneration, Mr John Hinchliffe, World Heritage Officer and the other Senior Executives of the Liverpool City Council for the excellent collaboration. Further thanks go to Dr Christopher Young, Head of World Heritage, Mr Henry Owen-John, North-West Regional Director and their colleagues from English Heritage for their valuable inputs. Finally, the mission wishes to express its appreciation to the Liverpool World Heritage Steering Group and Liverpool Vision for their presentations and in particular to Peel Holdings and its Development Director Mr Lindsey Ashworth and Development/Investment Surveyor Mr Ian Pollit for the constructive dialogue concerning the Liverpool Waters development.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Overall State of Conservation

The inscribed property of “Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City” comprises six areas of distinct townscape character (Pier Head; Albert Dock; Stanley Dock; Castle Street/Dale Street/Old Hall Street Commercial Centre; William Brown Street Cultural Quarter; Lower Duke Street) within five conservation areas. Each of these areas is different in character from the others – making the whole of the World Heritage property diversified. Over the years since inscription many of the docks and the city’s listed historic buildings, such as Albert Dock and St. Georges Hall, have been restored and are well-maintained according to internationally established guidelines for documentation, minimal intervention, authenticity and integrity – as was already reported in 2006. Since then important further restorations include the Port of Liverpool Building, the exteriors and interiors of the Cunard and Liver Buildings, and several properties in the Ropewalks area, among many others. As such, the overall state of conservation of the property remains good and has in fact been improved. Although public funds are drying up quickly, partnerships of local organizations to carry out repairs and other works to a number of historic buildings, structures or spaces are encouraged through the English Lottery Fund’s Townscape Heritage Initiative.

At the time of the 2006 reactive monitoring mission to Liverpool, the rehabilitation of the Pier Head (conservation area 1) comprising the three projects for the Museum of Liverpool, the new ferry terminal and Mann Island, was put into question by the preservation community (backed up by some media) in terms of compatibility with Liverpool’s World Heritage status. Since all three projects are now complete (the Museum opened its doors in July 2011, while most of the apartments in the Mann Island redevelopment scheme have been sold or rented out already), the mission had the opportunity to fully assess the impact of these three projects, which can be judged as positive. Both the ferry terminal and the museum are much less intrusive in terms of massing, scale, orientation and architectural expression than was previously suggested, which is primarily due to their low heights (reaching only half the height of the iconic Three Graces), materialization (clad in natural Jura limestone resembling the Three Graces) and out-of-the-way orientation, leaving the front of the Three Graces intact and unobstructed. Moreover, the plaza that was previously a wind-swept place, not a pleasant pedestrian area, has gained a more intimate, lively atmosphere, adding a public space at the river front for the city.

As regards the Mann Island project, the views to the Three Graces from Albert Dock, which was the key issue during the 2006 discussions, have not been blocked completely, but have been maintained from several points in the city. It is true that a certain loss has been incurred, which in the view of the mission should be off-set against the significant gains: the introduction of a mixed use scheme bringing visitors, residents and liveliness into this once empty, wind-swept corner of the city centre. The materialization in black granite, however, contrasts significantly with the direct surroundings (creamy tiles and red bricks). Nevertheless, the 2011 mission maintains its view that it was an insufficient ground for Danger Listing back in 2006.

The Liverpool One complex is the result of a massive redevelopment scheme since 2006 situated on the other side of the Strand (which is the principal transportation corridor that constitutes in part the boundary of the World Heritage site). Prior to redevelopment it was an open field in the middle of the city centre, a bleak remnant of World War II bombing damage. While controversial in 2006 primarily because of its enormous scale in the heart of the city, it has now become a major success in commercial as well as town planning terms: it has managed to attract a great diversity of shops and retailers, creating a lively atmosphere well suited to that part of town, whilst at the same time reconnecting various heritage-significant parts of the city with each other and with the World Heritage site, also through view corridors. A systematic study of the impact of Liverpool One on other retail areas in Liverpool has not been received by the mission, but based on anecdote and observations by staff of English Heritage no evidence exists that Liverpool One has damaged other retail areas of the city centre.

Progress in implementation of the recommendations of the 2006 Reactive Monitoring mission

The recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission have been followed up and implemented, primarily through the development of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), adopted and published by the Liverpool City Council in October 2009, with a further description of its overall character and spirit of place in an additional Evidential Report. The Liverpool City Council is now working on the attributes that carry heritage significance. The SPD was subjected to an awareness raising and public consultation process.

In terms of content, however, the mission does not agree with the suggestion put forward in the SPD relating to “opportunities for two secondary clusters of high-rise buildings”, both of which are in the buffer zone, away from the primary cluster of the Central Business District. As such, this suggestion is inconsistent with the recommendations of the 2006 mission.

The Proposed Development of Liverpool Waters

The Liverpool Waters scheme forms part of a key part of the Atlantic Gateway concept, a GB£ 50 billion long-term investment programme on land owned by Peel extending from Liverpool to Manchester along the Manchester Ship Canal. The GB£ 5.5 billion mixed-use scheme (of offices, residential units and a cruise liner terminal) itself is projected to pool financial resources of other (overseas) investors, but will be implemented by Peel Holdings. It comprises a massive redevelopment of the historic docklands north of the city centre, thereby extending it significantly and altering the skyline and profile of the World Heritage site.

Furthermore, in terms of visual perception the redevelopment scheme will fragment and isolate the different dock areas, instead of integrating them into one, continuous historic urban landscape. The scheme, as presented by Peel to the mission team, does not reflect, nor evolve from the fragile and subtle yet significant heritage structures present in the dock areas; instead it treats the core and buffer zones very differently (in terms of building height), while introducing the same mass and typology throughout. This contradicts the meaning and function of the buffer zone, as discussed at the 2008 Expert Meeting in Switzerland (published in World Heritage Series n°25), as well as the concept and approach of the Historic Urban Landscape – under development since 2005 and finally adopted as a UNESCO Recommendation, a non-binding ‘soft-law’, on 10 November 2011.

This Recommendation promotes the Historic Urban Landscape approach as a new way to include various aspects of conservation into an integrated framework. It defines the historic urban landscape as the urban area understood to be the result of a historic layering of cultural and natural values and attributes, extending beyond the notion of “historic centre” or “ensemble” to include the broader urban context and its geographical setting.

In the case of Liverpool this wider context includes the topography of the site, which is expressed as a three-tiered urban structure including the waterfront, the massing and height of the Three Graces, and the shoulders of the Anglican Cathedral on the ridge overlooking the city. Further to this, the historic docklands to the north complement those to the south, putting the Three Graces centre-stage in this more or less symmetrical city profile. This has a historical reason also, as the Three Graces were indeed at the heart of shipping and harbour operations during the height of its

glory, surrounded by dockyards and port structures. Shifting this profile to the north by introducing a secondary cluster of high-rise, with towers three times the height of the Three Graces, would destroy this profile, relegating the Three Graces to playing second violin, and thereby losing an important visual and historical reference to the city's glorious past.

The comprehensive Heritage Impact Assessment of over 300 pages, commissioned by English Heritage, expresses this concern, which is supported by the mission. In collaboration with Liverpool City Council, Peel Holdings also produced a Heritage Impact Assessment, which perhaps not surprisingly comes to almost diametrical conclusions – i.e. that the visual and physical impacts on the heritage assets are negligible, alongside the very positive socio-economic impacts generated by the scheme in terms of revenue and employment generation. However, Peels' Heritage Impact Assessment does indicate that several key views from the north back to the Three Graces will be blocked by the new developments, while also the hard-won views of the Three Graces from Albert Dock, over the residential buildings of Mann Island, will disappear against a backdrop of supertowers (including the "Shanghai Tower").

Development Strategies, existing Planning Procedures and Management System

Although the Liverpool Waters proposal is considered not to be properly designed, in its outline scheme, with regard to the heritage-sensitive location in and around the core zone of the World Heritage property, in overall terms the development strategies, existing planning procedures and management system for the property and its setting should be effective in putting heritage at the heart of the redevelopment process and thereby regenerating the city of Liverpool.

Mission's Conclusion and Recommendation

The mission concludes that if the proposed Liverpool Waters scheme as outlined during the mission would be implemented, the World Heritage property would be irreversibly damaged, due to a serious deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence, a serious loss of historical authenticity, and an important loss of cultural significance. It strongly recommends that the three principal stakeholders, being Liverpool City Council, Peel Holdings and English Heritage, reconvene around the table and work out an adjusted scheme that includes the observations put forward in this report.

1. BACKGROUND TO THE MISSION

At the invitation of the Government of the United Kingdom (by letter dated 17 August 2011) and as requested by the World Heritage Committee at its 35th session (Decision **35 COM 7B.118**), a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission was carried out to assess planning procedures and the overall development strategies for the World Heritage site of Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City (United Kingdom). The mission took place from 14 to 16 November 2011.

2. MAIN ASPECTS FOR REVIEW AND DISCUSSION AS IDENTIFIED IN THE TERMS OF REFERENCE

According to the Terms of Reference, the reactive monitoring mission assessed

- i. the overall state of conservation of this property and the factors affecting its Outstanding Universal Value, with particular regard to the proposed development of Liverpool Waters with its dense, high and mid-rise buildings;
- ii. progress in implementing the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of 2006 as set out in the decisions of the World Heritage Committee;
- iii. the overall development strategies, existing planning procedures and management systems and their effectiveness for the property and its setting.

3. CONSIDERATIONS BY THE WORLD HERITAGE COMMITTEE, 35TH SESSION (PARIS, 2011) AS ARTICULATED IN DECISION 35 COM 7B.118

The World Heritage Committee,

1. Having examined Document WHC-11/35.COM/7B.Add,
2. Expresses its extreme concern at the proposed development of Liverpool Waters in terms of the potential impact of its dense, high and mid-rise buildings on the form and design of the historic docks and thus on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
3. Notes that the independent Impact Assessment commissioned by English Heritage clearly sets out the significantly damaging negative impact on the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
4. Also notes that the proposed development is not in compliance with the property Management Plan nor with the Liverpool Urban Development Plan;
5. Urges the State Party to ensure that these proposals are not approved, as failure to do so could lead to consideration of loss of the Outstanding Universal Value of the property;
6. Requests the State Party to invite a joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission, as soon as possible, to assess planning procedures and the overall development strategies for the property;
7. Also requests the State Party to submit to the World Heritage Centre, by **1 February 2012**, an updated report on the state of conservation of the property and on the implementation of the above, for examination by the World Heritage Committee at its 36th session in 2012.

4. INSCRIPTION HISTORY OF LIVERPOOL

Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City was inscribed in 2004 during the 28th session of the World Heritage Committee (Suzhou, China) based on Cultural criteria (ii), (iii), (iv):

- Criterion (ii): Liverpool was a major centre generating innovative technologies and methods in dock construction and port management in the 18th and 19th centuries. It thus contributed to the building up of the international mercantile systems throughout the British Commonwealth;
- Criterion (iii): The city and the port of Liverpool are an exceptional testimony to the development of maritime mercantile culture in the 18th and 19th centuries, contributing to the building up of the British Empire. It was a centre for the slave trade, until its abolition in 1807, and to emigration from northern Europe to America;
- Criterion (iv): Liverpool is an outstanding example of a world mercantile port city, which represents the early development of global trading and cultural connections throughout the British Empire.

The property has been on the Committee's agenda at its sessions in 2006, 2007, 2008, 2009, 2010, and 2011. In 2006, a joint UNESCO-ICOMOS reactive monitoring mission visited the property to assess the state of conservation and in 2009 and 2011, the State Party submitted state of conservation reports to the World Heritage Committee. A further state of conservation report is due on 1 February 2012 (see Decision **35 COM 7B.118**).

5. NATIONAL AND LOCAL POLICIES FOR THE PRESERVATION AND MANAGEMENT OF THE WORLD HERITAGE PROPERTY

For the moment, no statutory controls follow from the inclusion of a site in the World Heritage List although, in accordance with the guidance, the Outstanding Universal Value of a World Heritage site must be taken into account by local planning authorities in determining planning and listed building consent applications. Local authorities should also formulate specific planning policies for protecting these sites and include these policies in their development plans.

On a national level, the following Planning Policy Statements are in place that concern the preservation and the management of the World Heritage property: PPS1 (Sustainable Development) and PPS5¹ (Planning for the Historic Environment). With respect to protecting and enhancing the environment, Paragraph 17 of PPS1 states that “a high level of protection should be given to most valued townscapes and landscapes, wildlife habitats and natural resources. Those with national and international designations should receive the highest level of protection.” Paragraph 35 of the PPS1 confirms that high quality and inclusive design “[...] means ensuring a place will function well and add to the overall character and quality of the area. [...] Good design should [...] be integrated into the existing urban form and natural and built environment [...]”. A contextual approach to design is emphasized in paragraph 36 with the need for proposals to ‘respond to their local context and create and reinforce local distinctiveness [...]’. Further, paragraph 38 states “it is, however, proper to seek to promote or reinforce local distinctiveness particularly where this is supported by clear plan policies or supplementary planning documents on design.”

A range of policies in PPS5 have particular relevance to the current proposals including HE6.1, HE7.1, HE7.2, HE7.4, HE7.5, HE9.1, HE9.2, HE9.5, HE10.1, HE10.2. HE6.1 states: “Local planning authorities should require an applicant to provide a description of the significance of the heritage assets affected and the contribution of their setting to that significance. The level of detail should be proportionate to the importance of the heritage asset and no more than is sufficient to understand the potential impact of the proposal on the significance of the heritage asset. As a minimum, the relevant historic environment record should have been consulted and the heritage assets themselves should have been assessed using appropriate expertise where necessary given the application’s impact. Where an application site includes, or is considered to have potential to include, heritage assets with archaeological interest, the local planning authorities should require developers to submit an appropriate desk-based assessment and, where desk-based research is insufficient to properly assess the interest, a field evaluation.”

The City of Liverpool has produced a number of strategic documents that are of relevance to the management of the city’s historic environment. A *Unitary Development Plan* (UDP) was approved in 2002, with policies for protection and sustainable use of the historic environment. It predates the inscription of Liverpool on the World Heritage List, but remains relevant as it contains policies for conservation areas, listed buildings, archaeology and design, which are used for the determination of planning applications. The UDP is supplemented by a non-statutory Supplementary Planning Guidance on Urban Design, entitled “The Liverpool Urban Design Guide”. The Liverpool Site Management Plan (December 2003) includes a spatial and thematic vision for the site, with an over-arching vision for managing the site “as an exemplary demonstration of sustainable development and heritage-led regeneration”, and it includes clearly identified areas as “New Development Opportunities”. Last but not least, a Tall Buildings Guidance was drafted based on an urban design and policy analysis, but not adopted. This guidance supplements the adopted, non-statutory Liverpool Urban Design Guide and statutory Design Policy HD18 contained within the adopted UDP.

In addition to the UDP, the *Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site Supplementary Planning Document* (SPD) was adopted in October 2009. The SPD deals with the management of the site and embodies the principles of the existing Management Plan of the World Heritage site. It provides detailed guidance for new development, regeneration and conservation in the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage site and the surrounding area. The following paragraphs are particularly relevant to the issues the mission looked into:

4.6.13 High-rise Buildings in the World Heritage Site

“Given the outstanding universal value of the WHS, the inherent sensitivity of the character and fabric of its historic townscape and existing national planning policy (e.g. PPG 15 and the Town and Country Planning (Listed Building and Conservation Area) Act 1990) and existing policies in the UDP, there will be a strong presumption against high-rise developments within the World

¹ superseded Planning Policy Guidance 15 (PPG 15) on Planning and the Historic Environment

Heritage Site, as they would be over-dominant elements and out of context with its prevailing character. The only exception to this general presumption is at the system of historic docks and quaysides north of Collingwood Dock and Salisbury Dock, where there is very little predetermined form of development, and where medium-rise buildings will be considered [...].”

4.6.15 High-rise buildings in the Buffer Zone

“The City Council does however recognise the potential benefits of high-rise and medium-rise buildings and the need to enable their development in Liverpool city centre to support its continuing economic regeneration. The City Council therefore promotes the principle of the development of tall buildings in certain parts of the Buffer Zone. Following a detailed analysis of relevant issues [...], the City Council has identified a location for one dominant cluster of high-rise buildings in the Buffer Zone (1 - The extension of the Commercial District) and two secondary locations (2.1 - The Southern Gateway and 2.2 - Part of the Liverpool Waters Site around the site of the former Clarence Dock).”

4.7.2 Dock Water Spaces

“The historic docks in the WHS and BZ still show a strong homogeneity of design and materials. [...] It is essential that the fundamental integrity of the docks as open water spaces is retained.”

4.7.6 “The surviving areas of docks in the World Heritage site and buffer zone, including historic dock retaining walls, quaysides, artefacts and their water spaces should be conserved, retained and enhanced.”

4.7.7 “In this context it is considered inappropriate for existing water spaces within the docks that survive within the Buffer Zone to be infilled.”

5.2 Building Heights in the World Heritage Site

5.2.4 “[...] Given this, the outstanding universal value and sensitivity of the World Heritage site’s townscape, the comprehensive coverage by conservation area designations and the many listed buildings, the City Council considers it important to manage the height of new development in the World Heritage site to ensure that such development does not adversely affect the character of the World Heritage Site. This approach is supported by UDP policies HD11 and HD18 and by GEN3.”

5.2.6 “New buildings in the World Heritage site should not generally exceed the height of the tallest building in the immediate vicinity of the street(s) that they address. (The only exception to this is the area north of Salisbury and Collingwood Docks, where there is very little predetermined form of development.) In accordance with the guidance in 5.2.5, a new building could potentially exceed the height of the immediately neighbouring property, provided that: i) it is not higher than the existing tallest building on that side of the street, with which it has a close visual relationship, and ii) the height difference between it and its neighbour is no greater than the difference in heights between other neighbouring properties along that part of the street(s) that the new development addresses.”

6.4.12 Water Spaces

“Proposals to infill dock water spaces in the character area and adjacent Buffer Zone will not generally be permitted, in accordance with Section 4.7 of this document, which sets out clear guidance in relation to the surviving water spaces across the World Heritage site and buffer zone. Proposals for temporary/permanent structures and for new uses will be subject to the guidance in Section 4.7”.

The mission noted that the SPD provides no parameters concerning volume, density, and height for new buildings, and considers that the concept of “immediate vicinity” is not well defined, while the methods used to calculate the admitted difference of height that new buildings can reach, established by art. 5.2.6 commas i) and ii) allow for progressively higher buildings. Furthermore, the difference in treatment of the core and buffer zones, in terms of allowable building height, contradicts the meaning and function of the buffer zone.

6. PROGRESS IN THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JOINT WORLD HERITAGE CENTRE/ICOMOS MISSION OF 2006

The recommendations of the 2006 joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission have been followed up and implemented, primarily through the development of the Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), which was adopted and published by the Liverpool City Council in October 2009. The document was sent to the World Heritage Centre at the time of adoption in accord with Decision 33 COM 7B.130 of the World Heritage Committee. The document has statutory status within the overall planning system of the city. As requested by the World Heritage Committee, this document refers to the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value of the inscribed property and describes its overall character and spirit of place, which are further outlined in an additional Evidential Report. The Liverpool City Council is now working on the attributes that carry heritage significance and reviewing the property's Management Plan, with advice from a task group drawn from the World Heritage Site Steering Group.

Furthermore, the SPD was subjected to an awareness raising and public consultation process that included ten presentations "to various groups", two public exhibitions, a public debate, for which 700 letters were sent out, 250 draft copies distributed, 450 draft summaries distributed, and 40 written representations received. The mission would like to commend the Liverpool City Council for its efforts to aim for a transparent and participatory process, and would only recommend that in the future such exercises also be conducted over the Internet, by making documents electronically available with the possibility for the public at large to submit comments and observations.

In terms of content, however, the mission has questioned the suggestion put forward in the SPD relating to "opportunities for two secondary clusters of high-rise buildings". Both locations are in the buffer zone, away from the primary cluster of the Central Business District, and they do not relate to the current urban context (which at those locations is between one and seven storeys high). This suggestion is inconsistent with the recommendations of the 2006 mission.

In the course of discussions, the justification was put forward that "Liverpool was a pioneer in constructing high-rise buildings in the 18th century". The mission is of the opinion, however, that with the inscription of the property in 2004 a new point of reference was established, which should aim to preserve as much as possible the current skyline and profile of the World Heritage site; to make the buffer zone serve its purpose to enhance integrity (structural, functional and visual) and to protect and transmit the site's Outstanding Universal Value through the concept of setting (as set out in the 2005 ICOMOS Declaration of Xi'an); as well as to avoid isolation or fragmentation from the surrounding urban context in which the historic docklands represent a continuous landscape of perception, value and management (as put forward in the 2011 Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape).

Notwithstanding this critical issue (which forms the core of the mission's strong reservations against the Liverpool Waters scheme), in overall terms the development strategies, existing planning procedures and management system for the property and its setting should be effective in putting heritage at the heart of the redevelopment process and thereby regenerating the city of Liverpool. The mission agrees that if anywhere culture and heritage should be used as drivers for change and growth, it should be Liverpool, which remains the most deprived local authority in England, with the 3rd lowest employment rate in the UK.

7. STATE OF CONSERVATION OF LIVERPOOL – MARITIME MERCANTILE CITY

The Pier Head - Character Area 1 - Mann Island - Character Area 2

The Strategic Regeneration Framework for the city published in 2000 identified the scheme of a massive improvement project for the Pier Head and Mann Island, including the renewal of the public realm. The scope of the scheme was aimed at inserting new life in these areas, also creating a museum where the economic, social history and popular culture of Liverpool are

presented through temporary and permanent exhibitions, to symbolize the regeneration of the city. The new cultural facility would attract the public from the city centre to the area, at the same time allowing its flow to and the adjacent public promenade areas.

The Museum of Liverpool - Mann Island

The Liverpool Museum, by the Danish architectural team 3XN, was opened on 19 July 2011. Located in the World Heritage site, between Albert Dock and the Pier Head next to the Three Graces, today the museum building constitutes a key landmark. Its silhouette clearly stands in the composite setting of the area and is quite recognizable from most of the views along the Liverpool quaysides of the Mersey River, and especially from all along the quaysides of the Mirral peninsula. Its two dynamic inclined and irregular sculptural volumes, parallel to the riverfront and clad with limestone similar in colour to the Pier Head historic buildings, introduce to Mann Island:

- a) contemporary urban patterns, which were historically oriented orthogonal to the river;
- b) contemporary architectural patterns, with no reference to the verticality and elevation rhythm of the Three Graces inspired by eclectic/classical principles of the beginning of the early 20th century.

Together with the adjacent Neptune Development buildings, the King Arena building south of Albert Dock and a number of high-rise buildings recently erected in the King Triangle on the limit of the World Heritage site, these add a contemporary component to the Liverpool townscape.

The Liverpool Museum is considerably lower in height and volume than the Three Graces. Whilst its presence modifies the local setting and the views of the historical assets from both close and distant points, it also contributes to the revitalization of the area and to the presentation of the history of Liverpool. As such, it does not affect the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage site. Furthermore, one of the key objectives of the World Heritage Convention is to “[...] use educational and information programmes to strengthen appreciation and respect by their peoples of the cultural and natural heritage [...]” While this does not justify inappropriate development it is a factor to be considered.

The Mersey Ferries Terminal Building

Standing isolated on the Pier Head quayside in front of the monumental compound of the Three Graces, the recently built Terminal Building presents architectural features analogous to those of the Liverpool Museum, with white stone cladding and glass curtain walls. Due to its scale and distance from the historical assets, the features of the Terminal do not in absolute terms interfere with the attributes of the Three Graces, and do not affect adversely the overall integrity and authenticity of the property.

Mann Island apartment and office buildings

Under the auspices of a Neptune Development Limited initiative, three buildings are now under completion in the Mann Island area, east of the Liverpool Museum. The western and central blocks, respectively 9 and 11 floors, are residential buildings connected by a glazed, public ‘winter garden’. The third block, facing the Strand, is a huge office building standing in the townscape with its eleven floors. The three buildings are provided with two-storey underground car parks.

Following relevant analysis undertaken by the architect prior to the finalization of the design, the plans of roofs and elevations of the two residential blocks were inclined in order to preserve views and vistas from some surrounding points to the front and rear elevations of the Three Graces. Due to their cladding in black polished granite and dark glass windows, the buildings appear as black massive, irregular prisms floating on a transparent ground floor. The office building, clad with alternating transparent and black panels, has a rather animated elevation rhythm.

Looking at the setting from the Hartley and Salt-house quays, the new buildings hinder a full view of the historical assets of the Pier Head. Moreover, the office building on the Strand creates an urban screen visually separating the site from the commercial district. In spite of cautions adopted in their design, the marked dark appearance of the massive volumes of these buildings and their proximity to the Three Graces have the effect of creating an architectural counterpoint to the

Graces, which distracts to a certain extent from their landmark character. The mission considers that this development, albeit not affecting the authenticity of the area, nevertheless has impacted on the integrity of the World Heritage site.

Ropewalks area (core zone)

The Outstanding Universal Value of Ropewalks is related to the way that this area developed to service the trade from the Old Dock of 1715, the first commercial wet dock in the world, as well as to the high degree of authenticity of the historic buildings still standing and the overall integrity of the urban grid patterns. The area is characterized by a dense mixture of old warehouses, eighteenth century merchants' houses, often in semi-derelict condition, located mostly along the prominent Duke Street. This situation of decay is being consistently addressed by the Liverpool City Council, which adopted in 2005 a specific Supplementary Planning Document aimed at implementing the vision for Ropewalks area. This SPD intends to develop a sustainable economy fitting to the local urban context, promoting conservation and restoration of listed historic buildings at risk, as well as the renewal and conversion of other historic buildings and development of contemporary building in redundant plots. Historic buildings are being re-used and attributed with new suitable uses, such as housing or hotels.

In this framework, in order to foster the social and economic upgrading of the area, the Liverpool City Council has launched a bold campaign to improve the public realm, making public spaces and routes attractive, safe, uncluttered and accessible to disabled and elderly people. This has resulted in the recent enhancement of the urban environment with the provision of attractive new spaces such as Campbell Square and Concert Square. The mission considers that the Ropewalks area development, with its ongoing or proposed renovation, rehabilitation and redevelopment initiatives, contributes to carefully re-establishing the city's coherence.

Restoration project of the Stanley Dock warehouses (core zone)

The Stanley Dock complex, located on the east side of the dock road, occupies a prominent position in the north Liverpool dockland landscape and includes a water space and industrial structures that have created a distinctive industrial setting. It is a key element of the World Heritage site and, at national level, is protected as the Stanley Dock Conservation Area. The Tobacco Warehouse, the Northern Warehouse and the Hydraulic Pump house are Grade II listed buildings and although partly altered, have kept most of their authentic features.

In 2011, the owner of the site (Stanley Dock Properties Ltd) brought a planning application before the City Council for the restoration of the compound and the conversion of the Tobacco warehouse, North warehouse and South warehouse to a mixed use scheme. During the mission Darmody Architects presented the outline of the restoration project aimed to convert the warehouse spaces into residential units, offices and exhibition areas. The mission considers that the project, notwithstanding some internal structural alterations foreseen to bring natural light in the central area of the building and to mitigate the low height of existing floors, would contribute to the conservation of the historic buildings and of the historical assets and setting of the area as well as to its revitalization.

Wellington Dock (Buffer zone): Extension project of the wastewater treatment plant

Wellington Dock is located within the buffer zone, immediately north of the Stanley Dock Conservation Area, and is not subject to any national designation. The environment of Wellington dock is highly industrial. United Utilities currently manages the wastewater treatment in the existing plant at Sandon dock, immediately north of Wellington dock. The company has submitted an application to Liverpool City Council for an extension of the plant, in order to comply with European Union environmental regulations, which is planned through an infill of Wellington dock.

During the mission, United Utilities presented the strategic, technical and economic motivations of the planning application to fill in Wellington dock. According to the axonometric architectural outline presented, the extension would be concentrated in the area of the existing water basin, and not touch any structures of the Wellington dock retaining walls. The surface area between the new

building and dock walls would be at the original level of the water in the dock and be covered with slate chippings, recalling the water's surface.

The conclusion of the "Impact on the Outstanding Universal Values", presented by Jacobs Engineering U.K. Consultants, acknowledges that the project will have an impact on the authenticity and integrity of the World Heritage site: "Whilst it is acknowledged that the proposed development will have an adverse impact on the historic dock landscape and the setting of the World Heritage site, it is also recognized that the proposals will have a beneficial impact on water quality within the River Mersey."

The mission considers that more detailed technical information, comprising an architectural plan and section drawings, as well as visual simulations are needed to carefully weigh the negative impacts of the extension on the integrity, authenticity and Outstanding Universal Value of the adjacent World Heritage site, in its widest urban context, as well as its beneficial outcomes for the community.

Liverpool Waters development application (core and buffer zones):

The site of the Liverpool Waters development proposal covers the area comprising King Edward Triangle (buffer), Princes Dock (buffer), Princes Half Tide dock (core), West Waterloo Dock (buffer), the area corresponding to former Victoria, Trafalgar Clarence Docks (buffer), today filled in, as well as Clarence Basin (buffer), today partially filled in, Graving Docks (core), Graving Dock Basin (core), Salisbury Dock (core), Collingwood Dock (core), Nelson Dock and Bramley Moore Dock (core). The sites of King Edward Triangle and Princes Dock in the buffer zone have undergone development in recent years with the construction of office blocks, hotels, car parks and other commercial structures, among which is the freestanding Alexandra Tower on the river front. The other docks mentioned above have retained the character of a utilitarian and industrial area, albeit derelict.

The concerned part of the World Heritage site is protected by the City Council regulations as the Stanley Dock Conservation Area: although most of its structures are disused or in poor condition, it represents an authentic dockland landscape, the *raison d'être* for Liverpool's World Heritage listing. There is a wide range of listed buildings and structures within or close to the site, which are to be considered as attributes of the World Heritage site in the statement of Outstanding Universal Value: the river wall, the water spaces, the pier structures and the dock boundary wall, designed by Jesse Hartley.

In October 2010 Peel Holdings, owner of the site, submitted an application to Liverpool City Council seeking an "outline planning permission" for an urban mixed-use development to be implemented over a 30-year period. The project, with an estimated investment of GB£ 5.5 billion, involves an area of 60 ha, extending for 2km along the waterfront from Princes Dock and the King Edward Triangle, north of Pier Head, up to Bramley Moore Dock, at the northernmost extent of the site. It foresees to provide a total of 1,278,000 m² for residences, offices, restaurants, cafés, shops and community services, plus 413,000 m² of underground and overground parking.

Concerning the building typologies, the outline Master Plan provides mid-rise buildings plus two clusters of high-rise buildings. Five new high-rise buildings at Princes Dock and King Edward Triangle, including the 192m high "Shanghai Tower", would complement the existing tall building cluster in the Commercial (Central Business) District, while a new public space would link the base of Shanghai Tower to the waterfront and to the historic quayside. Immediately north of Princes Half Tide dock the outline Master Plan foresees a new cruiseliner terminal complex, as well a new cultural building. The second cluster of seven high-rise buildings (up to 148m) would be erected at the Central Dock area, the former Victoria and Trafalgar Docks, around a central public space and separated from the riverfront blocks by the new canal.

On the riverfront and starting from the Civic Building, a dense frontage of blocks is foreseen, up to 41m in height. At Clarence Graving Docks medium rise blocks (between 19 and 27m high) are planned around the existing water spaces and four blocks of 45m high along the riverfront. At

Nelson Dock and Bramley Moore Dock there are plans for blocks of 38m high on the riverfront and 32m high on the docks, with a small floating island in Nelson Dock plus floating pontoons in Bramley Moore Dock as part of a marina. A network of access points, routes, public spaces and underground and overground parking would service the area, while the new canal, the new canal, parallel to the river, already connects West Waterloo Dock to the Graving Dock area.

Peel Holding's Heritage Impact Assessment

According to provisions 4.2.3 of the City Council's 2009 SPD, in September 2010 Peel Holding commissioned and presented the "Assessment of Impact of Liverpool Waters proposal on the Outstanding Universal Value of Liverpool World Heritage site", which states in its conclusion: "Whilst some limited harmful impacts remain, this assessment has demonstrated that these are greatly outweighed by the benefits offered and that overall, there is no risk to the inscription of the Liverpool World Heritage property. ... The revised assessment of cumulative impacts, which is also informed by intangible factors, demonstrates a strongly beneficial outcome."

Liverpool City Council's Heritage Impact Assessment

In advance of the submission of the planning application, in 2010 the Liverpool City Council undertook its own Heritage Impact Assessment on the basis of the available information. The study concluded that there would be considerably more positive heritage impacts arising from the proposed development than negative impacts. The City Council's Heritage Impact Assessment did not take the impact of underground parking on the archaeology of the site into account, as the proposal for underground parking was not shown yet in the available information. It must be noted that the study considered that the 15 storey blocks, initially proposed along the river frontage, are of "High negative Impact/Non-compliance with the World Heritage site SPD", against compliance with SPD articles 4.6.13, and 5.2.6 (Guidance on Tall Buildings and Building Heights in the World Heritage site) that foresee exceptions to the consideration against high-rise developments within the system of historic docks and quaysides north of Collingwood Dock and Salisbury Dock.

English Heritage's Heritage Impact Assessment

The Heritage Impact Assessment of English Heritage, Statutory Advisor to the UK Government, published in March 2011 notes that the Liverpool Waters development presents significant issues of non-compliance with the City Council's UDP and SDP, and concludes: "In summary, the development fails to deliver satisfactorily against the principal test set by the World Heritage nomination and the Statement of Outstanding Universal Value, namely that in both the World Heritage site Character Area 'islands' and in the buffer zone the development should protect, respect and transmit the World Heritage site's Outstanding Universal Value."

The buffer zone as a whole has specific functions to protect and transmit the Outstanding Universal Value of the World Heritage property. Because of the reasons stated below, the mission considers that the development proposed in the buffer zone would result in the modification of the functional hierarchy and morphology expressed by the port circulation system (river – sluices – dock – water basins), as well as by the historical typologies of the port industrial structures and services, thus affecting the buffer zone's protection and transmission of the World Heritage site's authenticity:

- a) the significant difference of scale in building height and density proposed (medium-rise buildings along the waterfront and high-rise buildings in the clusters) compared to the scale of the historical industrial typologies and morphology assets, setting and context;
- b) the absence of functional connection and significance between the proposed buildings and the historical assets of the setting;
- c) the proposal to create an urban grid inspired by the adjoining east area grid existing beyond the dock wall (those features not corresponding to the historical and functional urban patterns modelled by the docks structures and water basins orthogonal to the river frontage).

The mission furthermore considers that the development proposed in the buffer zone would result in a possible loss of important archaeological assets, thus affecting the contribution of the buffer zone to the integrity of the World Heritage site, since the important structural works needed for the

foundations of the proposed buildings and water-tightness of underground car parks that may harm the integrity of the archaeological assets of the area.

The mission would like to point out that along Bath Street at Princes Dock, and Regent Road, from the former Trafalgar Dock to Clarence Graving Dock and from Wellington Dock to Huskisson Dock, the World Heritage site's boundaries include the wall, which closes off the docks and controls the access to them and a 9m strip west of the docks boundary wall. This wall, granted World Heritage status, can only retain its integral significance if physically and functionally related to the dock structures for the protection of which it has been erected.

At the time of inscription such delimitation of the World Heritage boundaries was motivated by doubts about the subsistence of the dock retaining wall, infilled or remodelled during the 20th century. Today, according to recent documentary and aerial photography investigation, it has been assessed that important elements of the historical assets of the adjoining buffer zone's central docks are still existent above ground level. This situation should lead to an effective protection of the area, as affirmed in the retrospective Statement of Outstanding Universal Value adopted in 2009.²

Impact of the proposal on the Authenticity of the World Heritage property

Up until today, the still existent central docks' structures within the World Heritage property, although in poor condition, have retained much of their spatial relationship to the river and provide a strong sense of place, function and character. Therefore, and in view of:

- a) the absence of a functional connection and significance between the proposed buildings and the historical assets;
- b) the proposal to create artificial islands in the water spaces;
- c) the proposal of an urban development which presents a significant difference of scale in building height and density (medium-rise buildings along the waterfront in the World Heritage property, and medium-rise and high-rise buildings in the buffer zone) compared to the scale of the historic-industrial typologies and morphology assets, setting and context that would affect the morphological and symbolic relationship between the Central Dock Area and the monumental Three Graces buildings;
- d) the proposal to create, in the former Trafalgar and Victoria Docks area, a canal corridor parallel to the river, as well as to create an urban grid inspired by the adjoining east area grid existing beyond the dock wall (those features not corresponding to the historical functional urban patterns modelled by the docks structures and water basins orthogonal to the river frontage);

the development would result in the definitive modification of the functional hierarchy and morphology expressed by the port circulation system (river – sluices – docks – water basin), as well as by the historical typologies of the port industrial structures and services, thus seriously affecting the authenticity of the World Heritage property.

Impact of the proposal on the Integrity of the World Heritage property

In view of:

- a) the proposed modification of historical typology and morphology of the concerned areas;
- b) the proposal to create artificial islands in the water spaces;
- c) the physical and visual separation that would be created between two parts of Character Area 3 – Stanley Dock Conservation Area;
- d) the proposed modification of the morphological and symbolic relationship between the Central Dock area and the monumental Three Graces buildings;

² Authenticity: "The main docks survive as water-filled basins within the property and in the buffer zone. The impact on the setting of the property of further new development on obsolete dockland is a fundamental consideration. It is essential that future development within the World Heritage property and its setting, including the buffer zone, should respect and transmit its Outstanding Universal Value."

"It is important for new development to minimize direct impacts on important historic elements, such as significant structures or archaeological deposits." Art. 22 of the Vienna Memorandum.

e) the modification of the comprehensive morphology of the townscape observed from distant views and the modification of vistas on some key land mark buildings from the World Heritage property;
the development would alter the relationship of the different areas of the World Heritage property, thus seriously affecting its integrity.

Conclusion

Referring to guiding principles provided by relevant international Charters and Recommendations, in particular the 2011 UNESCO *Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape*, as concerns “the complex layering of urban settlements, in order to identify values, understand their meaning for the communities and present them ... in a comprehensive manner” (article 26), these should inform the planning and design of the Liverpool Waters intervention. Recalling that:

- the hierarchical relationship historically established between the river, the water spaces, industrial dock structures and service buildings of the World Heritage property and its buffer zone correspond to the functional exigencies of the mercantile port, of which the surviving structures are still the physical expression;
- the proposed development, with its density and height of buildings, would significantly modify the morphology of the historic urban landscape and its views, hindering the understanding of the overall layout of the World Heritage property, as well as the functional, visual and symbolic relationships of its historical assets;
- the innovative technologies involved in the implementation of the Liverpool Waters proposal are not connected to the innovative development of the Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City and would therefore convey to present and future generations the values of 21st century urban renewal, not those related to the Outstanding Universal Value that motivated the inscription of Liverpool on the World Heritage List;
- cultural heritage conservation is a supporting factor for sustainable economic development,

the mission considers that the property would be faced with a potential serious deterioration of its architectural and town-planning coherence, a serious loss of historical authenticity, and an important loss of cultural significance. Therefore, the mission considers that if the proposed development would be implemented, the essential attributes testifying to the Outstanding Universal Value of Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City during the 18th, 19th and early 20th centuries would be irreversibly damaged.

8. ASSESSMENT OF DEVELOPMENT STRATEGIES, PLANNING PROCEDURES AND MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

This issue has been covered under paragraphs 5, 6 and 7.

9. MISSION'S CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The implementation of the recommendations of the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS mission of 2006, as set out in the decisions of the World Heritage Committee, has taken place through the development, adoption and publication in October 2009 of a Supplementary Planning Document (SPD), with an additional Evidential Report, by the Liverpool City Council. The overall development strategies, existing planning procedures and management systems, and their effectiveness for the property and its setting, should be effective in putting heritage at the heart of the conservation and redevelopment process of Liverpool.

The overall state of conservation of this property is good and has in fact improved since the 2006 Reactive Monitoring mission. With regard to the factors affecting its Outstanding Universal Value, in particular as regards the proposed development of Liverpool Waters with its dense, high and mid-rise buildings, the mission concludes that the redevelopment scheme of Liverpool Waters, as presented to the mission, would ignore the current consensus on the role and meaning of the buffer zone, not take into consideration the concept of the Historic Urban Landscape, and damage the Outstanding Universal Value of the property beyond repair. While the mission is fully supportive of the regeneration efforts undertaken by the Liverpool City Council, putting heritage at the heart of the spatial development process, it will not support the Liverpool Waters scheme in its current outline, as it will be developed at the expense of the city's heritage and its Outstanding Universal Value.

Therefore, the mission strongly recommends that the three principal stakeholders, being Liverpool City Council, Peel Holdings and English Heritage, reconvene around the table and work out a scheme that includes the above observations and recommendations.

ANNEXES

- ANNEX 1. Illustrations
- ANNEX 2. Mission composition
- ANNEX 3. Mission programme
- ANNEX 4. Reference documents

ANNEX 1. Illustrations

Fig. 1. The Liverpool Museum on Pier Head, adjacent to the Three Graces and the Mann Island development.

Fig. 2. The partially obstructed view towards the Three Graces from Albert Dock.

Fig. 3. The historic docklands towards the north as the site for the Liverpool Waters scheme, with the Central Docks at left in the foreground.



Fig 4. Final Liverpool Waters scheme in 2010 (after height and density reduction) seen from the north.



Fig 5. Axonometric masterplan of the current proposal for the Liverpool Waters scheme seen from the north.

ANNEX 2. Mission Composition

Dr Ron van Oers, Programme Specialist, Special Projects Unit, UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Ms Patricia Alberth, Assistant Programme Specialist, Europe and North America Section,
UNESCO World Heritage Centre

Arch. Giancarlo Barbato, ICOMOS Expert

ANNEX 3. Mission Programme

Time	Event	Attendees
Sunday 13th November	Arrival	
	Members of Mission arrive at hotel	
Monday 14th November	General Orientation and Context; Values and Significance of the WHS	
9-10.00	East Reception Room, Liverpool Town Hall Welcome to mission by members and senior officers of Liverpool City Council, English Heritage, DCMS, Steering Group and Peel, chaired by Cllr Joe Anderson: • Introductions • Aim of the Mission and Role of the Delegation, explained by the mission experts • The general role of LCC – GF/JA • The Role of LV – MS • The role of DCMS – PB • The role of EH – HOJ • The role of the Steering Group – IW • Peel's background – LA	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JA, MK, WS, GF, NK, ML, PJ, RB, JH, KB) LV (MS, MT) EH (CS,HOJ, GI, CY) DCMS (PB) SG (IW and JD) NML (DF) Peel (LA, IP, PdF, KN, MB)
10.0-10.20	Coffee Break	
10.20-10.50	East Reception Room, Liverpool Town Hall Presentation: <i>Mission Experts explain the WH Convention and its obligations for protection and management; a summary of the SOC decisions for Liverpool and the purpose of Reactive Monitoring Missions and how they are structured.</i>	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, PJ, RB, JH, KB) LV (MT) EH (CS, HOJ, GI, CY) DCMS (PB) SG (IW, DF and JD) Peel (LA, IP, PdF, KN, MB)
10.50- 11.30	Presentation in Liverpool Town Hall: <i>Explanation of Liverpool's economic situation– LV (MT)</i>	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, PJ, RB, JH, KB) LV (MT) EH (CS, HOJ, GI, CY) DCMS (PB) SG (IW, DF and JD) Peel (LA, IP, KN)
11.30-1.00	General minibus tour of North Liverpool to see context of Liverpool Waters (LW) Site: – Everton Brow viewpoint over LW, – Anfield and Vauxhall neighbouring residential areas and Liverpool FC regeneration proposals – Dock Road - o Operational docks to N of LW - o Mixed industrial uses on E fringe of LW - o Wellington Dock – in advance of presentation on Day 3 - o Stanley Dock – in advance of presentation on Day 3	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (MK,ML, PJ, RB, JH) LV (RT) EH (CS, HOJ, GI, CY) DCMS (PB) SG (IW, DF) Peel (, PdF, KN) LFC (IA)
1.00	Lunch at Matou, Pier Head	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (Mke, WS, ML, RB, JH,)

		EH (CS, HOJ, GI, CY) DCMS (PB) Steering Group (IW) LV (IM) Peel (LA,KN, IP, PdF), LFC (IA) Neptune (SP)
2.00-4.00	Walk through: - Pier Head (new canal link and landscaping) - Mann Island and Museum of Liverpool (principle subject of 2006 Mission) - Albert Dock (International example of heritage-led regeneration) - Old Dock Experience (Preservation and interpretation of OUV) - Liverpool 1 (Urban design and integration of cultural heritage)	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (RB, JH,) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) NML (DF, JDu, JMcC, LS, YV) L1(CB) Neptune (SP)
4.00-4.30	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Discussions with conservation interests: WHS SG (IW), MCS (PB, TS), WC, DS and FG	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (RB, JH,) WHS SG (IW) MCS (PB, TS) WC DS SoS (FG)
4.30-5.00	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Discussions with ICOMOS UK (DT?)	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (RB, JH) ICOMOS UK (DT?)
5-5.30	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Presentation: <i>Liverpool's OUV and responses to the decisions of the WH Committee</i> – by JH and CY	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (RB, JH,) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (PdF, MB)
5.30-6.00	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Presentation: <i>Significance of the Docks in their global context</i> (by KF, supported by GI, JH and PdF)	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (RB, JH,) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (PdF, MB)
6.30-7.30	Liverpool Town Hall Informal Reception	
Tuesday 15th November	Protection and Management of the WHS: Detailed Briefing on Planning and Liverpool Waters	
9.00-9.15	McCartney Room, Epstein Centre, Hatton Garden Feedback/Follow-up on proceedings of 1 st day in	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH, PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel
9.15-9.35	McCartney Room, Epstein Centre, Hatton Garden Presentation: <i>General introduction to the UK planning system, nationally and locally</i> by ML;	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, JH, PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (MB)
9.45 -10.30	McCartney Room, Epstein Centre, Hatton Garden Presentation:	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, JH, PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY)

	<i>WHS Supplementary Planning Document and Summary of future development needs within the WHS and its buffer zone by JH</i>	Peel (IP, PdF or MB)
10.30-10.50	Coffee Break	
10.50-12.30 pm	McCartney Room, Epstein Centre, Hatton Garden Presentations: <i>Liverpool Waters</i> • Peel and the Ocean Gateway Concept; • The Liverpool Waters Planning Application; • Heritage-led, High Quality Urban Design; • Heritage Significance and Heritage Impact Assessment by Peel	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, RB, JH,PJ) SG (IW) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (LA, IP, PdF, KN, MB, PS)
12.30-1	Brief walk through Historic Commercial District en route to lunch	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH) EH (HOJ,CY,GI) LV (JD) Peel (PdF) LCCI (JS, MM)
1-1.50 pm	Lunch at Panoramic	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, RB, JH,PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) LV (MT) Peel (LA, IP, PdF, KN, MB, PS) LCCI (JS, MM)
2pm-4.30pm	Ferry from Liverpool to Seacombe. Mini-bus tour of view-points of Liverpool Waters site from Wirral, passing Wirral Waters. Mini-bus tour of Liverpool Waters site, including restored dock wall and Bascule Bridge, with walkabouts to inspect details of the WHS.	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (ML, RB, JH,PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (LA or IP, PdF, PS)
4.30 - 5.30	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Liverpool Waters question, answer and discussion session with Peel Developments team	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (MK, ML, RB, JH,PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (LA, IP, PdF, KN, MB PS)
Wednesday 16th November	Transmission and presentation of WHS, consultations and conclusions	
9.00-9.15	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Feedback/Follow-up on proceedings of 2nd day in hotel	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH, PJ) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel
9.15-10.30	Tour of Ropewalks (including Liverpool Sailors' Home Gateway, Base2Stay and The Bluecoat)	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH,CG,SC,PH,KB) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) RN AU BB
10.30-11.30	Further site visits or discussion as required	

11.30-12.00	Reid Room, St George's Hall Presentation: <i>WH Marketing and Interpretation</i> by WS	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH, KB) LV (CMcC, GBo) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Peel (IP, MB)
12-1	Reid Room, St George's Hall Presentations in other major proposed developments: 12.00 <i>Stanley Dock</i> by Harcourt: Tim Darmody, Pat Power 12.30 <i>Wellington Dock</i> by United Utilities: Perry Hobbs, Sandra Honeywell, Steve Mogford Dave Watson	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH, ML, JW) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) SG (IW) Peel (IP)
1-2	Lunch in Empire Theatre	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (JH, KB, GB) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) TMP (RH?) SG (JB)
2-4	Private discussion time for the delegation	
4-5	Conference Room in the Mission's hotel Round table discussion on key issues, including feedback by the mission, led by mission	Mission (RvO, PA, GB) LCC (WS, GF, NK, ML, PJ, RB, JH, KB) LV (TBC) EH (HOJ, GI, CY) Steering Group (IW, DF and JD) NML (JDu) Peel (IP, PdF, KN, MB, PS)
5. End of Mission		

Glossary of initials

LCC – Liverpool City Council

JA – Councillor Joe Anderson – leader of the Council

MKe– Councillor Malcolm Kennedy – Heritage Champion and Member for Regeneration and Transport

WS – Councillor Wendy Simon – Member for Culture

GF - Ged Fitzgerald - Chief Executive

NK – Nick Kavanagh - Director of Regeneration

MK – Mark Kitts – Assistant Executive Director

ML – Mark Loughran – Development Control Manager

PJ – Peter Jones – Development Control Manager for Liverpool Waters

RB – Rob Burns – Urban Design Manager

JH – John Hinchliffe – World Heritage Officer

KB – Keith Blundell – Tourism Manager

GBo - Graham Boxer – Head of Arts, Heritage and Participation

SC – Steve Corbett – Conservation Manager

CG – Chris Griffiths – Buildings at Risk Officer

PH – Peter Hoey –Townscape Heritage Initiative Officer

EH – English Heritage

CS – Chris Smith – National Planning Director

HOJ – Henry Owen-John – NW Regional Director

GI – Graeme Ives – Historic Areas Advisor

CY – Christopher Young - Head of World Heritage

DCMS - Department for Culture Media and Sport

PB – Paul Blaker – Head of World Heritage

SG- WHS Steering Group

IW – Ian Wray – Liverpool University and Chair
JD – Jenny Douglas – City Centre Development Manager, Liverpool Vision
JB – John Belchem – Liverpool University
MM – Maresa Molloy – Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and Industry

National Museums Liverpool

DF – David Fleming – Director of National Museums Liverpool
JDu – Janet Dugdale – Director of Museum of Liverpool
JMcM – Jen McCarthy – Deputy Director of Museum of Liverpool
LS – Liz Stewart – Exhibition Curator – Archaeology & Historic Environment
YV – Yazz Vanducci – Old Dock Tour Guide

Peel Developments

LA – Lindsey Ashworth – Development Director
IP – Ian Pollit – Development/Investment Surveyor
PdF – Peter de Figueiredo – Historic Building Consultant
KN – Keith Nutter – Planner at White Young Green
MB – Martin Bailey – Planner at White Young Green
PS – Peter Swift – Landscape Architect/Urban Designer at Planit IE

TMP – The Mersey Partnership

RH – Rod Holmes – Chairman

LV – Liverpool Vision

MS – Max Steinberg – Chief Executive
MT – Mike Taylor – Deputy Chief Executive
IM – Ian McCarthy – North Liverpool Manager
RT – Richard Tracey – N Liverpool Development Officer
CMcC – Clare McColgan Director of Culture
GB – Graham Boxer – Head of Arts, Heritage and Participation

RT – Richard Tracey

LCCI – Liverpool Chamber of Commerce and Industry

JS – Jack Stopforth – Chairman

Merseyside Civic Society

PB – Peter Brown
TS – Trevor Skempton

LFC – Liverpool Football Club

IA – Ian Ayre – Managing Director

The Bluecoat

AU – Alistair Upton – Director
BB – Bryan Biggs – Artistic Director

RN – Robert Nadler – Director of Base2Stay
SP – Steve Parry – Director of Neptune Developments
CB – Chris Bliss – Estates Director of Liverpool One
WC – Wayne Colquhoun
DS – David Swift
FG – Florence Gersten – Save Our City

ANNEX 4. Referenced Documents

English Heritage. 2011. Assessment of the potential impact of the proposed Liverpool Waters master plan on OUV at Liverpool Maritime Mercantile WHS Impact Assessment.

ICOMOS. 2003. Technical evaluation of the nomination of Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City.

Liverpool City Council. 2003. Nomination file of Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City.

Liverpool City Council. 2008. Buildings at Risk Enforcement & THJ grant development work. Summary of Enforcement Programme & Urgent Works Survey.

Liverpool City Council. 2008. Townscape Heritage Initiative Conservation Led Regeneration in Liverpool's Ropewalks.

Liverpool City Council. 2009. Liverpool Maritime Mercantile City World Heritage Site. Supplementary Planning Document.

Liverpool City Council. 2011. Briefing notes for the joint World Heritage Centre/ICOMOS Reactive Monitoring Mission to the World Heritage property "Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City", United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, 14-16 November 2011.

Liverpool City Council. 2011. Liverpool World Heritage Site Supplementary Planning Document – Public Consultation Results and Response.

Liverpool City Council. 2011. Official Map and Guide.

Liverpool City Council. 2011. Review of the World Heritage Site Management Plan for Liverpool – Maritime Mercantile City.

Michael Parkinson. European Institute of Urban Affairs. 2010. Liverpool City Centre: Maintaining momentum, raising quality.

Peel Holdings. 2010. Liverpool Waters planning application submission.

Peel Holdings. 2011. Liverpool Waters planning application update - selected documents including Heritage Impact Assessment, Design & Access Statement, supporting characterization reports and Archaeological Deposit Model Report.

UNESCO. 2011. UNESCO Recommendation on the Historic Urban Landscape.