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##

## Abstract

The city of Liverpool has experienced extensive redevelopment to its waterfront over recent decades as derelict land is being transformed into mix use developments. Peel Holdings’ ‘Liverpool Waters’ is an ambitious, large scale plan that hopes to continue the ongoing waterfront developments, by creating 17,000 jobs and 23,000 apartments.

The aim of this research is to get a sense of how the public feel about this grand plan including the various issues that surround urban development. Along with this, the respondent’s opinion on Liverpool’s waterfront development as a whole was asked. While these issues could be apparent in many developments nationwide, the conflict between UNESCO and Peel Holdings over issues of heritage is unique to this development and it was for this reason that it was investigated. Research was conducted through the use of questionnaires.

The study found that the vast majority of respondents were in favour of the Liverpool Waters scheme, as well as Liverpool’s waterfront development as a whole. Mostly those who did were not in favour were sceptical as opposed to being outright against the developments. The issues of heritage were considerably more contentious than the other questions with strong opinions for both sides of the argument. While public opinion is generally in favour, citing the economic affects of the scheme as the main benefit, the public showed that the UNESCO dispute is by far the most controversial issues on the scheme, and this dispute is set to continue.
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# Chapter 1: Introduction

## 1.1 Background:

The general shift in western countries from industrial to post-industrial economies has led to a lack of employment in the once highly productive, manufacturing cities; this led to the outmigration of large parts of the population (Hollander *et al.* 2009). As a result of this, large parts of urban areas were made redundant, becoming unused, and falling into a state of dilapidation.

Deindustrialization that began during the 1970s is the main factor that has led to reduced populations and the decline of inner city areas. Liverpool for example during the early 1980s experienced one of the highest unemployment rates in the UK, as a result 12,000 people were leaving the city each year and around 15% of land was vacant or derelict (Belchem, 2006). Due to this, urban planners have put into practice regeneration schemes as a way to draw back the lost populations and wealth and to create new markets in the hope of creating a more sustainable city both economically and socially.

The waterfront areas of cities have become a popular and successful place for regeneration to occur. London’s Canary Wharf, Salford Quays and Liverpool’s Albert Dock are all prime examples of waterfront regeneration in the UK, there are also many other well known examples from across the world such as Vancouver’s Granville Island and San Francisco’s Mission Bay (Marshall, 2001). The reason that waterfront land is so appealing for urban redevelopment may be due to deindustrialization, as the former docklands fell out of use thus freeing up land, this is evident in London’s Canary Wharf which has been turned from unused docks into a worldwide financial hub and Liverpool’s Albert Dock which is now a thriving tourist attraction. However the reason may not be that simple, Marshall (2001, 5) describes the waterfront of cities of the past as being the generators of economic wealth and that by regenerating these areas today it speaks to our past and our future by ‘providing opportunities for cities to reconnect with their waters edge’ he goes onto say that as waterfront areas were once the centre of activity in the past by regenerating them, they again become the centre of activity but in a new way.

The idea that the urban waterfront is an ideal place to live, work and socialize in the United Kingdom can be traced to the work of the Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) of the 1980s. The 1980s was a time when deindustrialization was having its full effect on the urban population, 1982 saw over three million out of work, which equated to one in eight people unemployed. This was felt more so in the north, around 15 to 16 percent, whereas the south, had around 10% (BBC, 2012). The Urban Development Corporations were a government led initiatives to stimulate growth in unused and abandoned urban areas mainly through investment from the private sector. While there were many UDCs established during the 1980s, the most notable of them are that of the Merseyside Development Corporation, which was responsible for the Albert Dock, and the London Docklands Development Corporation which helped create Canary Wharf (Ward, 2004). One noticeable point is that many of the UDCs focused on waterfront areas, which may have been the spark that has caused the growth in the desirability and appeal of the urban waterfront.

The city of Liverpool has experienced ongoing regeneration of its city centre and waterfront over recent decades through large scale projects that have transformed significant parts of the city. Starting most notably with the revitalisation of the Albert Dock by the Merseyside Development Corporation with construction beginning in 1982 and finishing a year later (Albert Dock, 2012). The next large scale project came in 2008 in the form of the £920 million Liverpool One redevelopment, which focused on the city centre adjacent to the Albert Dock and aimed to physically join the two developments together by making it easier for the public to travel from one to the other. After this on the 6th of March 2012 Liverpool City Council approved the largest project ever considered for planning permission in Liverpool (Liverpool Waters, 2012a). The £5.5 billion Liverpool Waters scheme aims to regenerate 60 hectors of Liverpool’s historic dockland into a “world class, high quality, mixed use waterfront quarter in central Liverpool”, (Liverpool Waters, 2012b) with a matching development planned for the other side of the River Mersey on the Wirral, known as Wirral Waters. Together the project is known as Mersey Waters, and the site is one of the four ‘Enterprise Zones’ designated by the UK Government in 2011 (The Peel Group, 2012) that are aimed at drawing in business through economic incentives and simplified planning. The Liverpool Waters project is estimated to take thirty to fifty years to complete which shows the huge scale and ambition of the proposal. The planners aim to create at least 17,000 full time jobs as well as 23,000 apartments. However the project has not been met with universal praise, as English Heritage and the United Nations Educational, Scientific and Cultural Organization (UNESCO) have stated that the plans will damage Liverpool’s world heritage status, as part of the Liverpool Waters development falls within the world heritage site and they may go as far as to remove Liverpool’s status. However this project is yet another part in the ongoing regeneration of large parts of Liverpool’s city centre and waterfront areas as a proposal for another regeneration scheme was unveiled on the 1st November 2012 (Liverpool Daily Post, 2012).

Munck (2003) describes Liverpool as not being a ‘global city’ such as New York or London, nor does he describe it as a postmodern city as the reasons to why it is studied. He does however mention that Liverpool is studied mainly in relation to social problems and the ongoing urban regeneration schemes that have been a part of the city over the past number of decades. While being the focus of a lesser amount of studies than cities such as London and New York, the city of Liverpool and its significant amount of urban renewal, has had research undertook on it on aspects of its urban regeneration projects and the stakeholders involved. The research available that is specific to the issues surrounding Liverpool’s urban and waterfront regeneration is slim, however due to the significance of the Merseyside Development Corporation and the work they did in renewing the Albert Dock, Liverpool is usually featured in most urban studies that focus on the UK. The more recent urban development in Liverpool, Liverpool One, features much less in the literature due to it having only been completed a number of years ago. The aforementioned ‘Liverpool Waters’ scheme, as of yet, has had no research completed on it yet, as it has only this year passed through the planning permission phase. Given the fact that the urban environment of Liverpool is in a constant state of flux as rundown dilapidated areas of the city are being renewed or converted at almost a constant rate, then it seems evident that like in much the same way a map is out of date as soon as it is printed, so too is research undertook on a constantly changing urban environment. It is for that reason that this research is being done.

## 1.2 Aims:

The aims and objectives of this research will be to look into Liverpool’s waterfront regeneration, focusing specifically on the Liverpool Waters development. The reason Liverpool has been chosen is due to the fact that the city has experienced extensive regeneration of its waterfront over recent decades and also due to Liverpool’s importance as a historical maritime city, and the significance the waterfront has had on the development of Liverpool. The changing in land use and the issues that arise from this, in particular the social issues will be the main areas of the research. By using the opinions of the local population of Liverpool, acquired through questionnaires, with the aim to come to a conclusion as to who the waterfront development is aimed at, who will benefit most, whether the public think it is a priority for Liverpool, as well as issues of gentrification. Empirical research has been undertaken in the form of a questionnaire that the population of Liverpool were asked to undertake. The public’s opinion on the proposed Liverpool Waters scheme as well as Liverpool’s waterfront regeneration as a whole was sought, along with basic information about the individual such as average household income and age. Finally people’s opinion on the conflict between regeneration and heritage was asked to determine the general opinion and the importance that the public put on their city’s heritage.

Secondary research will come in the form of previously published work on Liverpool’s urban environment as well as work done on the waterfront of other cities. Research on the urban waterfront, its regeneration, and the various issues surrounding it, such as social or economic, have become more and more popular in recent years, with the majority of publications being less than a decade old. This will undoubtedly be a benefit to this research as the secondary data that is used will be more relevant and up to date in regards to the topic.

## 1.3 Literature Review:

Today, there are a large number of themes one can look into when researching urban regeneration and this is evident within the broad variety of literature available. There has been a definite growth in the amount of research done on urban regeneration over the past decade, as is evident when searching for relevant material. Robert & Sykes (2000) stated that while they were undertaking their research, they noticed a need for more quality literature on the urban regeneration process as a whole, this apparent lack of literature was noticed just over a decade ago, today however there is a noticeable increase in the variety of research available as the amount of study done and published on urban regeneration has noticeably increased.

The literature will firstly be reviewed in a chronological order beginning with research published during the 1980s and early 1990s, as this is when interest in studying urban regeneration saw a noticeable increase in the UK with the work of the Urban Development Corporations (UDC). The change in focus of research that occurred during the 1990s, whereby wider issues relating to urban regeneration were beginning to be realised and assessed, such as the awareness of culture being an important part of the regeneration process will then be looked at. Then, the idea that the UK was experiencing an ‘urban renaissance’ was developed as a result of the widening in research, as well as government policy which was fundamental in driving urban renewal at this time will be analysed. The suggestion that the ‘urban renaissance’ has now shifted to ‘city competitiveness’ will then be proposed and research indicating Liverpool’s own ‘city competitiveness’ will also feature. After this, research focussing specifically on urban waterfront regeneration will be analysed, the waterfront of Toronto, being a popular case study, will be looked at here in terms of what has been researched. Literature specific to the urban waterfront will continue, however, it will be focusing exclusively on the urban waterfronts of the UK and include the UDCs. Next, contemporary issues in the field of urban regeneration research will be looked into, in terms of the sustainability of regeneration projects, which has become a popular area of research. Finally the various methodologies that have been employed by researchers into both waterfront and general urban regeneration will be analysed.

The study of urban regeneration and its related issues is a relatively recent area of research, with the vast majority of the literature being less than ten years old. However, the growth of interest in urban regeneration as a field of research in the UK can be seen in the work of the Urban Development Corporations (UDCs) of the 1980s. Parkinson (1988) Taner & Tiesdell (1991) Adcock (1984) and Aderson (1990) are examples of the first wave of research into UK urban regeneration and the work of the UDC’s in particular, which was the prominent area to focus on at this time. Research at this time tends to focus on the work that the UDC’s were doing towards revitalizing the run down urban centres of UK cities as well as the organisation and policy behind the establishment of the UDC’s themselves. Adcock (1984) is an example of this, as the paper focuses specifically on the powers and organisation as well as the regeneration objectives of the Merseyside Development Corporation. Taner & Tiesdell (1991) also focuses on the management and legislative backgrounds of urban regeneration which further emphasises the popular avenues of research at the time focusing more so on policy. The Merseyside Development Corporation that Adcock (1984) and Parkinson (1988) are analysing was responsible for the International Garden Festival that took place in Liverpool in 1984 with the aim of sparking growth to Liverpool’s tourism; it is an early example of, then unrealised, cultural led urban regeneration. Research at this time was focused more so on the policy and the processes that was involved in the urban regeneration procedure as opposed to the wider issues that are involved that features prominently in today’s research.

During the 1990’s there was a shift in the focus of research in urban regeneration as wider issues were brought into the discussion, such as the idea of culture being used as a catalyst for urban renewal. Lorente (1996), Evans (1993), Chelliah (1999), McCarthy (1998), Lawless & Robinson (2000) and MacGregor & MacConnachie (1995) are all evidence of the change in the direction of research into more contemporary and broader areas, such as the social and cultural aspects of urban regeneration. For instance, culture is what has been used as a driver for some aspects of Liverpool’s urban regeneration such as the Albert Dock as well as the Liverpool Waters scheme. Both take into account and use Liverpool’s maritime history as an important port city in the regeneration process, by taking advantage of the unused docks on the waterfront. The process of changing the land use from old docklands to residential, business and commercially focused while still keeping remnants of Liverpool’s maritime heritage is a perfect example of culture-led urban regeneration.

The widespread regeneration of urban areas in the United Kingdom that was experienced at this time, came to be known as the ‘urban renaissance’, due to the fact that many of the UK’s neglected urban centres where in the process of rapid economic redevelopment and interest in the urban space grew significantly. Macleod & Johnstone (2012, 1) state that it is common within many countries in recent years, that the vision of an urban renaissance has been instrumental in guiding the great changes that English cities have experienced. Punter (2011, 1) expands on this further, by stating that the urban renaissance has been ‘a defining feature of contemporary urban policy’, but the ‘English variant’ of the urban renaissance was not fully formulated until 1999. The reason for this is noted by both Punter (2011) and Atkinson & Helms (2007, 1) who state that the creation of the Urban Task Force in 1999, set up by the New Labour Government and headed by Lord Rogers, had the aim of identifying the causes of urban decline. As well as establishing a vision for English cities ‘founded on the principal of design excellence, social wellbeing, and environmental responsibility’ (Urban Task Force, 2005).

Since the early 1990s there have been further advances in research on the urban environment, and in particular, that of the idea of an ‘urban renaissance’. Colantonio & Dixon (2010) state that during the 1980s regeneration focused mainly on the physical and economic renewal of urban centres. However since the 1990s across the European Union, this focus shifted and was replaced by a much more integrated approach to regeneration that included wider issues, them being environmental improvements, and social and cultural elements. Colantonio & Dixon (2010) deduce from the change in regeneration focus that it has caused a shift in emphasis from ‘urban renaissance’ to that of ‘city competitiveness’.

The European Institute for Urban Affairs (2007) cited in Colantonio & Dixon (2010, 4) describes the key drivers of city competitiveness as:

* Innovation process and products;
* Economic diversity;
* Skilled people;
* Connectivity and communication;
* Place quality; and
* Strategic capacity in leadership and decision making.

What Colantonio & Dixon (2010) are implying here, is that during the 1980s, the first wave of urban regeneration focused almost exclusively on the aethstetic and economic renewal of urban areas, which will in no doubt improve the look of a previously dilapidated urban area, it may not however, be sustainable do to a lack of a skilled workforce, innovative products or economic diversity. In order for cities regeneration projects to remain sustainable for a foreseeable amount of time, Smith (2006, 175) states that cities must be attractive to long-term investment so that they do not become ‘white elephants’. To ensure that long-term investment will occur, is for a city to strive to achieve as many of the key drivers that Colantonio & Dixon (2010) mentioned earlier so as to maximise the likelihood of successfully acquiring not only long-term investment but also to capture ‘opportunities for development’ and ‘leading edge business’ (Singhal *et al.* 2013, 1). It is because of this that has led to the development of the idea of ‘city competitiveness’ as cities are contending with one another in order to ‘win’ investment and business.

In terms of Liverpool’s role in the city competitiveness theory, Parker & Garnell (2006, 1) highlight on the rapid economic recovery of Liverpool since the early 2000s and state that this success is starting to have an effect on the prosperity of the North West. The reason as to what has caused this success is the ‘appointment of a new managerial and political structure to Liverpool City Council; the establishment of a clear vision for Liverpool and the catalyst for this recovery Liverpool One’ (Parker & Garnell, 2006, 1). The point that Parker & Garnell make about Liverpool City Council appointing new leadership is one of the key drivers for city competitiveness that Colantonio & Dixon (2010) mentioned earlier. Evidence such as this only strengthens the argument that the idea of the UK experiencing an urban renaissance has evolved into city competitiveness.

City competitiveness as a theory has little existing literature, and what is available is mostly less than five years old, which emphasizes the contemporary nature of research in urban regeneration, as well as providing evidence that the ideas and theories are not static but in a state of flux. New interpretations of the urban environment appear to almost occur in cycles of around a decade or more. This may be due to regeneration projects taking a number of years to be completed, then further years for the impact of said regeneration to be analysed and interpreted and for research to be done. When a city experiences regeneration again, the cycle repeats and new interpretations are made. There is evidence for this in the three distinct regeneration projects, two completed and one proposed, that the city of Liverpool has, there is clear distinction between the literature available on the work of the urban development corporations in the 1980s and the ‘Liverpool One’ redevelopment of the 2000s. While at this time there is no literature available on the Liverpool Waters redevelopment scheme at all, within the coming decades as the project continues and most certainly when it is completed research will be done, and new interpretations will be made on the urban landscape and the urban waterfront, thus continuing the cycle.

Research that focuses specifically on the urban waterfront, like with urban regeneration research, has increased in volume in regards to the amount published in recent years. The urban waterfront, and in particular the regeneration of them is a niche area of research on the urban environment. While there may only be a small amount of literature available that focuses solely on the regeneration of the urban waterfront, they do frequently feature briefly in literature looking at urban regeneration as a whole, and relate the issues that the research is looking into on the urban waterfront. In order to gain a wider range of literature on the urban waterfront, research that has been conducted in countries other than the UK will feature heavily as there are a number of prominent waterfront sites that have been studied in depth by a number of researchers, such as the Toronto waterfront. Looking into how research has been conducted on different urban waterfronts around the world will be beneficial, as a broad yet focused picture of the research can be created.

In much the same way as general urban regeneration research, waterfront regeneration research looks into the diverse issues and questions that arise from the development, planning, construction, intention, and legacy, as well as other areas of the renewal of urban waterfronts.

The Toronto waterfront has been the focus of much research over the past decade, and could be viewed as a popular case study in regards to waterfront regeneration. The Toronto waterfront has undergone extensive redevelopment and renewal with many projects completed as well as others that are currently under construction, in development, and a number of proposed projects for the future (Waterfront Toronto, 2013). The Toronto Waterfront Revitalisation Corporation is a publically funded organisation that functions is much the same way as the Urban Development Corporations of the UK. The variety of research that can be conducted on a single area is evident when one looks at the available literature on the Toronto waterfront. The idea of culture being used as a driver for redevelopment of Toronto’s waterfront has been identified through the city striving to host the Winter Olympic Games. Oliver (2011, 14) states that various stakeholders have used Olympic bids not due to the cities love of sport, but more so as a way to help ‘define the meaning and purpose of its waterfront’, as Oliver (2011) argues that the city has been unable to for more than 50 years. However, this apparent lack of vision that Oliver (2011) mentions is contradicted by others, Laidley (2007) makes reference to a ‘new and novel’ way in which the waterfront is being planned; know as the ‘ecosystem approach’. It is allowing policy makers to resolve pre-existing problems that had impeded on new forms of waterfront development, and in doing so setting the stage for the waterfront to become a key site in the ‘pursuit of world city status’ for Toronto.

The waterfront has been identified as an important and integral part of an urban environment, and that it should be exploited for the benefit of the area, Giovinazzi & Moretti (2010, 57) describe waterfront regeneration as one of the most ‘interesting phenomena of urban renewal of the last decades’. Jones (1998, 436) states that the waterfronts role in the urban renaissance was initially addressed in 1990 at a conference called ‘Building by Water’, and the popularity of the urban waterfront being used as a space for living, working and leisure can be seen today in many of the UK’s towns and cities. The research mentioned earlier by Adcock (1984), Parkinson (1988), Aderson (1990), and Taner & Tiesdell (1991), while being examples of early urban regeneration research in the UK, they are also early examples of research specific to waterfront regeneration. The two UDC’s, the Merseyside Development Corporation and the London Docklands Development Corporation worked on the regeneration of Liverpool’s and London’s docklands are they are the focus of the abovementioned research. The reason as to the sudden interest in the work of the UDC’s may be down to the neo-liberal ideals of Thatcherism during the 1980s that promoted privatisation and the free market, yet the UDC’s were created by the government, thus almost going against Thatcher’s ideas of a small state. It may be for this reason as to why research on UDC’s focuses almost exclusively on policy and the organisational structure of them.

The sustainability of waterfront projects as well as many other various urban regeneration projects has become a popular focus point for both researchers and urban planners. Bunce (2009, 652) states that ‘the integration of sustainability objectives into urban revitalisation and planning policies is particularly evident in European and North American cities’. Bunce (2009) shows that Toronto’s waterfront regeneration has, since 2004, held the concept of sustainability in high regard, paying particular attention to the ‘three pillars’ of sustainability concept, as can be seen ‘through policies and strategies for residential and commercial redevelopment put forward by the Toronto Waterfront Revitalization Corporation’.

The sustainability of Liverpool’s regeneration and other UK sites has also been highlighted by a number of researchers. Maliene *et al.* (2012) focuses on the regeneration of brownfield sites in both Liverpool and Cologne and compares the two. They conclude by stating that while both sites have been successful in acquiring private investment, it may not be sustainable for a foreseeable amount of time. This conclusion is drawn by a number of other publications such as Parker & Garnell (2006) who state that Liverpool must build on the success of the Liverpool One development to be able to compete in the global market; they are implying that there is a necessity for Liverpool’s redevelopment projects to be as sustainable as possible for the benefit of the city. Dixon (2006) also looks into issues of sustainability on brownfield sites in a similar fashion to Maliene *et al.* (2012). Dixon (2006) states that developers are unaware as to precisely how sustainable development can be applied to brownfield regeneration, the research highlights on the need for a better way in order to measure sustainable brownfield regeneration. This apparent lack of an satisfactory way of measuring various aspects of urban regeneration has been highlighted by a number of authors, Paddison & Miles (2007), Roberts & Sykes (2000), and Colantonio & Dixon (2010) all make reference to the difficulty in measuring the success of regeneration through various proxies, other authors, such as Evans (2005) focuses directly on what is used to measure the success, and impacts that culture has had on regeneration.

## 1.4 Methodology of Literature

In terms of the types of methodology used to carry out research on regeneration of urban and the waterfront, researchers have employed various techniques and methods in order to complete their studies. Works mentioned earlier such as Maliene *et al.* (2012) as well as Couch *et al.* (2003) both used surveys as their main source of data collection when carrying out research on the urban environment. In a similar fashion, Munck (2003) used focus groups when conducting research into Liverpool. Like surveys, focus groups are a form of participatory research and they were used them in order to gain the perspective of the people of Liverpool. When carrying out the focus groups they were not open to anyone, but only to specific people, youth, elders, ethnic minorities, and gendered focus groups were used in order to gain peoples experiences of living in Liverpool including their opinions on regeneration. Surveys and focus groups will be most useful when qualitative data is required to carry out research and also when a certain demographic wants to be targeted to acquire opinions or statistics of that certain group.

Another popular way in which research is conducted on urban regeneration is through the use of case studies (Couch *et al.* 2003, McCarthy, 2007, Cizler, 2012). Case studies are versatile as they can be used to look into various areas of urban regeneration for instance Maliene *et al.* (2012) and Cizler (2012) both look into the social and cultural aspects of urban regeneration such as issues of heritage, whereas McCarthy (2007) and Couch e*t al.* (2003) take a more policy based approach to their case studies.Couch *et al.* (2003, 12) carried out a number of case studies on European cities, and stated that in order for them to be successful in using them to expose similarities and differences then the multiple case studies that they carried out had to follow a common design or template. Couch *et al.* (2003, 12) state that without a template the case studies would be little more than a ‘collection of parallel descriptions’. While Cizler (2012) and McCarthy (2007) only focus on one case study in their research they still follow a predefined path in which the case study is analysed. However a common template becomes far more important when two or more case studies are looked at as it will allow the same variables to be compared and contrasted which would result in a more accurate study of two different locations. Even if the two locations are vastly different whether that being, economically, geographically, or culturally, the use of a standard format with which case studies are carried out would, in theory, result in conclusions that could be argued to be a lot more plausible compared to a study that did not use a standardised analysis method.

## 1.5 Conclusion

The literature available today on urban regeneration, and in particular the urban waterfront, has increased in volume by a significant amount in only a few decades, which will be as a result of the increase in urban regeneration projects over the same time period. Early academic research into urban regeneration focused almost exclusively on urban policy, procedures, and the organisations, such as the UDCs, that were involved in regenerating and renewing dilapidated urban centres. From this, new areas of though emerged primarily during the 1990s that expanded the urban regeneration field as aspects of culture, and its impact and role in regeneration, were brought under analysis, tourism and social issues also became popular characteristics of urban regeneration. It was at this time that the urban renaissance was identified as the urban environment became accepted for what it was. Today, as Colantonio & Dixon (2010) stated earlier, the urban renaissance has evolved now into city competitiveness whereby cities are competing with one another to win over, business, tourism and investment. The sustainability of urban regeneration is becoming a subject area that is gaining much attention, not just the economic sustainability, but also questions of environmental, social and cultural sustainability are being asked by researchers on the urban environment. Finally, the various methodologies that are used by researchers show the diversity of the relatively young subject area, the study of urban regeneration has, and is continuing to grow to include much wider issues.

# Chapter 2: Methodology

## 2.1 Methodology:

The aims of this research are to analyse who, and what, the ongoing regeneration of the Liverpool waterfront is aimed at, as well as who will benefit most and whether it is seen as a priority for the city, paying particular attention to the proposed ‘Liverpool Waters’ scheme that was granted approval by the UK Government for planning permission, only recently on the 4th March 2013. By using the opinions of the local population of Liverpool as the main source of empirical research, studies done by others on the Liverpool waterfront and other urban waterfront areas will make up the part of secondary research, which will be used as both a comparison and as a means to evaluate proposed developments for Liverpool’s waterfront.

Questionnaires were the means of acquiring the views and opinions of the Liverpool public, as instead of interviews, it would seem likely that with questionnaires a higher number of responses would be attained, therefore providing more information for analysis. Similarly to Maliene *et al.* (2012), questionnaires were a fundamental part of the study. Both qualitative and quantitative data was collected within the questionnaires. The personal opinions of those who undertook the questionnaires were the qualitative data, and made up over half of the questionnaire, out of the ten questions asked six of them were asking for a qualitative answer, that being the individual’s opinion. Quantitative answers made up the remaining four questions, and this data will be used to establish the general trend of people who answered the questionnaire in an economic, geographical, and personal approach.

The questionnaire was in the form of an online survey that was set up on www.surveymonkey.com on the 5th November 2012 and was online for a total of sixty-five days, until the 9th January 2013 at which point questionnaires could no longer be filled in. In order to promote the online survey a post was made on an online forum used by the residence of Liverpool. It consisted of ten questions focusing on the Liverpool Waters regeneration scheme as well as Liverpool’s waterfront regeneration as a whole, asking for the public’s opinion on them. Questions regarding the person’s age, gender, and household income were asked to establish the general demographic of the respondents.

The were a number of reasons as to why an online survey was chosen, firstly it was because this way there would be no limit to the number of response that could be collected, also as opposed to a paper questionnaire, there was no limitations on the number of surveys that were recreated and filled in. Additionally an online survey could be completed by members of the public at any time that the questionnaire was online, whereas questionnaires conducted in person, by hand, would be limited to the amount of time spent in location. It was felt that an online survey would be more likely to achieve a higher number of replies than a questionnaire carried out in the traditionally way as members of the public could take as much time as they wished when completing the survey.

There was no discrimination towards the type of person, in terms of age, gender, income, or any other variable, that was sought after to take part in the questionnaire. It was hoped that a wide range of people from different backgrounds, economic positions, age groups, and other variables would complete the questionnaire, so as to maximise the potential of getting an overview of the general publics’ opinion.

Once all the primary research had been completed and responses were no longer accepted, then the interpretation of the results began. As both qualitative and quantitative data were collected for the research, different methods had to be employed when attempting to interpret the results, as well as when drawing any conclusions. However, that is not to suggest that the two types of data sets can only be used independently of one another when it comes to the discussion of results as the two data sets will be used in conjunction with one another.

## 2.2 Quantitative data

The quantitative data that was collected will be used in order to categorize the types of people that had replied to the survey in a statistical manner. In order to establish the demographic of the respondents their age, gender, and average household income was asked for, it is hoped that this data will be sufficient in determining if there is any trends amongst the respondents.

Quantitative data will be interpreted and presented through the use of statistics. The software that is used on [www.surveymonkey.com](http://www.surveymonkey.com) automatically uses basic statistics with the collected responses and presents them in simple bar graphs. However, when attempting to interpret and draw conclusions from the data it will need to be analysed further. To this end, the collected data will be transferred to statistical software so that more information can be extracted from the responses. For instance, the presence of outliers could affect the outcome of statistical tests taken on the data, so by removing them, a clearer picture of what the data is showing may be attained.

## 2.3 Qualitative data

While qualitative based questions formed half of the questionnaire, they would however, contain significantly more information available for analysis than that of the quantitative data. The qualitative data that was collected was in the form text, containing the opinions, beliefs and perception of the general public of Liverpool’s waterfront regeneration, in regards to not only the Liverpool Waters scheme, but also the issues surrounding it such as UNESCO, who will benefit most, and if they think it is worthwhile. Qualitative data will be more difficult to interpret compared to quantitative data due to the nature of the information being that of people’s own opinions, as a result, normal mathematical analysis of the data will not work. Therefore a process of deduction will made on the data as a means to establish if there are any recurring opinions within the questionnaires, however this is not to suggest that only popular opinions are relevant. Unlike quantitative data that will require computer software in order to carry out the analysis, the quantitative data will have to be analysed manually without the aid of any software.

# Chapter 3: Results and Analysis

## 3.1 Introduction

The total number of surveys that were completed and received was forty and as mentioned earlier both qualitative and quantitative data was collected and these results would be subject to differing types of analysis. Firstly the quantitative data will be shown and analyzed first, as this information can be used in order to understand the demographic of the respondents, as well as building a sense of who the respondents are, in terms of any trends or differences in the data. The quantitative data will be shown through graphs and charts followed by analysis. Following this, the qualitative data will be analysed, which has made up the majority of the date collected in the study, as this section will consist of public perception and the personal responses to the questionnaires in regards to Liverpool’s urban and waterfront regeneration and the Liverpool Waters scheme in particular.

## 3.2 Quantitative Data

### Table 1.0: Age Groups of Respondents



The first question asked within the questionnaire was what age group the respondent belongs too. The above table (Table 1) shows the age groups that respondents who took the questionnaire belong to; the X axis consists of the age groups and the Y axis the frequency. Out of the forty total respondents, exactly 50% were between the ages of 18 to 24; and following closely behind as the second largest group with 37.5% of respondents is the 25 to 34 age group. Overall, 87.5% of respondents were between the ages of 18 to 34 which show that over three quarters of respondents to the questionnaires are relatively young. The remaining 12.5% of respondents were aged between 35 and 64. The spread of data is not particularly wide as half of respondents are from one age group which could cause the responses to qualitative questions to be seen as bias towards younger opinions, however due to the nature of the Liverpool Waters project, which is long term at around forty years, it will be the younger generations who will be able to make full use of the project. Nevertheless this is not to suggest that as older generations may not see the finished product and that their opinions are at all less valuable or relevant than that of younger generations.

### Table 1.1: Gender of Respondents



Secondly the gender of respondents was asked, and the results are shown in the above table (Table 1.1). Gender was asked for the same reason as age group, as well as following questions, which will be used as a means to acquire a sense of the people who responded to the questionnaires. As can be seen within the data of Table 1.1 the vast majority of respondents were male, out of forty total respondents, thirty-five were male, with females only making up 13%, or five, of the replies. Given the information from Table 1 regarding age groups and Table 1.1 above, one can deduce that the average respondent to the questionnaire is a male between the ages of 18 to 34, this could be due to the nature of an online questionnaire, and the way in which it was advertised for respondents. The use of an online Liverpool forum as a means to gain responses could be the cause of male respondents outweighing female respondents by a substantial amount, simply due to the community of the online forum.

### Table 1.2: Approximate Household Income of Respondents



The final question asked that will be used to help describe the respondents in general was their average annual household income. Table 1.2 above shows the data collected on the average household income of respondents with income groups along the X axis and frequency of responses on the Y axis. The data follows a positive skew in distribution, with 30% of respondents having an annual household income up to £24,999, and 47.5% of respondents within the £25,000 to £49,999 income group. The remaining 22.5% of respondents were in the higher income groups of £50,000 and upwards. Table 1.3 below, from a report by the Institute for Fiscal Studies (2012), shows the distribution of average weekly household income between 2010 and 2011, as can be seen; this data also follows a positive skew in distribution in a similar way to table 1.2, a steep rise which peaks before the mid point on the X axis, followed by a gradual decline. Thus the data from both tables 1.2 and 1.3 suggests that the distribution of average household income in the UK rises sharply from a low income of between £0 and £24,999, and then peaks at between £25,000 - £49,999 annual income in table 1.2, and around £25,000 approximate annual income in table 1.3. The fact that both tables are showing similar results suggests that the comparatively small sample size used in this study has resulted in a somewhat accurate depiction of the average household income of the UK, as can be seen when comparing both table 1.2 and 1.3.

**Table 1.3: Income Distribution in 2010-11 UK (Institute for Fiscal Studies, 2012, 11)**



From the data in the above tables it will be possible to determine the demographic of the respondents. For instance, identifying the average respondent to the questionnaire using the information gathered will be useful when used in collaboration with the personal opinions that were also collected.

In the case of this study, the average respondent that completed the survey was male, between the ages of 18 to 24 or 24 to 34 and has an approximate annual household income of between £25,000 and £49,999. The conclusion regarding household income is fortified by a report by the Liverpool Fairness Commission (Liverpool City Council, 2010) that state that the average household income of Liverpool in 2010 was £29,285 compared to the average for the whole UK of £35,299. As mentioned earlier the way in which the survey was carried out could have caused the uneven distribution of male respondents over female respondents.

## 3.3 Qualitative Data

The qualitative data that was collected creates the backbone of the study, making it an extremely important aspect of the research as it is the opinion of the public that will determine the conclusion of this study. This section will be set out in a similar fashion to that of the previous, with each question of the survey presented and analysed individually then conclusions will be drawn.

The first question of the survey that required a qualitative response asked the respondents for their general opinion on the Liverpool Waters scheme. Of the forty respondents in total thirty-four replies were given with 6 respondents skipping, the number of responses to qualitative questions was expected to be less than 100% as people seem to be more willing, or prefer, to answer quantitative questions over qualitative questions. However, 85% of respondents answered the question which is in reality a particularly high response rate, and this has led to a sufficient amount of information collected.

Of the thirty-four replies asking for the respondent’s general opinion on the Liverpool Waters regeneration scheme in particular, twenty-four expressed positive opinions for the scheme, eight held mixed or unsure opinions and only one respondent was outright against it. In terms of those for, an interesting point to denote is that while the majority of respondents agree with the scheme, and feel as though it will be good for Liverpool, each response highlights on different areas this will benefit from its construction. For instance, increased tourism is mentioned as a positive effect of the Liverpool Waters scheme, which already makes up a major proportion of Liverpool’s economy. Another aspect that a number of respondents picked up on was the benefit that more investment may have on the city. The respondents suggested that this will lead to the attraction of more business to the city and the creation of more jobs, which will be especially beneficial to Liverpool when considering the recession that the UK is currently experiencing. One respondent described Liverpool Waters as a ‘brilliant scheme’ and that it will allow the city’s economy to ‘flourish as a result’, another suggested that it will be good for the people of not only Liverpool, but also the surrounding areas. Other respondents feel as though the scheme should go ahead because the proposed site is currently unused docklands, one member of the public believed that it is ‘making good use of land that has been dilapidated and useless for so long’ and like others highlighted on the creation of jobs. The final positive impact of the Liverpool Waters scheme that was picked up on by a small number of the respondents was the impact it will have on Liverpool’s image. The improvement of Liverpool’s skyline as seen from the river Mersey or the Wirral was suggested by one respondent; and this is an important point, as when Liverpool is featured in the media it is more than likely to contain images of Liverpool’s waterfront, usually showing Pier Head with the iconic Royal Liver Building. With the Liverpool Waters scheme planned to be built alongside Pier Head it will have a drastic impact on the cities image not only locally, but also globally. Peel Holdings are trying to attract international business thus improving Liverpool’s stakes in the theory of ‘city competitiveness’ mentioned earlier, and perhaps Liverpool Waters will be what brings the city into the global market, as Munck (2003) described Liverpool as not being a ‘global city’ it may, in the future, become an important centre for global business due to the impact of Peel’s work.

The number of replies to the questionnaire which contained a positive opinion of the Liverpool Waters scheme is encouraging. 70% of respondents (24 out of 34) to this specific question have expressed optimistic opinions and positive opinions towards the Liverpool Waters project. Peel Holdings conducted a similar questionnaire on the Liverpool Waters sister site, Wirral Waters and recorded over 95% of people supporting the development (Liverpool Waters, 2008). The reason that the Wirral project has received more support could be due to the issues surrounding the Liverpool project. The main issue being that of the disagreement between Peel Holdings, UNESCO, and English Heritage, over the possibility that the scheme may jeopardise Liverpool’s title as a world heritage site. Issues such as this have not been a part of the Wirral Waters project which may be the reason as to why there appears to be a higher percentage of public support. The publics’ opinion on the conflict between regeneration and heritage was specifically asked as part of this research.

On the other hand, other members of the public do not see Peel Holdings plans to be a worthwhile investment for the city of Liverpool and are sceptical of its necessity. One respondent described the proposal as ‘highly optimistic, perhaps unreasonably so, given [the] current economy’ and another described the exiting waterfront development as being ‘hit and miss’. Already emerging are conflicting opinions about the Liverpool waterfront regeneration as a whole, and not just the Liverpool Waters Project. Three respondents suggested that the scheme could cause an almost gentrifying effect on the waterfront, with the planned flats being too expensive for the average person living in Liverpool. For instance, one respondent while at first suggested that the Liverpool Waters scheme would be successful ‘if done properly’, went onto say that it could however lead to an ‘unwelcome exclusive feeling to even more parts of the waterfront’.

As there is currently no housing built on the site of where Liverpool Waters will be developed, it could be suggested that the plans will gentrify the area regardless. Also it could be the case that housing prices in the local vicinity of the Liverpool Waters development may see an increase, as living close to the site becomes more desirable. Especially when considering the amount of jobs that Peel Holdings have suggested will be created on the site.

Shand & Sloan (n.d) undertook a study on how housing prices in Barking are affected by regeneration projects in the area. From their observations, they concluded that it is typically first-time buyer property prices that experience an increase. They suggest that is due to a more transient population moving into the area, which in the case of Liverpool may also occur as Peel Holdings are hoping to attract new people to the city. Shand & Sloan (n.d, 29) go onto state that while renewal initiatives attract people to the area, there is risk that gentrification can occur, which can reduce the impact that renewal will have on wider areas of the community. The Eldonian Village in Liverpool, a community based housing association (Eldonians, 2013), is close to the proposed site of Liverpool Waters and the development may have an impact on it due to the demand that new residents will put on housing demand. Mehta (n.d, 7) also conducted research on the impact of urban regeneration on the local housing market but in Liverpool, stated that there is a definite relationship between urban regeneration and the housing market in terms of both price and demand. However the impact is difficult to measure. This apparent difficulty in measuring the various impacts of regeneration, both positive and negative, has been highlighted by various authors on the urban environment (Paddison & Miles, 2007, Roberts & Sykes, 2000, Colantonio & Dixon, 2010, Evans, 2005 and Dixon, 2006). Given the evidence, it will seem likely that the surrounding area of Liverpool will experience some sort of impact, and some of the respondents to the questionnaire also feel this way. However, what this impact will entail remains to be seen, and will unlikely be determined until the project is fully underway and nearing completion.

The public opinion on all of the Liverpool Waterfront regeneration that has occurred, past and present, was also asked to determine how the public feel towards the direction that Liverpool is heading in. The responses were similar to that of the previous question with a high amount of positive replies but this time there was a lot less scepticism. A lot of respondents feel as though the improvements to the waterfront are a great benefit to the city, both economically and aesthetically. The public were generally pleased with how the waterfront has been developed and that it is being put to use, as opposed to when it was previously in a state of dereliction. One respondent described the waterfront as the ‘greatest asset for the city’ which is a good point, as Liverpool uses its maritime history to its advantage, in particular through tourism. Also, as parts of the waterfront are included in the world heritage site it makes Liverpool a desirable place to live and visit. The importance of Tourism to Liverpool economy is substantial, The Mersey Partnership, which is the official tourist board for the Liverpool City region, released their 2020 strategy for the visitor economy in October 2009. In it, they detailed the growth in tourism for the Liverpool City Region, for instance between 2003-2008 it has risen from 16th to 6th place in the UK for international visitors, with visitor spending standing at £2.8 billion (The Mersey Partnership, 2009a). Statistics released by the Mersey Partnership in December 2009 stated that the city of Liverpool itself receives 37% of total visitors to the region, and 39% of total spend (The Mersey Partnership, 2009b). In their 2020 plan the Merseyside Partnership identified tourism as a key driver for regeneration and acknowledged both the waterfront and the World Heritage Site as key areas of investment. One respondent, who was a student, recognised the importance of tourism to the Liverpool economy, simply stating that more tourism equates to more money for the local economy, as well as stating that when his parents visit they usually also visit the waterfront, due to both the regeneration and the historic value of the docks.

Replies to the questionnaire that hold sceptical views on the Liverpool Waters scheme have highlighted on issues that are present in many urban regeneration projects of not only the UK, but globally. Concerns of gentrification are a particularly prevalent debate in places such as Toronto and London, so due to this it was felt that this would be an important avenue of investigation. For this reason, the question of whom they though the waterfront was primarily aimed at was asked.

Of the thirty replies to this question thirteen felt as though the Liverpool Waters scheme would benefit the whole economy of Liverpool and that a large proportion of the population would benefit also. A recurring response was that of the increased tourism that the scheme would potentially create would better the wider area of Liverpool, by increasing revenues. The creation of more jobs was also a point that was picked up on as benefitting not only those working within Liverpool Waters but also the wider area. One reply which felt as though it would benefit the whole of Liverpool stated that, more construction jobs, jobs in office and retail and more income from visitors and tourists would provide more money for the council to spend on other services. Others feel as though that while the scheme will benefit certain types directly, such as professionals and the business sector, they do feel as though it will aid in improving the wider economy of Liverpool. One opinion was that it will, depending on who can ‘afford to get involved’, however he then went onto say that he believes that the touristic value for Liverpool will be greater than simply those who directly benefit. As long as the scheme exploits cultural tourism, such as ‘galleries, shows, venues and entertainment’ for both foreign and domestic visitors. Finally there were those who felt as though the scheme would only affect a certain type of person, again these people being professional and business types. But also, they felt as though there was too much emphasis and money being put into regenerating the city centre and the waterfront, instead of the wider area. Two respondents explicitly mentioned this, one stressing that Liverpool contains some of the poorest districts in the country, and that while the city centre and waterfront are under heavy investment; they felt as though the rest of the city was being left behind. Another stated that they could not ‘see it making much difference to Kensington and Walton’; this opinion would likely be expressed in a lot of cities where large-scale regeneration is occurring, such as London or Toronto, as local residents would see only certain areas of their community or city being renewed and not others, and this will inevitably cause conflict. However that is not to say that this opinion is not well-founded, as some areas of Liverpool are highly deprived and have been for a long time, yet the city centre has been under almost continuous renewal for around a decade.

The final area of enquiry was the conflict between Peel Holdings, UNESCO and English Heritage over the possibility that the Liverpool Waters scheme would damage and perhaps lead to the removal of Liverpool’s World Heritage Site Status. 42% of the Liverpool Waters site is within the World Heritage Site, and makes up 22% of the whole inscribed site (Liverpool Waters, 2013). Due to this, participants were asked what their opinions were on this conflict and whether UNESCO’s and English Heritages’ uncertainties should have any effect on the planning and decisions involved with the regeneration. While the project has been given central government approval this has not deterred UNESCO from placing Liverpool on its ‘danger list’ as well as planning to send inspectors to the site in November 2013, this could lead to Liverpool being struck off the list immediately (The Guardian, 2013).

The opinions expressed by respondents in regards to the heritage of the site are a lot more contentious than that of the other questions. Opinions are almost split between those who think the World Heritage Site should or should not have an effect on the decisions and planning, with 19 respondents thinking it should and 13 it should not. Those who felt as though the concerns expressed by UNESCO should be taken into consideration generally voiced the opinion that the docks should retain as much of the historical aesthetics. For instance, a respondent who agreed, stated that there would be ‘no use in regenerating, if Liverpool is regenerated into a bland shopping centre’ another did not want ‘wrecking balls and drills’ took to the city’s history. One respondent in particular, expressed an interesting point that modern architects are desperate to get their designs placed next to the famous buildings of Pier Head, but felt as though ‘we have to remember why this is such an important city, and protect that heritage’. There were others who felt as though the developers should take into account UNESCO’s concerns in the development and that ‘at the very least the architecture should be more fitting’. In general those who agreed felt strongly of Liverpool’s heritage and did not want to see its historical sites turned into a homogenous modern development, and felt as though the planners should do everything they can to keep the UNESCO status, as one respondent described the docks as being the ‘defining feature of Liverpool’, which in essence they are so the scheme should do all it can to protect them.

Those who felt that the World Heritage Site should have no impact on the development of the site expressed a wider variety of opinion in their reasoning. A number of respondents felt as though Liverpool did not need the status of a World Heritage Site as without it Liverpool is still a historically important city. For example, one respondent while encouraging the scheme, stated that the city ‘does not require a title from the UN to promote its history…as the history books already do that’ another said that if the title is removed it would not take the buildings that made it so with it. These opinions suggest that some people hold the economic benefits of the scheme in a higher regard than that of heritage, as they do not see losing the UNESCO status as being detrimental to Liverpool’s image. In fact one respondent explicitly said that it should only be taken into consideration if there is a financial benefit to the World Heritage Site. Others voiced further reasons such as the status and the possibility of losing it ‘should not be used to halt progress’ nor should redevelopment be ‘held to ransom by UNESCO’. Added to this, respondents have suggested that something has to be done with the docklands as one respondent described the current state of the docks as ‘an eyesore and a painful reminder of how Liverpool’s economy crumbled in the past’ while another labelled it a ‘derelict wasteland’.

As can be seen there are strong opinions expressed in terms of the heritage of the site, and Peel Holdings are taking the issues around heritage and UNESCO seriously. A thorough heritage impact assessment was carried out in 2011 on the Liverpool Waters site, it came to the conclusion that while there will be some harmful impacts to heritage, these are greatly outweighed by the benefits offered and that from their conclusions they state that ‘overall there is no risk to the inscription of the Liverpool World Heritage property’ (Liverpool Waters, 2011, 380). However, this has not stopped UNESCO and English Heritage from voicing their concerns of the project, even since it has been given full government consent, leading to the likelihood that this disagreement will remain for the foreseeable future and could lead to Liverpool losing its status, which, as has been shown, is one of the more contentious subjects of the public around the Liverpool Waters scheme.

# Chapter 4: Conclusions

## 4.1 Conclusion

Overall the respondents to the questionnaire expressed varied opinions and feelings towards the Liverpool Waters scheme, Liverpool’s waterfront regeneration as a whole, and in particular the on-going conflict between Peel Holdings and UNESCO. Given only the information gathered from the questionnaires, the general consensus is that the public is in favour of the Liverpool Waters scheme and Liverpool’s other waterfront developments, feeling that they benefit the city both economically and aesthetically as well as improving Liverpool’s image. An increase in tourism and job creation have both been identified by a lot of the respondents as being the most positive and valuable impacts that the Liverpool Waters scheme will create. However, there are concerns amongst the public that the redevelopment may only benefit certain people, leaving other feeling alienated. Also there is a feeling in some respondents that the outlying areas of the city are being left behind or isolated from the rapid redevelopment of the city centre.

Finally there is public perception of the conflict between Peel Holdings and UNESCO over concerns that the Liverpool Waters development will damage the heritage of the waterfront. This subject was undoubtedly the most controversial area of the questionnaire with strong feelings and arguments put forward by the respondents both for and against the issue. Those for, saw Liverpool’s heritage as a defining feature of the city and felt as though everything should be done to preserve both it and the World Heritage Site for the benefit of the city. Those against felt as though UNESCO’s decision would harm the city’s future if development was restricted, as some thought as though UNESCO was being unfair almost, as the current state of some of the docklands are in a state of dereliction, and have been for a number of decades, and Liverpool Waters was aiming to bring the docks into the 21st Century as a centre of commerce. Peel is committed to safeguarding the heritage of the docklands in their plans and is using the historical importance to their advantage.

Peel describe Liverpool’s ‘spirit of place’ as not solely coming from the past and certainly not from ‘playing it safe’ but from maintaining the process of change that was central to the period that is now celebrated in the World Heritage Site (Liverpool Waters, 2013). After all, Liverpool docklands have been under constant change throughout its history as a mercantile city, and now that shipping has declined and the docks have moved from the city centre, it would seem as though the Liverpool Waters development is just another step in the cities ever-changing landscape. And in a time of widespread and deep austerity cuts to many services, the opportunity for Liverpool to redevelop a large area, funded primarily by Peel Holdings itself, means the city is in an extremely fortunate position. It would seem evident as while it may benefit some people over others, many respondents stated any investment in the city must be beneficial, even if it indirectly.

To conclude, this research has shown that even if a redevelopment plan is promising thousands of new jobs and homes, in the case of Liverpool Waters, 17,000 of the former and 23,000 of the latter. Regardless of this, they can always expect to experience some sort of opposition, whether that is from the local population or organisations. In the case of this study there was some disapproval expressed by the public about various aspects of the plans such as it benefitting more than others as well as if it is in Liverpool’s best interests at this time. There was also mixed feelings shown over Peel Holdings approach to the heritage issue. As of March 2013 the plans have been given the green-light by central government without the need for a public enquiry, showing that both the Liverpool City Council as well as the government is fully behind the project. The true benefits and limitations or winners and losers of Liverpool Waters will not be fully realised until the project is complete which will not be for a significant amount of time.

## 4.2 Limitations and Recommendations of Study

While being able to come to a conclusion from the research conducted within this study, there are still a number of limitations that have been identified, as well as recommendations for further study. The main limitation to the study was that of time constraint, given more time the questionnaire could have gone through a pilot study in order to refine the questions so that exactly what was required from respondents was asked. Also, the use of an online questionnaire made it only available to a select audience, that being members of the Liverpool forum, which resulted in the majority of respondents being a male between the ages of 18-34 with an average household income. This may have resulted in bias opinions from respondents. In addition to this, only people who have strong opinions towards the redevelopment could have felt the need to answer the questionnaire, as opposed to a passer-by who would be asked in a traditional questionnaire. Finally, the amount of respondents to the questionnaire (40) was relatively low in order to get a sense of the greater populations’ opinion, in order to get more respondents it may have been beneficial to promote the questionnaire to a wider audience. Also, the collection of quantitative data in the questionnaire could have been used in order to separate respondents along lines of income group or age, so that they could then be compared

In terms of recommendations for further study, the issue around Peel and UNESCO could potentially be a research area in itself, as from the replies and the media it is the most controversial area of the redevelopment. Also in terms of carrying out the study, conducting work in a similar fashion to that of Munck (2003), mentioned earlier, would make the replies more comparable as respondents were targeted specifically along gender and age lines so that they could be compared. Also, the way in which Maliene *et al.* (2012) conducted their work by carrying out the same questionnaire on two separate locations then comparing the results following a common template, would make for interesting comparative research.
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## Appendix

Blank copy of online questionnaire:

1. What is your age?
2. What is your gender?
3. What is your postcode? (This will only be used as a means to determine the area you live in only)
4. What is your approximate average household income?
5. Before undertaking this questionnaire, had you heard of the Liverpool Waters regeneration scheme?
6. What is your general opinion on the scheme? Do you think it will be worthwhile? (Link: [www.liverpoolwaters.co.uk](http://www.liverpoolwaters.co.uk))
7. Do you think that the regeneration scheme will only benefit certain types of people? or Liverpool as a whole, if so why?
8. As the Liverpool waterfront is a designated World Heritage Site alongside the likes of the Great Pyramids of Egypt, English Heritage and UNESCO are worried that the plans will damage Liverpool's historic docklands and may remove Liverpool's status as a World Heritage Site. Do you think this should have any effect on the decisions and planning involved with the regeneration? If so why?
9. Do you have any further opinions to do with any aspect of the redevelopment?
10. What is your general opinion on all of the waterfront regeneration that has occurred, past and present, in Liverpool?