



Harbour Place Shaping Strategy

Formal Consultation Report

Appendix B: Summary of free text responses

Free Text Summary of Survey Responses

Table of Contents

The Vision	3
General comments.....	3
Vision Themes.....	11
Active and Accessible theme and principles.....	11
Resilient and sustainable theme and principles.....	17
Industrious and creative theme and principles	21
Water space	24
High Level Summary:.....	24
General comments.....	26
Moorings.....	30
Nature	33
Water Activities	35
Public Access.....	38
Water Transport	41
Place Plans.....	45
Baltic Wharf	45
Spike Island	54
Wapping Wharf.....	61
City and Backs	67
Canon’s Marsh.....	73
Hotwell Road	79

The Vision

General comments

High level Summary:

- That BCC should recognise, preserve and restore the maritime heritage and industrial ambiance of the Harbour; there were calls to protect creative industries, charities, and organizations in the area, especially from displacement through rent increases and residential developments
- Support for improving public realm
- Calls to prioritise environmental sustainability, water quality, and biodiversity
- Opposition to high-rise residential buildings that could create over-crowding, disrupt open space / views or disrupt the character of the area
- Comments noted that the vision should speak more to how the Harbour can be improved for residents, with calls to better acknowledge and prioritise the boating community / those living on boats; that infrastructure gaps should be addressed
- There was support for an accessibility focus
- Geographic considerations - that the strategy could be better linked with the New Cut, the River Avon, Cumberland Basin and the Harbour Head. Calls for a parallel strategy to manage the estate extending to Hanham Lock.
- Comments requested greater recognition of the contributions of charities and watersports organisations, with calls for further investment.

Comments

General support for the Vision

1. Agreement and enthusiasm for the regeneration plans. Calls for swift implementation. Particular comments on discrete areas
2. That the Vision builds successfully on what is currently in the Harbour
3. That the HPSS successfully addresses concerns about the current state of the Harbour
4. That the Harbour is already doing many of the things it mentions, advice to avoid the phrasing ‘the Harbour will’ as this fails to recognise this
5. Appreciation of the Vision's holistic, comprehensive and coherent approach to improving the Harbour
6. That having a vision with themes and principles informing it are a sound approach to the future use of the area
7. Support for how the Place Plans prioritise different aspects of the vision
8. That the art work in the documents could be turned into a colouring book

Concerns about the vision

1. Feasibility and Financial Concerns

- Questions as to the viability of plans due to BCC financial constraints and past sale of Harbour assets
- BCC should reassess the push for financial self-sustainability
 - This could undermine the Harbour’s character and broader benefits including the multiplying effect of its visitor economy and benefits to health and wellbeing
 - This should be reflected in BCC’s funding priorities and its mechanisms for leveraging funds from regional and national agencies
 - That the Victorian structure of the Harbour will require more funds than can be generated through self-sufficiency for its upkeep
- That the HPSS has not explored improvements to the Council’s revenue-capturing mechanisms. It should have included realistic forecasts for other funding sources such as a Community Infrastructure Levy on housing development or National or Regional development funds.
- Concerns were raised about over-commercialization and the risk of prioritizing financial goals over the Harbour as a restful and communal space
- Whether the private sector will be necessary to fund the changes
- That there should be a focus on quality rather than cost savings
- That the emphasis on greening and sustainability should not be compromised in the face of possible financial challenges or in favor of economic growth
- That the themes / principles should be prioritised to aid funding decisions
- That the symbiotic relationship between the different things happening on the Harbour should be recognised, e.g. the operational requirements of the Harbour, the maritime industries and infrastructure and the social and cultural aspects - particularly water leisure activities
- Request for explanation for how the Vision was paid for, how changes will come forward, for timings and costs, for transparent reporting, and for the communications plan
- Perception that BCC will make money from flats and that the HPSS exists to add positive spin

2. Lack of Detail, Unclear Implementation

- That the vision is utopian – it is trying to do too much and will therefore not do anything. That it lacks detail, ideas are appealing but without clear, actionable steps for their implementation. The strategy will need to be consistent, imaginative and feasible if it is to work
- On the achievability of the Vision based on their experience of BCC involvement in the Harbour. On whether the necessary actions, management, and consultation with key stakeholders will occur, particularly with regard to supporting marine industries

3. Other

- Concerns about the focus on elite, wealthy users over the broader community.
- That the vision does not recognise the existing uses of the Harbour and the people that have worked to make it what it is. Call for recognition of the contributions by charities and organisations providing watersports access to youth, with calls for further investment.

Suggestions for the vision going forwards

1. Community Engagement
 - Support for ensuring that local communities have continuing ownership over the ideas as they develop
 - Ensure better communication and engagement with the local community, including businesses, residents and stakeholders to strengthen the vision and ensure shared ownership of public spaces
 - That it will be essential that the collaborative culture that exists between the various watersports providers within the Baltic Wharf area is nurtured and grown
 - That engagement exercises are disingenuous / meaningless – that the decisions have already been made. That the Harbour has organically become an enjoyable space, despite conceptual / top down plans
2. Geographic Scope
 - That the strategy should include the New Cut, the River Avon, Cumberland Basin, the Harbour Head, the SSI and refer to its relationship with the Avon Gorge / tidal river generally
 - Perception of a confusion of boundaries of HPSS, Western Harbour and DS4. That as a result Avon Quay is neglected when it comes to decision making
 - Calls for a parallel strategy to manage the estate extending to Hanham Lock.
 - This area of the river has seen an increase in informal, unlicensed and unregulated leisure water activity as well as holiday rentals.
 - It is likely to come under increasing pressure as a result of the Temple Quarter and other city center developments.
 - This stretch of river is also suffering significant environmental deterioration and structures are beginning to fail
3. That Hannover Place is spelt wrong

Inclusivity, diversity, affordability

1. Inclusivity and diversity
 - General support for increasing the diversity of users, with one objection to HPSS's aim of welcoming diverse communities into the Harbour
 - Public spaces should cater to people of all ages and ensure visitor safety
 - The vision should better represent diverse communities and people with disabilities, including in the images within the documents
 - Support for an accessibility focus. That the HPSS should ensure accessibility goes all the way to the water's edge
2. Affordability
 - A focus on financial security of the Harbour should not result in a place which is too expensive for people to use. This would result in gentrification and discourage diverse communities. Ensure that the Harbour can be enjoyed for free
 - Calls for activities and clubs to remain affordable – that they may not be able to operate under commercial rates
 - Calls for the fees and charges that boat owners pay to be affordable – that raising fees has driven many out
 - One comment asks what the Council can do to discourage clubs for 'picking and choosing' membership

- Concerns about the vision catering primarily to wealthier residents, students or tourists, leading to exclusion of lower-income Bristolians.

Transport

1. Active Transport

- Support for active transport but with emphasis on separating cyclists and scooter users from pedestrians to improve safety especially for vulnerable groups like older people
- That the Harbour walk should be retained

2. Public Transport

- Current public transport is seen as inadequate. Calls for significant improvements in Bristol's bus network, particularly for outer areas and evenings/weekends. Calls for direct busses rather than having to change
- Calls for new public transport infrastructure including an underground system and tram. Calls to fully reopen and extend the Harbour Railway

3. Traffic and Road Infrastructure

- That high-speed through traffic should be eliminated on safety and accessibility grounds
- Criticism of the current road conditions and the lack of funding to improve this.
- Criticism of CAZ – that this reduces access to the Harbour

4. Parking and Car Access

- That easy car parking is needed to maintain accessibility for visitors to businesses. Suggestions to increase parking
- Request of resident exemption from bus gate fines via number plate recognition to allow residents to get home more directly / reduce unnecessary pollution

5. Ferry service

- Support for proposed ferry improvements
- That the ferry service has become overly tourist-focused
- That it lacks accessibility along the north bank
- Support for restoration of old ferry stops to aid access around the Harbour
- Support for transport via the River Avon from Avonmouth to free up traffic into Bristol

6. Access and Connectivity

- That the Harbour needs to also be accessible to people in North Somerset, South Gloucester etc
- That more should be done to improve links between Spike Island, Southville, Hotwells, and Clifton, as well as North Somerset, South Gloucester etc. This could be through a bridge, regular 7-day ferry service, or even a cable car. This would benefit local businesses, visitors, and traders while generating potential revenue
- That issues of access, circularity and movement need to be addressed

7. Accessibility

- Calls to improve accessibility at wharves and ferry landing stages for wheelchair users and those with reduced mobility. Ensure accessible links between ferry and public transport, e.g. at Temple Meads station, the City Centre and Hotwells
- That poor connectivity excludes poorer and disabled residents from the Harbour

8. The impact of transport works

- That BCC should note the impact of bridge closures on residents
- Pedestrian access should be preserved during any works. Closures at Vauxhall Bridge, Underfall Yard, and McArthur’s Yard have been challenging

Public Realm

1. Support for improving public realm. Appreciation for the vision’s intent to make the Harbour a social space that is playful, fun and inclusive
2. Public space
 - There should be more emphasis on connecting communities through shared public spaces
 - That the Harbour should remain open to all, with less private or restricted access
 - That the Vision should focus on protecting spaces for rest and recreation
3. Call for the HPSS to improve health and well-being
4. Comment on the need for safety, including at night and for children
5. Maintenance
 - That upkeep of old walls and removal of damaging plants like Buddleia trees are needed in order to preserve the area
 - That planting grass around the railway tracks in the Harbour will require unsustainable levels of maintenance.
6. Support for increasing interaction with the water itself

History, Culture and the Character of the Harbour

1. Heritage in the Harbour
 - Support for the approach to heritage in the Harbour
 - That BCC should recognise, preserve and restore the maritime heritage, historical artefacts, and industrial ambience of the Harbour. Operational maritime heritage, such as traditional boatbuilding, should be nurtured and potentially expanded with initiatives like a boatbuilding academy
 - The Harbour should tell the story of its history better
 - Calls not to turn the Harbour into a museum
 - That a maritime museum should be included in Bristol Harbour if changes are being made
 - Calls for the inclusion of references to longstanding features of the Harbour, such as the Cabot Cruising Club and the John Sebastian lightship (the last remaining wooden lightship afloat in the world)
 - That greening around the railway tracks would cause them to lose their industrial character
 - Perception that the term ‘operational dock’ is no longer necessary – prioritise vistas and an active waterfront instead
2. Boats and the water
 - Support for welcoming larger sailing vessels into the Harbour
 - That water sports are great entertainment for those watching on land
 - That boats (especially historic ones) are what make the Harbour
3. Creative and Cultural Preservation
 - Support for the approach to cultural uses in the Harbour

- That the Harbour should be a thriving place for arts and culture
 - Calls to protect creative industries, charities, and organizations in the area from being displaced by residential developments. These are seen as essential to Bristol's identity and success as a vibrant cultural destination. Perception that existing art and cultural places in the Harbour will be erased in favour of 'new opportunities'
 - Recommendations to add more music, art, cinema, and skateboarding spaces
 - Disapproval of the current programming for the Harbour Festival
 - That protecting the Harbour's artistic, quirky, and industrial qualities is vital for tourism and maintaining its unique identity
4. Other
- The HPSS should note the Harbour's role as a place of arrival and departure

The Environment

1. Environmental Concerns
 - Support for the approach to environmental sustainability, climate and nature
 - Calls to prioritise environmental sustainability, water quality, and biodiversity over purely economic goals. It should seek to encourage key species and explicitly mention the Biodiversity Action Plan (BAP) Priority Species
2. Water and the environment
 - Water quality needs to be prioritized, including enhanced testing. Companies should be held to account for sewer overflows and misconnected drains
 - That the water should be a space to connect with nature
 - That encouraging watersports should be balanced with a need to safeguard the environment
 - Calls for restoring greenery in the Harbour to provide shaded areas for hotter weather – in particular around St Augustine's Reach
 - Rewilding efforts were questioned due to the conflict with maintaining the area as a working Harbour
 - That developers should be held to account if they omit planting
3. Flooding
 - Consider the Harbour's historic role in flood risk management

Living in the Harbour

1. Living in the Harbour
 - The vision should recognise that the Harbour is also a place where people live. How will this affect them? What can be done to make this a better place to live in the context of a growing population
 - Ensure that the needs of communities are met, e.g. rent controls, community land trusts, and co-operative ownership of organisations and businesses
 - Ensure that changes do not negatively affect residents, concerns in particular about a spread of drinking culture and increased noise
2. The Boating Community

- Calls to acknowledge and prioritise the boating community, including those living on boats, as part of the Harbour’s diversity. That boats were not adequately referenced in the document.
 - That boaters should be prioritised over those accessing the Harbour for leisure
 - That a diverse mix of vessels and the community that live and work on them give the Harbour its charm
 - Support for increasing residential living opportunities on the water, inspired by models like Copenhagen
 - Support for increased moorings as encouraging maritime activity will enhance Bristol’s tourism, economy, and cultural appeal
3. Practical Concerns / infrastructure
- Address infrastructure gaps, such as public toilets, litter especially in areas with increased activity
 - How could the new heat system help boaters?
4. Sensitive development
- Opposition to high-rise residential buildings that could create over-crowding, disrupt open space and views or disrupt the character of the area. Respondents emphasized that new developments should be proportionate to their surroundings and avoid sacrificing quality for density. Mention given to Wapping Wharf, Baltic Wharf and the SSGB car park in particular. That quiet areas are important as well
 - That overdevelopment could put pressure on local facilities / infrastructure, this will need to be improved if more residents move to the area
 - That any new development needed to be designed well to fit with the Harbour’s heritage / older buildings
 - Comment not to let ‘success’ destroy a beautiful area. That overdevelopment with no connection to the past could disrupt the area’s character and lead to more traffic congestion. The Harbour should not be ‘tidied up’ at the expense of losing character
 - Ensure practical uses of the Harbour are taken into account in development

Business in the Harbour

1. That the Harbour has to be economically successful to sustain its goals
2. That investment in existing industrial and creative businesses could deliver returns in the future
3. That a focus on restaurants and coffee shops will affect the viability of the proposals. Other comments suggest that food businesses should be prioritised more in the Vision
4. That maritime and cultural/creative industries and small businesses should be encouraged, avoiding over-commercialisation. That existing businesses should be preserved. That the Vision needs to guarantee the spaces used by existing businesses.
5. The Vision should reference the role of the Harbour in hosting events

Waterspace

1. Swimming
 - Support for the approach to water-based activities and maritime industries
 - Support for open water swimming in the Harbour. Suggestion of a sauna to go along with the swimming area

- Support for a lido pool – in particular for Canoe Polo which would allow for participation in national competitions. The Pool size would need to accommodate a playing pitch that is 35m x 23m for this. There would need to be car parking nearby to drop off craft
 - Water temperature and cleanliness were raised as potential issues for swimming activities
 - That swimming could be in Cumberland Basin so as to not get in the way of sailing
2. Watersports
- Respondents commended the vision’s recognition of maritime and water-based activities as integral to Bristol’s identity.
 - Concern that existing water business and leisure activities could be displaced. That the current spaces and facilities are inadequate for water born activities
 - Support for water based activities being accessible, with monitoring to ensure inclusivity
 - There should be an emphasis on promoting physical activity and sports for wellbeing, including mental health
3. The Waterspace Center
- Support for investment in a purpose-built watersports centre. That current provision is piecemeal with tired facilities
 - Comments that encourage collaboration between providers for the watersports center to work
4. Facilities and Infrastructure
- Support for greater use of the Harbour for diverse water sports and competitions, including canoe polo, triathlons, and rowing regattas. Note the different infrastructure requirements for these, including spectator infrastructure
 - Make available multiple launch sites for both organized and self launch with associated car parking and craft drop off
 - Concerns about overcrowding on the water and reduced safe spaces for sailing, which could compromise existing clubs like All Aboard and Navy Cadets. That open spaces elsewhere may be neglected – in particular around M Shed
 - Baltic Wharf and Avon Quay are integral parts of the on-water activity
 - HPSS should integrate the water / youth activities in the Harbour better, e.g. kayakers, canoers and rowers use Bathurst Basin as it is a quiet part of the Harbour

Comments about specific place plans

Comments about Baltic Wharf

1. Housing
 - Criticism of planned high-rise developments in Baltic Wharf and surrounding areas, with calls for smaller-scale buildings
 - The affordability of new apartments to locals was questioned
2. Impact on Harbour Activities
 - That tall buildings close to the water could disrupt wind patterns and affect sailing
3. Sustainability and Environmental Impact
 - Calls for Baltic Wharf to be preserved as public green space
 - That removal of mature trees is incompatible with sustainability goals
4. The diversity of things happening in the Harbour

- That housing at Baltic Wharf caravan site undermines the diversity of the Harbour

Comments about City & Backs

1. Preserve and enhance views of the historic Redcliffe Railway Tunnel and railway cutting and put up information boards
2. Maintain cobblestone ‘footprints’ at Welsh Back and reinstate them at Redcliffe Wharf

Comments about Spike Island

1. Puppet Place must be preserved and supported as a vital cultural site with global significance, integral to Bristol’s creative history, including its connection to Aardman and other important puppeteers and animators
2. Emphasis should be on making the Harbour a destination with open spaces, rather than focusing on building more housing on Spike Island

Comments about Hotwells

No comments

Vision Themes

Active and Accessible theme and principles

High Level Summary:

- **Principle 1:** There was support for better accessibility for disabled people and also that greater accessibility in turn facilitates the wide range of volunteering that happens in the Harbour. Notes that the water channel needs to be accessible. There were concerns that the Harbour will become inaccessible to those on a low/average incomes with suggestions to address economic barriers to the area. That it should be easy to visit the Harbour for free. Calls for improvements to travel in terms of bus/mass transit, active travel, but also for those visiting by car. There were requests for more amenities for visitors, residents and boaters.
- **Principle 2:** Comments on improving safety in the public realm and in the water itself. Support for making the area feel safer. Support for green measures and improving air and water quality.
- **Principle 3:** Comments encouraged a balance in terms of buildings in the Harbour – that it should not all be housing and requested the buildings be well designed. There was concern about over development and high rise. Also calls to improve facilities for boat dwellers.
- **Principle 4:** Support for play spaces, with objections around compatibility with safety and the water’s edge and also the Harbour needing to be a place for everyone, not just children. Enthusiasm for expanding watersports and child-friendly water activities, provided safety

measures are in place, with particular concerns over clashes due to space constraints. That Cumberland Basin should also be used for watersports

General comments

1. Comments around financial feasibility of achieving the Strategy in current climate. That BCC have not delivered high quality development in the past
2. That the plan is too vague at this stage
3. That the elements presented in the strategy have already been achieved
4. That the Harbour primarily needs to be a place of work
5. Chack spelling of 'Hanover Place'
6. Request to include Cumberland Basin (which is used for water polo) and Feeder Canal in the plans

Principle 1: The Harbour will be welcoming to the wider city, inclusive and accessible to all

Accessibility / Inclusivity

1. For disabled people
 - Calls for better accessibility for disabled people, including improved public transport links, accessible walkways, and more and cheaper parking
 - That cobbles are not accessible, though also that they are part of the area's heritage
 - Call to add reference to a Changes Places Toilets in the Vision from We the Curious which will be sighted near the public toilets in Millenium Square
2. For able bodied people / children
 - That increasing accessibility (parking in particular) in turn facilitates voluntary work, e.g. maintenance of historical artefacts in the Harbour
 - That public realm should be designed with child heights in mind so that they do not have to be lifted to see things
3. For Boaters
 - Call to increase accessibility for people living on boats
 - That the water channel needs to be accessible. This requires faster and more lock gate openings, removing the notice necessary to come in and better maintenance. This stops yacht visitors in particular.
4. On wayfinding
 - Better wayfinding needed – that the Harbour walk feels detached
5. That changes, for example around accessibility can also destroy character
6. Calls for spaces that cater to all demographics, including marginalised groups, ensuring diverse participation

Affordability

1. Concerns that the Harbour will become inaccessible to those on a low/average incomes
2. Suggestions to address economic barriers, with criticism of high costs for entry, transport, and services. That it should be possible to visit the Harbour for free.
3. That high fees for boaters mean that the water is not accessible for all

Transport

1. Car users
 - Calls to retain car parking, especially for disabled people but also for able bodied
 - Call to get rid of the bus gate on Cumberland Rd or allow number plate recognition for residents
 - That bridge closures have meant that communities in South Bristol are cut off from the Harbour. That this has affected business
 - That Commercial Rd be reopened to two way traffic
2. Mass Transit
 - Improvements needed in bus and ferry services to make the area more connected and accessible for visitors from the wider region. Mention given to improving public transport to the SSGB
 - That the railway should be expanded
 - That transport should incorporate trams / light rail
 - The ferry should be electrified, made free, and fully accessible. It should extend from Plimsoll Bridge to Netham. Others doubt that ferries are especially useful
 - That coach drop offs should not interfere with cycle lanes – e.g. near M Shed
 - That the coach parking around We The Curious is in the wrong place
3. Active travel
 - Call to separate cyclists and pedestrians. Cycling should be made safe for children
 - Calls for new bridge connections
 - That walking routes must be clear, safe and fully accessible
 - That the Chocolate Path could provide better connections in the area. It should have more entry points along its length
 - Call to widen the pavement on Cumberland Rd
 - Call to slow traffic on Cumberland Rd
 - That pedestrian routes continue to go through Millenium Sq

Amenities for visitors

1. Requests for more public toilets, changing facilities, water fountains, and accessible services to support visitors
2. That there should be more places for people to sit close tot the water

Engagement and co-design

1. Call to allow co design of public realm and accessibility improvements to incorporate the views of a range of individuals
2. Calls for further engagement with boat dwellers and water sports organisations
3. That We the Curious would like to be included in discussions over heritage / play trails around the Harbour

Principle 2: The Harbour will be a comfortable, open and safe place for people to spend time, that promotes wellbeing

Walkability

1. Support for improvements to the Harbour walkway. That the Harbour needs to feel connected for walking.

Safety

1. Safety and public realm
 - Highlighted need for water safety measures, including barriers and separation of activities to minimise risks, especially for children, and young people on a night out
 - That walls around the Harbour should be reduced
 - Provide exit points for if people or animals do fall in
 - That too many railings etc will destroy the character of the area
2. Water and safety
 - Water safety should be a priority - there is a history of water related emergencies
 - That a consolidated water sports hub could be safe if activities are not properly separated
 - That visiting children are especially at risk around the Baltic Wharf/ Underfall/ Avon Quay area. It will be difficult for watersports organisations to control this risk
3. Crime
 - That a new police station is needed here to make it feel safe
 - Call for better lighting and passive surveillance
4. That plans should incorporate the 'Make Space for Girls' research

Tranquility

1. Respondents value peaceful areas around the Harbour, providing a balance with active and lively spaces

Community Focus

1. Call to create spaces that support community and recreational activities, avoiding over-commercialisation

The Environment

1. Importance of prioritising greening and preserving existing trees
2. Calls for bringing more wildlife into the area
3. Calls for improving water quality – that the storm sewers that discharge into the Harbour should be addressed
4. That air quality here should be measured
5. Concern that green space will be built on

Principle 3: The Harbour will be a great place to live, with high-quality urban design, services and amenities

Development

1. Affordable housing is encouraged – especially for low income Bristolians. That building expensive flats does not align with this element of the vision
2. Concerns about exclusivity and loss of public space
3. Call to ensure a balance in terms of buildings in the Harbour – that it should not all be housing. This will build on the existing character of the area
4. Call to focus on good design of buildings. That design should ensure people feel safe and should respect the Harbour's heritage and character. They should have large balconies, communal workspaces, bike storage, rooftop gardens etc
5. Concern about over development and high rise – especially in terms of views and the potential for development to affect wind for sailing
6. Call to keep Baltic Wharf Caravan Club. That Baltic Wharf should be a public park
7. That the Harbour should be for leisure and not more housing

Living on the Water

1. That house boats should be encouraged as these add character to the Harbour

Services for Residents

1. Facilities for boat dwellers are seen as inadequate. Improvements in infrastructure, including waste management, maintenance, and utilities, are seen as priorities for existing boat residents before introducing further development
2. That community / 3rd spaces are needed

Heritage

1. Accessibility should be balanced with heritage – calls to retain cobbles and old train tracks
2. That the area's heritage as a working Harbour should be retained
3. That the Harbour should be for heritage and play, not homes

Businesses

1. Calls for buildings which incorporate independent businesses and amenities
2. Support for more cafes and bars along the waterfront
3. That Spike Island in particular should retain an industrial focus
4. That existing creative organisations should be supported

Principle 4: The Harbour will offer a unique playable quayside, helping to create a child-friendly city

Play Spaces

1. Support for safe and creative play areas, and to integrate child-friendly design into urban features without compromising safety
2. That housing needs play spaces and communal indoor spaces
3. Concern that play spaces could be an eyesore.
4. That the area is fundamentally unsafe for children / teenagers. That it is unsafe to incorporate the railway tracks into the play space or to have play near water

5. That playing children, especially on scooters are dangerous to other Harbour users
6. That HPSS should not overly focus on children, child free people and older people need to be comfortable in the area as well. Requests to design spaces that cater to children while considering the needs of other groups, such as older adults seeking quieter areas
7. That to be child friendly, the Harbour also has to be inexpensive
8. Clarity sought over the play landscape relates to Canon's House (subject to planning for refurbishment and an extension). Question over whether the public realm outside a building intended for office workers should it be designated for play. Play may be distracting and noisy for workers, and the space will be used by workers on their lunch breaks
9. That a playground should be incorporated into the plans, e.g. in Canon's Marsh
10. Support for collaboration with We The Curious on redeveloping the water features and other infrastructure in Millennium Sq
11. Call for new skatepark in the Amphitheatre or behind it. Call for safe, skateable paths around the Harbour up to the curbside skatepark. Skateparks need better lighting and maintenance. Support for people who make DIY skateparks

Water-Based Activities

12. Enthusiasm for expanding watersports and child-friendly water activities, provided safety measures are in place
13. Calls to support water sports organisations
14. That Cabot Cruising and Bristol Cruising Club should be included in the plans
15. On the watersports hub
 - That adding too many water activities will clash. That swimming gets in the way of other activities and is noisy
 - That there need to be moor pontoons to enable quick assets to the water
 - That boats need to be moved without too much interaction with the public. That separation from the public is necessary for the safeguarding of children etc - that Avon Quay is suited to this
 - That the water sports center will need changing facilities and toilets
 - That this could be extended geographically
16. Swimming
 - Support for open water swimming, including saunas. Comments opposing a lido as well as those in support of one. That there should be a hoist /ramp for disabled swimmers. That swimming should be free and at swimmer's own risk
17. Watersports need to be balanced with the Harbour being a working space – calls to consult industry experts
18. That Bathurst Basin is used by youth water sports organisations, with Benjamin Perry Boathouse as the base.
19. That investment is needed to ensure water users are informed as to the safe use of the Harbour so as to not to interfere with the ferry or to pose a danger to themselves
20. Café on Avon Quay welcomed, as was improving access to the area
21. That Cumberland Basin could be used for watersports
22. That affordable boats storage near the water is necessary for those who don't have a car

Avoiding Over-Sanitisation

23. Concerns about overregulation and loss of the Harbour's authentic character due to development, increased safety features, play interventions etc

24. That the Harbour needs to be a place of work

Resilient and sustainable theme and principles

High Level Summary:

- Principle 1: Perception that BCC should reassess the push for financial self-sustainability and should avoid over-commercialisation; that there was a risk that the area would become overly focused on wealthy users over the broader community and organisations, especially if fees and charges were overly onerous, making activities in the Harbour unaffordable / unsustainable to run. Calls for funding commitments and plans for delivery
- Principle 2: That environmental measures in the Harbour should be prioritized, but implemented with a sensitivity to accessibility and also maintained. Particular attention was given to improvements to public transport. Disagreement around the priority that should be given to cars and parking. Disagreement over the utility of ferries
- Principle 3: That the existing communities, whether boaters, water sports orgs, residents etc. should be fostered and appreciated in the Vision. Respondents called for affordable amenities and speedy implementation of better facilities for boat owners. There were concerns over rising rents and fees that risk displacing creative and community organisations.
- Principle 4: That tourism and local community needs need to be balanced, avoiding over-commercialisation and preserving the Harbour's character. That crime and litter need to be addressed for this to be a success. There were concerns about events that restrict local access.

Principle 1: The development of the Harbour will underpin the sustainability of the Harbour and Dock's Estate

Existing creative and maritime businesses

1. That rising land prices in the area make it difficult for businesses which service boats
2. That existing communities should not be priced out of the area (through increasing mooring fees, leisure licenses and lack of affordable provision in development) in order to make the Harbour financially sustainable
3. Existing creative and maritime businesses and the boating community should be recognised as integral to the Harbour's sustainability, with investments in maintenance, moorings, and energy-efficient facilities to encourage this
4. That the Harbour needs to primarily be operational – it should support boaters and boat maintenance. That there is a need for operational (boat) space in the Harbour.
5. That existing businesses and boaters also need to contribute to the sustainability of the Harbour
6. That activity in the Harbour makes it attractive for visitors

Implementation of the HPSS

1. That BCC do not have money to implement the plans.
2. Calls for funding commitments and plans for delivery
3. That the document should be clear explicit about seeking any changes to allow the Harbour to be financially viable
4. That plans should be implemented speedily
5. That the Harbour should be a 'loss leader' rather than seeking financial sustainability as it already supports the wider economy of the city
6. On the importance of maintenance

Principle 2: The Harbour will play a vital role in delivering upon Bristol's zero carbon, biodiversity and climate resilience ambitions

Flood

1. Comments on the need for comprehensive flood prevention and water quality management to address climate resilience, with concerns about rising water levels and pollution
2. Concerns about building on floodable land

Environmental measures and greening

1. Trees, shrubs, sensory planting and native plants, should be prioritized. Suggestion of a community orchard.
2. That trees are useful for shade - especially needed in Millennium Sq and Cannons Marsh
3. Tree planting should be done sensitively to avoid accessibility challenges caused by roots / poor placement. Planting should reflect the working nature of the Harbour.
4. On the importance of maintenance, which could be done by the community
5. That BCC also needs to deal with invasive species in the Harbour
6. That ecologists should be employed to plan greening in the Harbour
7. That there should be a water quality focus
8. That there should be an educational angle to the environment and the Harbour, e.g. wildlife monitoring and litter campaigns
9. That floating reed beds will need to be carefully designed so as to not become a litter trap
10. That the area needs to be regenerative
11. That losing mature trees to development is regrettable

Sustainability

1. Sustainability efforts should ensure they support existing communities,
2. That they should minimise greenwashing (comment that does not think that EVs / charging infrastructure is sustainable).
3. Suggestions included solar panels, carbon-capturing initiatives (including carbon capturing planting), and sustainable energy sources
4. That the energy centers could be used for educational purposes

Travel and sustainability

1. Call to allow residents to drive through the bus gate on Cumberland Rd so as to reduce no of miles driven

2. Calls for improvements to the bus network
3. Call to reduce space for cars and parking for pedestrians and cyclists, but also calls for car parking to be retained
4. That ferries are still quite expensive and polluting. That they are currently mainly used by tourists, though it would be good if they were used by residents and commuters. That more ferry stops would be useful
5. That sailing and rowing are sustainable forms of travel but require places to tie up and store boats. People could paddle board to work. Some Harbour crossings could be oar powered.
6. Call to lower the speed limit for motor craft to stop their wakes disrupting other water users which is not safe or enjoyable

Principle 3: The Harbour will be a place that supports community life

Existing communities

1. That it is imperative that the existing community is fostered and appreciated in the Vision. Particular mention was given to the boating community, which contributes to the area's vibrancy and heritage
2. That the Harbour is a place for all Bristolians, not just residents
3. That existing activities, such as beginners sailing at Mardyke Quay could be affected by increased moorings and wind interference from buildings

Amenities

1. Respondents called for affordable amenities and spaces that encourage social and cultural activities, such as public gardens, seating areas, and sensory plantings
2. Requests for speedy implementation of better facilities for boat owners – especially given the changes to fees and charges. Recycling and toilets facilities mentioned in particular.
3. Comments on the importance of disabled access
4. Calls for public toilets
5. That focus should be on how existing facilities are developed, and not to replace them for the sake of it

Affordability

1. Concerns were expressed over rising rents and fees that risk displacing creative and community organisations

Community engagement

1. Calls for better engagement with existing residents, boat owners and businesses. That they need to feel engaged with
2. Calls to ensure community-led design and decision-making, fostering a sense of ownership and inclusion

Principle 4: The Harbour will balance its world-class tourist offer and events programming with the needs of its diverse local communities and neighbourhoods

Tourism

1. Respondents emphasised the importance of balancing tourism and local community needs, avoiding over-commercialisation and preserving the harbour's character
2. That crime and litter (especially from hospitality) need to be addressed
3. That food and drink businesses in the Harbour should not be expanded
4. Support for events in the Harbour, canoe polo tournaments mentioned in particular, although others are concerned that this would have a negative impact on locals
5. Request for historic ships to be moored near to the SSGB. That Millennium Sq needs more infrastructure such as power and water for events.
6. That the plans should mention the Bristol Big Screen in Millennium Sq
7. That the Harbour could become part of the developing 'UK Historic Harbours' initiative being promoted by the Maritime Heritage Trust and Historic England which would support the idea of the Harbour hosting a future Tall Ships festival in the future

Concerns about restricting local access

1. Concerns were raised about events that restrict local access or prioritise commercial gain, with suggestions for more free, community-focused events

Public Transport and visitor economy

1. That SS Great Britain and other attractions should be better supported with improved, closer public transport and infrastructure. That car parking should be retained nearby

Other

Comments about development opportunities

1. Respondents urged careful consideration of heritage, biodiversity, views and community needs in development
2. Concerns about the redevelopment of sites like the Baltic Wharf caravan site. It is seen as a unique, green asset which supports the visitor economy and that building there will undermine biodiversity and heritage
3. Development should enhance existing assets and infrastructure rather than replace them, focusing on creating a resilient, inclusive, and vibrant space for all users
4. Call for mix uses, including houses to activate the area better. That there should be small plots with alleys to facilitate an intensification of uses
5. Calls for more affordable housing, avoiding rent increases driving out locals / businesses
6. That Bathurst Basin should not have additional moorings because: it is a 'no mooring location', the quayside is Grade II listed, the space is used by the Scouts, room is needed for the John Sebastian Light Ship to turn and the pontoons are not occupied as they are.
7. There should be a focus on increasing sustainable living
8. That Redcliffe Wharf should be retained as an open space for pop ups
9. That development should not privatise public space

Miscellaneous

1. That Cumberland Basin / Western Harbour should be integrated into the HPSS. Note this area's role in joining the City to the SSSI
2. That money here should be spent on deprived parts of Bristol
3. Spelling mistake at 'Hanover Place'
4. Would dredging the Harbour more often improve the water quality?
5. That BCC should focus on Broadmead instead

Industrious and creative theme and principles

High Level Summary:

- Principle 1: Calls to support, preserve and enhance Bristol's maritime industry and heritage. Concern that a focus on tourism, commercialisation, and residential developments could undermine the Harbour's identity as a working maritime hub.
- Principle 2: Praise for the Strategy's aims to promote arts and creativity with calls for there to be specific recognition of the value of film making in the harbour. That the operations of organisations should come before increased tourism. Creative businesses around the Harbour may not want to be public facing. Disagreement around Businesses, nightlife and events – with differing priorities for visitors vs residents

Principle 1: The Harbour Will Be a Vital Part of Bristol's Cultural Identity, Where Everyday Public Life Coexists with Water Uses and Maritime Industries

1. Calls to support, preserve and enhance Bristol's maritime industry and heritage. Suggestions included integrating traditional maritime skills such as boatbuilding with youth training schemes, restoring Underfall Yard, and incorporating new museums and public art. That this should remain the primary focus of the Harbour. Another comment is skeptical that boats are used regularly in the Harbour or that there is a marine industry.
2. That the people who live and work in the Harbour are what gives it its cultural identity
3. On the importance of restoring Underfall Yard after the arson attack
4. That developments should have active ground floors to create a mixed use environment
5. That the boaters license fees should cover access to a maintenance area for their boats
6. Concern that a focus on tourism, commercialisation, and residential development could undermine the Harbour's working identity as a or a pleasant place for members of the public. Worries about the privatisation of parts of the city, including the Harbour
7. That there should be greater acknowledgment of Bristol's role in the transatlantic slave trade, proposing a dedicated museum or expanded storytelling initiatives such as information boards.

Principle 2: The Harbour Will Be a Place Where Creativity, Making, and Culture, Including Local Production and Provenance, Are Celebrated and Supported

1. Praise for the Strategy's aims to promote arts and creativity, noting the importance of supporting existing creative organisations like Puppet Place and Spike Island, which contribute to the area's identity and economy. That the Strategy should make greater reference to the importance of M Shed and Watershed.
2. Suggestion to dedicate spaces for street art and graffiti, creating pop-up markets, and fostering street entertainment.
3. That the operations of organisations should come before increased tourism. Creative businesses around the Harbour may not want to be public facing.
4. That organisations in the Harbour are struggling due to rising rents, a lack of long leases and a lack of support generally
5. Businesses, nightlife and events; Support for encouraging independent businesses in the Harbour. That nightlife should be considered in the Harbour where appropriate, including on boats. Others express concern about noise from events in the Harbour, such as in Lloyds Amphitheater or say that nightlife should not take place here at all. Call for more classical programming, theatre, charity and community building events. That there could be more events at both Spike Island and Underfall Yard. Suggestion of pop up/antique/food markets, drone shows and more buskers and street entertainment. Calls for independent restaurants, bars and cafes, especially near the waterside
6. That existing creative industries in the Harbour activate the area and are low height so allow sun to permeate the Harbour walkway
7. Connectivity; Support for an improved walkway around the Harbour, in particular the section that goes behind the SSGB. That Spike Island should be better connected.
8. That the creative outputs in the Harbour should be affordable and not just for the wealthy
9. Suggestion of an Avon Quay Trust to better understand the needs of residents, enhance facilities and generate revenue for the Harbour

Omissions and general comments

1. Question about how this will be funded
2. That these aims are already the case in the Harbour
3. That the Strategy should include plans to improve water quality, tackle pollution, and enhance environmental sustainability. That it should detail plans to address storm water outlets discharging into the Harbour. That it should also provide plans for de-silting the Harbour, that this would allow the Harbour to store more flood water. That the strategy should address underwater sound pollution which affects marine life
4. That the Strategy should include measures to support affordable public facilities, such as toilets, EV chargers, and spaces for community and cultural events
5. That Western Harbour should be included in the Strategy. Question about whether Temple Quay has a cultural element.
6. Calls to remove the bus gate on Cumberland Rd and include more car access and parking

7. That the HPSS needs to consider residents to a greater degree rather than focusing on visitors. That the HPSS should consider the people who live on boats in the area. That the Harbour should respect and care for boat dwellers
8. That the Harbour Estates team needs to be properly staffed
9. Call not to 'tidy up' the Harbour too much

Water space

High Level Summary:

Vision: General support for the criteria listed relating to a successful water space with opportunities identified for strengthening further relating to the maintenance of Harbour infrastructure; maintenance of boater facilities; celebration of existing historic assets and the attraction of more historic vessels/creation of a maritime museum; and more ambitious environmental aspirations. More detail required on how this will be funded. Calls for Cumberland Basin to be considered within the plan.

Moorings

Those in favour of increasing moorings highlight: the available space; demand for live-aboard; demand for on-water boat storage for watersports organisations; the role of boats in animating the Harbour; the potential to generate income to help the Harbour become more financially self-sufficient.

Those against increasing moorings highlight: overcrowding and a sense of the Harbour being less calm; lack of demand; reduction in space for water sports and navigation; a proliferation of unmaintained boats becoming an eyesore; increased pollution; congestion on the quay wall; displacement of existing boaters; that public access should be prioritized over private moorings.

In terms of existing moorings, the current facilities are considered inadequate for certain groups of boat owners relative to the fees charged. Concerns that existing facilities are brought up to an acceptable standard before expanding or adding moorings. Risk of losing boaters to other harbours.

Considerations when creating new moorings: provision of amenities appropriate to different mooring types; appropriately located to avoid creating nuisance (noise, navigation); reduced environmental impacts through provision of composting toilet facilities, integration of floating habitats; provision for a variety of boat types including the larger Dutch barges; affordability; longer leases; accessible moorings for disabled people.

In terms of commercial moorings: These should be confined to designated areas, preserving tranquility in other parts of the Harbour. Aspirations for floating hotels, restaurants, market, spas, and shops to maintain the harbour's vibrancy.

A range of views on administration / cost of moorings.

Nature:

Those that support the expansion of floating ecospace in the Harbour, highlight their aesthetic, ecological, and health and well-being value; their role in enhancing water quality; and the added value through increased visitors. It's suggested that the focus for new floating eco spaces should be on under used parts of the Harbour. Bathurst Basin also identified as a possible location. Calls for creating public seating nearby and involving volunteers in their maintenance.

Those with concerns about floating ecospace highlight issues such as conflicting with water activities, undermining the harbours navigability, compromising the security of boats in the Harbour, ensuring their maintenance and detracting from the harbour's industrial character. Areas like Baltic Wharf not considered appropriate.

Other suggestions to support nature include: reducing marine traffic; the reduction in environmental harm from boats; the reduction of discharges of raw sewerage and pollution; retaining trees on land; preserving existing habitats.

Water Activities

Those who expressed support for expanding water activities highlight: health, economic and community benefits. Promoting water activities will need plenty of access points, easy ways to pay, discounts and outreach programmes to ensure inclusivity.

Those with concerns about expanding water activities highlight issues such as: overcrowding; conflict of between uses; safety; and water quality

A range of views have been expressed by those in favour of expanding swimming in the Harbour, with support for both expanded in-water swimming opportunities (increased space and frequency of access) and a lido-type swimming offer. Respondents highlight successful examples in Europe and the need to make swimming available to children.

Those with concerns about expanding swimming in the Harbour tend to highlight its incompatibility with other water sports, particularly sailing and a concern that regulated swimming in the Harbour will encourage people to swim generally which is unsafe. It was suggested that swimming areas should potentially moved to less congested parts of the Harbour (e.g. Cumberland Basin) to reduce interference with other activities such as sailing,

There was support for the Bristol Urban Watersports Network concept, and the idea of a consolidated watersports centre at Baltic Wharf and a network of other places to get on and off the water as a way of distributing uses throughout the Harbour and easing congestion. Nova Scotia slipway highlighted as missing. Queries raised about the accessibility of the Phoenix Wharf slipway. There was a suggestion that Avon Quay would make a better location for the watersports centre, and that Cumberland Basin should be included within the concept. Questions about how it would be funded.

Other suggestions included: school programmes; designated water sports zones; disabled facilities; repair and maintenance facilities; races/competitions; easier process to purchase licenses for paddleboarding and kayaking;

sufficient temporary moorings to allow vessels to explore; car parking; better public transport; adequate boat storage.

Water Transport

Support for increased ferry crossings with clearer signage, improved accessibility, affordable services and greater frequency (10-15 minute peak headways). Suggestions included electrifying ferries, tap-to-pay systems, locating ferry stops on land rather than pontoons wherever possible and ensuring they accommodate wheelchairs, pushchairs, and bikes. Calls for more ferry stops (along the north side of the harbour, at Plimsol Bridge and at various points along the route to Netham Lock) and integration with a broader transport network.

Some scepticism over the viability of extending ferry services and the need for a new cross harbour service (M-Shed to Ampitheatre) and to Avon Quay. Some queried whether the existing cross harbour ferry (SSGB to the Harbour Inlet) would be better replaced with a bridge. Some consider ferries noisy and polluting and highlight conflicts with other water users (particularly in the Baltic Wharf area).

Public Access

Support for pontoons and boardwalks being publicly accessible as they are a pleasant way of experiencing the Harbour. Concerns that waterside walkways and increased moorings do not become a barrier to water access for vessels.

SSGB has highlighted the potential of creating a waterside boardwalk past the site of the SSGB.

Concerns raised about the on-going maintenance costs associated with on-water boardwalks. EA has provided specific design guidance about such structures.

Calls to improve the rocky edge of the Harbour between Baltic Wharf and SS Great Britain so that people can access the edge more easily.

Request for more pedestrian/cycle bridges across the Harbour.

General comments

Comments in favour of the Water space vision

1. Support for the water space vision

2. Support for as much activation of the water space as possible
3. Support for the idea of a lido
4. Support for addition of water Eco space
5. Support for new decking
6. Support for new commercial facilities
7. That the most important point in the plan is the ‘open and accessible navigation route for the full range of marine users’
8. Support for focus on attracting the larger, more historic vessels, and providing the infrastructure for this. That this links well with Underfall Yard’s key aims.
9. Calls to involve communities as much as possible, including individuals and not just the clubs themselves

Things missing or wrong with the Water space Vision

1. Calls for a well-funded maintenance budget to prevent neglect of the Harbour's facilities. Current issues include litter in the water, crumbling harbourside infrastructure, and overgrown areas
2. Facilities
 - Concerns were raised about the inadequate facilities that are provided for the boating community – with comments encouraging the HPSS to take on board comments provided by this community in this regard. That facilities need to be 24/7 access. That boaters’ infrastructure needs to be well maintained.
 - Calls for increased provision of public toilets, with many noting their importance for accessibility and extended use of the area.
3. Environmental comments
 - That the plan could be far more environmentally ambitious
 - Support for plans to improve water cleanliness and quality, both for environmental reasons and to increase usability.
 - Call for the vision to consider underwater sound pollution, with limited vessel speeds, designated quiet areas where vessels are banned and times when vessels cannot operate.
4. Suggestions for increased water space activities, such as boat tours and paddleboarding, aim to attract more locals and tourists.
5. Suggestion for Harbour themed businesses along Hotwell Rd
6. Calls for preserving industrial and cultural heritage, with suggestions to enhance historical landmarks like the Redcliffe railway tunnel and areas such as Bathurst Basin and the John Sebastian lightship/Cabot Cruising Club HQ. Calls for a maritime museum
7. Call for better use of public space, for example the South side of Bathurst Basin
8. That the plan should encourage businesses and seek to attract more users. Request for more commercial information. That parking funds should be used to maintain the Harbour. That pontoons should be privatised
9. Enquiry into how much this will cost and how it will be achieved. Concerns about vague or overly broad language in the plan
10. Skepticism regarding the compatibility of competing aspirations, such as commercial growth with the broader aspirations

11. That the plan should include the Western Harbour Area. That mention should be made of Benjamin Perry boathouse, used by the Scouts and Guides
12. Calls for consultation with all water users

Comments about water activities

1. Support for Water-based Activities
 - Support for activities like paddleboarding, kayaking, and swimming in the Harbour. Suggestion of regular events such as triathlons and races. That a sauna could accompany the Harbour swimming. That the team should investigate precedents for this at Kalvebod Bølge in Copenhagen. Support for more slipways
 - Suggestions of new locks further down the Avon to keep a larger part of the river at a higher level for watersports and to generate electricity
 - Suggestion of better facilities at key locations, and integration of watersports with urban design. Also, easier digital systems for licenses instead of having to go to the Harbour Office. Suggestion of improving wayfinding for boaters and linking this with public realm improvements
2. General concern that storing boats on racks will not work – boats are far too heavy for this
3. That the bollard at the top of Ferry Grove ramp (near the Ostrich) which stops boats being launched there should be removed
4. Safety and Accessibility
 - That safety is key, especially around launching, landing and emergency exit points. Comments around increased water activity and congestion, especially at Baltic Wharf, where activities like dinghy sailing may conflict with swimmers. That a narrowed channel and more water users will make certain watersports more dangerous. That this is pertinent in cases of training at speed for national events.
 - Suggestions include creating a Bristol Urban Water sports Network to disperse activities across locations like Totterdown Basin and Phoenix Wharf and up to Castle Park and the Eastern reaches of the Harbour, easing pressure on popular spots like Baltic Wharf. That scheduling will be necessary to ensure the water doesn't become overcrowded
 - Suggestion of roped-off swimming areas, swimming in Cumberland Basin instead (ensuring the Western Harbour regeneration considers this), enhanced launching and landing points, and improved navigation channels
 - That boats exiting the Harbour need more staff to work the locks to let them out
 - That there should be a focus on water quality
5. Impact of Development on Water sports
 - Concerns about the effects of new residential and commercial developments on watersports. Issues include buildings affecting wind for sailing and limited space / channel width for sailing and rowing
6. Preservation of Existing Uses and Heritage
 - Respondents stress preserving traditional water activities. Comments on the need to support groups like the Cabot Cruising Club and the John Sebastian Light Ship and All Aboard who are located in areas of change. That the slipway at Bristol Marina is especially important for larger vessels
 - There are mixed views on introducing new features like a lido, that the idea could have potential while others worry about space conflicts
7. Financial and commercial concerns

- That increasing prices in the harbour / charges to store boats will discourage boaters. That increased fees are higher than in comparable sailing areas. That commercialising the harbour will squeeze access to water sports groups
- 8. Tourism and Commercial Opportunities
 - Calls to boost tourism through guided boat tours, expanded watersports options, and events. That new initiatives should be balanced with safety and existing uses
- 9. That there should be more engagement with the Cruising Clubs

Comments about transport

1. Accessibility: Respondents advocated for increased ferry crossings with clearer signage, improved accessibility, and greater frequency. Suggestions included electrifying ferries, improving quays and ensuring they accommodate wheelchairs, pushchairs, and bikes
2. Broader Connectivity: Calls for more ferry stops (including to Plimsol Bridge and Netham Lock) and integration with a broader transport network
3. Frequency and Usability: On the need for frequent and affordable services, with suggestions for 10–15-minute peak headways, tap-to-pay systems, and roll-on-roll-off functionality. That improvements will help the ferry companies to survive
4. Alternative Solutions: Suggestion of reliable off-season water crossings or additional footbridges to connect key locations
5. Comments supporting expanding ferry services. Also comments sceptical about their utility. That modes like cycling should have greater priority
6. That car parking should be retained
7. That electric scooters should be banned from the Harbourside
8. That retaining cars on Princes Street Bridge is necessary for people who live in Redcliffe to reach the A370 and Portway by car
9. Calls to reopen Vauxhall Bridge as soon as possible

Comments about access

1. Call for more bars and restaurants along the length of the Harbour. That there should be more places to sit and eat outside to stop people eating sat on the floor
2. That pontoons and boardwalks should be publicly accessible as they are a pleasant way of experiencing the Harbour
3. Suggestion of additional seating around Bathurst basin
4. Request for more pedestrian/cycle bridges across the Harbour.
5. That care should be taken that waterside walkways and increased moorings do not become a barrier to water access

Comments about moorings

1. Support for additional moorings to address oversubscription
2. On mooring facilities
 - That increasing moorings may overburden Harbour infrastructure, in particular car parking for residential boaters
 - Suggestion on composting toilet facilities as an eco-friendly feature

- New moorings should be well-designed and sensitive to affected communities / the boating community
 - That current facilities for certain groups of boat owners are inadequate relative to the fees charged
 - Question as to why moorings aren't planned at Queen St and Avon St.
3. Concern about increased moorings.
 - That increased moorings will put pressure on the water space, especially taken in the context of the additional space requirements of new ferries and Harbour swimming. That there are already a lot of moorings
 - That new moorings might be affected by noise pollution if placed near operations
 4. Safety and accessibility
 - Adding moorings must ensure no significant reduction in channel width to allow safe passage for rowers and other watercraft users
 - Safety concerns about overcrowded water spaces, especially during busy periods
 5. Protecting the diversity of boats in the Harbour is seen as vital, with larger vessels like Dutch barges at risk of being priced out. Longer-term leases for houseboats are proposed as a solution

Comments about nature

1. Support for floating eco space / habitats. Calls for expanded floating wildlife installations throughout the Harbour. That these should be effectively managed and not hinder boat movements
2. Calls for prioritising water quality, especially for Harbour swimming.
3. That undisturbed wildlife areas should be incorporated into the plans.
4. That the plans should note the biodiversity in areas like Bristol Marina, a habitat for diverse species such as otters, bats, butterflies and fish.
5. That development in the Harbour is at odds with greening the Harbour. That public access should be managed to protect wildlife and marine businesses.
6. Questions about integrating environmental goals with financial sustainability.

Other comments

1. Calls for buildings that are iconic and architecturally interesting. Other comment that design should not dominate, and that each area needs to be unique and characterful. That new buildings should not copy Wapping Wharf. Call to limit high rise building and ensure new buildings are keeping with Victorian architecture.
2. That existing organisations need to be fully consulted on all plans
3. That tree roots can get in the way of e scooters, bikes and pushchairs

Moorings

In favour of increased moorings

1. That moorings are in high demand. This is especially the case for live aboard moorings.

2. That increasing the people living on the water these will help to relieve the housing crisis, especially given the affordable nature of houseboats.
3. That living on boats is part of the culture of Bristol / the Harbour.
4. Support for increasing moorings to help the Harbour become financially sustainable.
5. That additional moorings for large ribs, safety boats, keel boats and other vessels that cannot be readily store ashore would be useful to watersports organisations.
6. That it's lovely to see people living on boats as a visitor to the Harbour
7. That moorings need to be supported by appropriate amenities
8. That there is ample space for more moorings
9. Support for new commercial moorings. That there should be commercial pontoons for non-residential boats
10. That new moorings should be zoned so that commercial moorings don't dominate the Harbour, with associated antisocial behaviour and noise

Concerns about increased moorings

1. Concern about overcrowding in the Harbour. That additional moorings would lessen the space available for water sports and navigation, making it less safe, especially for inexperienced sailors. That there are already pinch points along the river, e.g. Castle Bridge. Suggestion of relocating new moorings away from central areas. That the needs of local users like canoe clubs and charities need to be taken into account
2. Concern about unmaintained boats being an eyesore, pollution, and blocked views across the water. Calls for stricter regulation of design, maintenance, and size of watercraft
3. Skepticism about the necessity of additional moorings, that current demand is not sufficient to justify the proposed increase
4. Environmental issues such as pollution from waste products and diesel propulsion were highlighted, along with the need to manage wood burning and its associated air quality impacts. That new boats should be either battery or hydrogen run
5. That Harbour residents should be considered when new moorings are installed, particularly where walkways are already narrow
6. Worries that new moorings / fees would cater primarily to wealthier individuals, potentially displacing long-term residents
7. Call to prioritise floating habitats where navigation would not be impacted
8. Comments on the importance of preserving the Harbour heritage.
9. That the plan should prioritise public spaces over privatised moorings
10. That too many boats would look cluttered
11. That more moorings would make the Harbour less of a calm space
12. That shore homes should be prioritized over allowing people to live on the water

Comments about the type of moorings provided

1. That there needs to be a balance of different mooring types.
2. That the location of specific types of moorings is important and should be clarified. Business or party boats should be confined to designated areas, preserving tranquility in

other parts of the Harbour. That associated service provisions for different types of mooring is needed.

3. Respondents suggest prioritization of commercial and leisure uses (e.g. floating hotels, restaurants, a floating market, spas, and shops) to maintain the harbour's vibrancy. Others proposed focusing on developing land-based facilities for these uses. Other comments caution against excessive commercialisation, arguing it could detract from the harbour's charm and character and that there isn't demand for this
4. Others advocate for affordable residential moorings, ensuring inclusivity for diverse socio-economic groups. That there should be a mix of boat types, not just larger boats – that super yachts should not be allowed. That there should be long-term leases for houseboats and stationary vessels for live-aboard residents. Others comment that there should be fewer liveaboard moorings, and that focus should be given to encouraging leisure boats coming from inland waterways
5. That the current Harbour management discourages businesses and diverse boat types
6. Comments that moorings need to be scaled back

Supporting infrastructure / services are needed

1. Comments on the importance of ensuring that existing facilities are brought up to an acceptable standard before expanding or adding moorings, including waste management, access to utilities, post boxes, and cleanliness of toilets and greater accessibility
2. That more moorings could put a strain on local services like GP surgeries. Questions over whether current infrastructure can support additional residents or boats
3. Suggestions for improvement include better advertising and management of existing community services, such as the Bristol Community Toilet Scheme, and ensuring compliance with environmental regulations, especially concerning waste disposal
4. That these inadequacies, along with increased fees have led users to move their boats to other harbours. There are calls to make Bristol a leading example in harbour living and transit by upgrading facilities to meet modern standards

Comments about administration / cost of moorings

1. That when a boat is sold, the mooring should automatically be passed on to the new buyer.
2. That fees should encourage visitor boats
3. That there should be affordable moorings for less wealthy people to combat the gentrification of the Harbour and ensure diversity of take up
4. That the current administration rectifies the rise in fees and charges put in place by the last
5. That charges should not be aimed at particular times such as over the Harbour Festival, when people live in the Harbour year round
6. That the current fees are higher than anywhere else in the country, that it is pricing people out of the Harbour and at odds with sentiments valuing boats in the document
7. That the Harbour should insist on higher expectations of the boat owners to reduce 'tatty' looking boats in the Harbour
8. That Baltic Wharf Marina moorings should be operated by the council instead
9. That boat owners should not carry out maintenance on their boats on during unsociable hours and Sundays

Specific mooring queries

1. That the document should consider the John Sebastian Light Ship more fully and mark it as a heritage vessel. That the Benjamin Perry Boathouse should be flagged in the document with an indication as to how it would continue to operate in light of the plans for the area.
2. That the Cabot Cruising Club operate the berthing in Bathurst Basin with full backing of the residents around the basin. They would not support a change to this arrangement

Accessibility concerns

1. That moorings should not hinder access to and travel around the Harbour for residents and visitors. That moorings with public access are preferable.
2. That the plans need to ensure that increased moorings do not become a barrier to water access for boats etc.
3. Requirement for more accessible moorings for disabled people living and using boats

Nature

In favour of more floating ecospace

1. Support for the expansion of floating ecospace in the Harbour, recognising their aesthetic, ecological, contribution to wellbeing and added value through increased visitors
2. That this should be combined with having spaces relatively undisturbed by people
3. Appreciation for existing initiatives
4. That these are positive so long as they can coexist with it being a working Harbour

Concerned about conflict of space with other Harbour users

1. Concerns about floating Eco spaces conflicting with other harbour users and activities. That Eco spaces could affect the harbours navigability and that they will be a safety hazard (especially if unlit and hard-to-see). That their impact on water sports and accessibility would be disproportionate to their ecological benefit. That they could compromise the security of boats in the harbour. Suggestions include designing Eco spaces to align with existing activities and addressing issues like wind resistance for canoeing and kayaking. That they would not be appropriate in areas such as Baltic Wharf
2. Concern about ecospace detracting from the harbour's industrial character or existing community use
3. Suspicion that ecospace are there to make increased development more palatable

Concerned about the maintenance of ecospace

1. Concern about the maintenance of existing and proposed ecospace, that the ones already in the Harbour were neglected, with dead plants, litter accumulation, and derelict pontoons. This counteracts their intended benefits
2. On the need for adequate budgets, ongoing commitment, and clear strategies to ensure ecospace are properly maintained and remain visually appealing over time
3. That installing them is not worth the operational costs of maintaining them. Question as to who will bear these expenses. That existing ecospace should be maintained before expanding them.

Concerned about the effectiveness of floating ecospace

1. That these should only be installed if there is a demonstrable benefit to water quality
2. That marine traffic is what affects birds and should be factored in in light of Eco space, increased ferries and water activity. That attention should be given to space for take-off and landing of birds
3. That existing reed beds are fenced off such that birdlife is unable to access it. That these should be removed or adjusted
4. That focus should be given to retaining trees, especially on sites designated for new homes
5. That floating ecospace look a messy. They encourage mosquitoes and smell.

Suggestions for improving eco spaces / managing them

1. That boaters could manage ecospace as floating community gardens
2. That maintenance by volunteers will encourage community spirit and belonging
3. That they can help improve water quality, making it safer for swimming and watersports
4. Suggestion of introducing freshwater mussels to help clean the water and improve biodiversity

Public realm suggestions

1. Request for more seating on the walkways so that people can sit and enjoy the wildlife
2. That it should be ensured that people can still walk up to and access the edge of the water
3. That tree roots cause bumpy payments.
4. That focus should be on under used areas to provide incentives to visit
5. That high planting obscures views of the Harbour for residents
6. Calls to improve the rocky edge of the Harbour between Baltic Wharf and SS Great Britain so that people can access the edge more easily.

Water quality suggestions

1. That management of boats is necessary to mitigate against their potential environmental harms, e.g. discharging raw sewage. This should be achieved by fostering relationships with boat owners and adopting a marina style approach

2. That water quality should be tested regularly. Not that sewage has been sighted into an area used by children. Reports of bad water quality affecting boat users' health.
3. That reedbeds could be used to filter the grey waste of boat users. Reference to the floating neighborhood in Schoonschip in Amsterdam.

Protect existing nature around the Harbour

1. Calls to halt tree removal in the Harbour and to plant more trees
2. That any changes should seek to protect existing wildlife and habitats around the Harbour

Suggestions for additional sites

1. There is a successful reed bed in Bathurst Basin. Requests to install more in the Basin have been refused by the Harbour Master but there is scope for more beds here without detriment to other users.

Water Activities

In favour of more water activities

1. Support for expanding water-based activities in the Harbour, emphasising the health (mental and physical), economic, and community benefits. Support for open water swimming, the water sports hub and the water sports network
2. Support for prioritizing swimming in the Harbour / the lido, though others thought it should be for boats only. Comparisons to successful models in Paris and Copenhagen. Calls to lift the swimming ban in certain areas while ensuring safety. Suggestion for school programmes to ensure swimming and water sports are available to all children.
3. That accessibility should be increased, suggestions to create more entry points, slipways, and facilities for those with disabilities or limited resources. That slipways in more locations would ease parking concentrated on one spot
4. Concerns about overcrowding and conflict of uses in Harbour, that the focus should remain on other water sports and not swimming. Support for designated water sports zones. Support for watersports at Phoenix Wharf

Concern about overcrowding and conflict of uses in harbour

1. That the space is already busy and could become unsafe with additional activities and users. This includes a reduction in navigable water space and conflicts between motorised and non-motorised vessels and the space that would be taken up by the swimming area
2. That there is a need for clear rules, navigational awareness, and oversight by the Harbour Team to ensure safety and minimise conflicts
3. That swimming areas should be carefully planned and potentially moved to less congested parts of the Harbour (e.g. Cumberland Basin) to reduce interference with other activities such as sailing, which requires significant space for safe operation. The winds in Baltic Wharf are favourable so it should be an area for sailing rather than swimming. Suggestion to

distribute activities more evenly throughout the Harbour to help alleviate congestion at popular spots and increase usage of underutilised areas

4. That the many water sports in the Harbour get in the way of those with leisure licenses being able to move their boats to visit different parts of the Harbour.
5. That practical needs like repair and maintenance areas for boats should be prioritized
6. That the water quality in the Harbour is bad
7. That a water sports center won't cope with the number of people who would need to use it
8. That open spaces in Bathurst Basin are needed for turning the John Sebastian light ship

Concerns about safety and water quality

1. Safety Concerns:
 - That the Harbour is unsafe for swimmers and will become so for water users generally due to increased crowding in the Harbour and improper navigation. This is especially so for those learning to sail etc. That it is increasingly difficult to supervise activities on the water
 - Specific concerns are raised about accidents involving independent canoeing, kayaking, and stand-up paddleboarding
 - That regulated swimming in the Harbour will encourage people to swim generally. That this is extremely unsafe
2. Water Quality:
 - That the water quality in the Harbour is poor and needs to be improved before the proposals can be viable. This is viewed as a major barrier to swimming and other water activities. Concerns include pollution, litter, and risks of illness from contaminants like E. coli
 - Questions raised about the mixed messages regarding the harbour's water quality - previous warnings against swimming conflict with the current proposals
3. General Reservations:
 - Skepticism about the suitability of the Harbour for swimming – that a swimming pool would be safer
 - That there are potential legal / liability issues due to the unsafe nature of the Harbour
 - That motorboats should be monitored and controlled

Harbour activity suggestions

1. That the community should be allowed to use small craft and tenders
2. That the community should contribute towards the Harbour festival in an official capacity
3. That there should be 24/7 swimming allowed in designated zones, not solely allowed within certain hours as it is at present.
4. Activities
 - Suggestion to bring back races on the Harbour
 - That watersport/swimming events could be hosted given the right facilities and water quality, e.g. the Bristol Triathlon
5. That more space should be given over to swimming

6. That it should be easier to purchase licenses for paddleboarding and kayaking
7. Avon Canoe Polo Club currently does not store boats on the Harbour and would be interested in storing boats at the new Water Sports Centre
8. That the proposal to put commercial moorings in Bathurst basin will impact on the current boatowners and the activities there
9. That expansion of some water sports might curtail the activity of others, notably sailing. That this must not be allowed to happen.
10. Request for sufficient temporary moorings for those with leisure vessels to allow them to explore other parts of the Harbour

Other areas of opportunity

1. That Cumberland Basin should be included in the HPSS
2. That Merchants Road Bridge should be made a pedestrian foot/cycle bridge. Retain access for the activities on Avon Quay
3. Suggestion of putting an iconic building on Avon Quay, e.g. Bristol's answer to the Sydney Opera House.
4. That Bathurst Basin is used by the Scouts for kayaking, paddle boarding, canoeing etc.
5. Remove the bollard at the top of the Grove Ferry Ramp slip way to allow small vessels to be launched and recovered.
6. Remove the 2 rotten mooring platforms in the entrance to the Bathurst Basin
7. That places for watersports will need ample car parking
8. Swimming
 - That there should be lots of exit points to allow people to get out safely / in an emergency
 - That it should be secure to stop people falling in by accident
 - That Cumberland basin could facilitate swimming and other water sports
 - That swimming should be in several places around the Harbour
9. Call for a sports club house and restaurant open to public with shower and toilet facilities.
10. Support for the Bristol Urban Water sports Network
11. Avon Quay
 - Recognition should be given that Avon Quay is used by the Sea Cadets, Clifton College Combined Cadet Force, The Merchant Navy Association, Port of Bristol Sailing Association, The Maritime Volunteer Service, All Aboard Water Sports and Channel Yacht Sales. Urban Pursuit also use the land of the Quay
 - That this would be a better place for consolidated watersports – with shared assets and more pontoons. That it is a good spot as it is out of the way of the general public which would reduce accidents and allow for the safeguarding of children.
 - That a walkway here is unnecessary and unwanted
 - Others welcome development on Avon Quay given the fabulous views there
12. Areas outside the HPSS boundary

- Suggestion to work with Western Harbour to make more use of Cumberland Basin for dinghies. That at present this is difficult as the bridge needs to swing to accommodate masts
 - Suggestion to include Totterdown Basin
13. Calls to improve public transport, including better evening services
 14. Reference to the 50-year plan published in 2016/2017 – that this featured new mornings and riverside attractions along the old sorting office’s banks

Comments about funding, cost, and revenue potential

1. Comments advising against pay per use activities for tourists. That these would undermine provision for disadvantaged groups in area
2. Request for information as to how the Urban Water sports Network would be funded.
3. Question as to how the plans would generate revenue
4. That promoting water activities will need plenty of access points, easy ways to pay, discounts to ensure inclusivity and outreach programmes to enhance inclusivity

Slipway and storage suggestions

1. Question as to how the Phoenix slipway will be accessed
2. That the Nova Scotia slipway should be marked on the plans. That it is in regular use
3. Support for a new slipway/access point in Totterdown Basin
4. Question as to what will happen to current dingy storage if it is to be consolidated at Baltic Wharf. Will storage be affordable?

Effect of developments on proposals

1. Request to avoid tall buildings near areas designated for sailing
2. That the proposed Lido will severely restrict the available space for sailing

Public Access

In favour of greater access

1. Walking and cycling:
 - Support for more pedestrian and cycling routes such as along the new cut and around Totterdown Basin. Calls to reduce car dominance
 - Support for continuous walkways along the water's edge. Support for ideas like creating walkways similar to in Coal Drops Yard in London and the Wild Mile Footpath in Chicago
 - Public access valued not only for leisure but for its therapeutic and social benefits, especially for the elderly and disabled

2. Celebrating the Water:
 - Enthusiasm for better engagement and access to the water, including increased opportunities to sit close to the edge, enjoy the views, and partake in water-based activities
 - Support for more ferry stops
3. Safety Considerations:
 - Comments about safety, particularly in terms of stopping people falling into the water, maintaining escape routes, and ensuring life-saving equipment is available and well maintained
4. That wildlife should also be protected, that measures like protective barriers are thoughtfully implemented
5. Frustration about commercial events and existing infrastructure blocking or restricting access in some areas, such as Lloyds Amphitheatre. Calls to improve accessibility while avoiding unnecessary obstructions and barriers which limit access to the waters edge
6. That routes should be kept clean
7. To make sure that there is lots of seating

Comments about safety

1. Calls to consider safety near the water's edge.
 - That people sometimes fall into the water risking drowning. That greater access to the water's edge could make this more of a common occurrence. That this will put pressure on the emergency services. That increased drinking around the Harbour makes this even more unsafe
 - Other comments that emphasise personal responsibility and not going 'health and safety crazy'. That excessive safety measures will be to the detriment of the character of the Harbour
2. That it may be unsafe for people to walk near dangerous working areas, such as boat yards with maintenance or boats / watersport equipment. Sails are usually raised on, or close to the water's edge and that this can be hazardous. Some separation will be necessary
3. Questions around antisocial behaviour on the Castle Park walkway – it would need to be well lit and monitored
4. Safety measures
 - There should be consistency around the placement of bollards and chain barriers. That the plan should highlight the relevant safety policies it intends to adopt
 - Calls for more Harbour patrols
 - Calls for water safety advice, campaigns and signs
5. That stepped access also needs to be accessible to those with physical limitations

Other opportunities

1. That the continuous walkway should be prioritised. That new floating structures could help with the provision of continuous walkways

2. That the provision of new public toilet facilities should be prioritised along with a waste management plan.
3. Calls for prominent CCTV in all public areas to discourage vandalism
4. That there is ample space to install least 5 more benches in Bathurst Basin (1 on each side of Bathurst Basin entrance on each side, 1 on Bathurst Parade, 1 on Trinn Mills, 1 on Lower Guinea Street)
5. Suggestion of a new pedestrian bridge between Prince Street Bridge and Junction Swing Bridge as it is too far to walk between the two, especially for less able people
6. That boats need access to the water's edge – they will need places to moor up temporarily so as to allow for greater accessibility on their part. Suggestion of a pay-and-display mooring scheme
7. Calls for swimming in the Harbour
8. That Redcliffe Backs should be made accessible (the middle section is often closed to the public)
9. Comment about racial profiling in the image used for the section
10. Request for a maritime museum to complement Underfall Yard

Not in favour of more access

1. That there is already sufficient access in the Harbour and the walkways are fine. That nobody walks from Temple Meads to Totterdown
2. That the priority should be providing adequate facilities to current boat license holders or some of the other proposed improvements
3. That funds for this should be directed towards social services

Concerns about accessibility

1. That the routes need to be accessible. Particular mention made of the floating walkway
2. That skaters monopolise the space in Lloyds Amphitheater, meaning that pedestrians must walk along the edges
3. Suggestion of a new pedestrian bridge between Prince Street Bridge and Junction Swing Bridge as it is too far to walk between the two, especially for less able people
4. That any stepped access should also be disabled friendly

Comments about nature

1. Support for more tree planting, planters and mini gardens and for introducing more natural elements. Specific request for more Judas Trees which blossom
2. That the waters edge should be greened.
3. That wildlife will need to be protected from threads from humans
4. Request for more detail, is this greenwash?

Concerns about how proposals affect boats/water users

1. Concern that greater pedestrian access will restrict the use of boats
2. Clashes on launching
 - That the area around the Cottage is frequently congested with boats and equipment – that these will clash with pedestrians
 - That it is important that the area where sails are raised, (generally close to, or on the water) is segregated from the public
 - That clashes with the public on launching boats should be minimized – suggestion that Avon Quay is used for this
3. Sailing boat storage
 - Sailing boats are big and heavy and need to be stored near to a slipway
 - They should not have to cross a busy pedestrian area
 - They require secure storage (with + head room) for insurance purposes and safety
4. That boat storage on the Knuckle near Underfall Yard is at a premium and shouldn't be moved to make way for a viewing area and mini amphitheater

Concerned about maintenance / litter

1. That maintenance and removing litter (on land and water) need to be factored into plans.
2. That greater access risks additional rubbish in the waterways

More restaurants / bars by Harbour

1. Call for more bars and restaurants in the Harbour. That there is under provision at present
2. Suggestion of more moorings near cafes or restaurants

Water Transport

In favour of proposals generally

1. Support for the transport proposals, in particular
 - That the ability to commute to work by water taxi is environmentally friendly and enhances wellbeing for commuters and tourists
 - That ferries are needed for Baltic Wharf residents
2. The Ferry service
 - Comments that stress the importance of the improved ferry service in order to realise the full potential of the Harbour and meet environmental objectives.
 - Calls for a regular, reliable commuter service from Hotwells to Temple Meads. That it needs to be fast and affordable
 - That ferries should not get in the way of other water users

- Call for electric ferries
 - Ferries should operate year round and be reliable if intended as commuter routes
3. Call for more tourist boats in the Harbour
 4. That parking should still be available nearby to help older people and people with disabilities

Comments about the proposed ferry routes

1. Comments in support of proposed ferry routes
2. That few existing routes are accessible at present. That all stops need to be accessible
3. Suggestion of a route between Canons Marsh to Wapping Wharf for those with access requirements. Question as to the benefit of a route between Museum Square and the Lloyds Amphitheatre as it is quite a quick walk. Question about where the ferry landing at Avon Quay would be and what it's purpose is. That there are stops at Nova Slipway and opposite Avon Quay unmarked on the plans
4. That the ferry service should not target commuters and rush hour traffic but should encourage all day access to Harbourside and discourage road traffic. That targeting commuters will reduce the charm of the Harbour
5. That there is an environmental case for replacing bus routes with ferry routes
6. That a ferry could link up car parking (e.g. at the Western End of the Harbour) and the city

Suggestions for other routes

1. Suggestion of ferries down the New Cut
2. That ferries should be extended into Cumberland Basin and the Western tip of the Harbour. That Netham Lock should similarly be included (including stops at Oasis Academy Temple Quarter, Atlas St and Barton Hill), St Anne's and Totterdown Basin
3. That although the SSGB to Harbour Inlet ferry is useful, a bridge here would be even better
4. That all ferries should be accessible for wheelchairs, cycles and pushchairs
5. Call for regular service, e.g. every 15 mins to ½ hour with more ferries at school exit times
6. Call for commuter ferry
7. Call for ferries to maintain their blue and yellow colour scheme
8. Request for more ferry stops on the North bank
9. That ferry stops should be on solid ground and not on pontoons
10. Request to reinstate the ferry stop at the Pump house and under a new maritime museum
11. That routes should loop the Harbour rather than just crossing north/south

Comments about scheduling of ferry services

1. That ferries could provide an alternative to the bus network – that the bus service is poor and that ferries could be more environmental
2. That ferries should be as regular and easy to use as buses. That they should be affordable

3. That ferries should operate late, as well as over rush hours. Other comment that the ferry service should not be targeted at commuters and rush hour traffic but that it should be to encourage all day access and discourage road traffic

Comments about cost to users and operators of ferry services

1. That ferries should be affordable and easy to use. That they are currently too expensive. Suggestion of passes and reduced rates for residents. That they should be subsidised
2. That they should be viable public transport rather than just a tourist attraction
3. That levies recently applied to commercial operators go against this policy of improving transport links on water, by making these businesses less viable
4. Call for combined tickets with the busses and subject to the £2 fare cap
5. That the current ferry service struggles most of the year. That the 2nd Netham commuter trial has not been well used and caused the company a financial loss. That the ferries require improvements and support for this to work. That running costs are high and that people will not pay the price needed for them to be sustainable.
6. Request that short hops are free, and that you only pay for longer journeys
7. Suggestion of more but smaller boats, costing only 50p

Comments about marketing of ferry services

1. Suggestion to improve the signage for ferry stops and wayfinding to get there
2. That there should be a marketing budget / adverts to promote the services as part of the transport network
3. That ferries need to be accessible
4. Suggestion of shelters and digital updates

Concerns about investing in this mode of transport

1. That ferries are polluting and noisy – that quieter, greener options should be prioritised
2. That there isn't demand for ferries and they should not be subsidised by taxpayers
3. That funding would be better spent on improving other modes of public transport
4. That wildlife should be considered – that ferries mow down birds
5. How would ferries work around swimming in the Harbour
6. That BCC should work with the ferry companies if they want to expand routes
7. That putting in accessibility improvements will be expensive – that a feasibility study is necessary for this
8. That ferries are for tourists only
9. That there is enough water transport already
10. That increasing ferries should not increase pollution and littering
11. Ferries should not be allowed to overshadow other uses of the Harbour (watersports etc.)
Ferries and water users will need to cooperate over constrained space near Baltic Wharf
12. Ferries need to be affordable

13. Ferries aren't necessary as you can walk the Harbour in a relatively short amount of time
14. Call for a new pedestrian/cycle bridge instead

Other comments

1. That there need to be designated cycle lanes around the Harbour
2. That the ferry jetty is the one in the entrance to Bathurst Basin – the Grove Ferry Ramp is mainly used by birds
3. That there used to be two mooring platforms in Bathurst Basin that were used by ferries but which are now decayed and need to be removed

Place Plans

Baltic Wharf

High level summary:

Areas of Change

- **BWC1 Watersports Centre:** Broad support for the development of a consolidated Watersports Centre. However, concern about congestion on land, on slipways and on the water itself if concentrating too many organisations in this area (especially alongside increased visitor numbers) and that it could be difficult to share storage space. Concern that clubs would be forced to be moved to the Hub when they thought this unsuitable.
- **BWC2 Avon Quay:** Desire from existing businesses for Avon Quay to retain its boat building and water-related activities. Concerns that there will not be enough space to consolidate activities at Baltic Wharf. Concerns that there were potential safety hazards of intensifying public access to Avon Quay while maintaining safe operations for boat maintenance, water sports and youth programmes/work with vulnerable people.
- **BWC3 Caravan Park Redevelopment:** Concern about the scale and nature of proposed residential developments, in particular concerns about new developments disrupting wind for sailing. Resistance to the removal of trees and green spaces.
- **BWP5 Underfall Waterside:** Opportunity to open up waterside for commercial activities/events by relocating Scouts boat yard not welcomed by some water users or Underfall Yard. Boat yard considered to be well located to use the nearby Nova Scotia slip

Public realm

- Support for improvements to the Baltic Wharf Harbour edge with respondents highlighting the importance of accessibility. Concerns from existing businesses about opening up public access to Avon Quay water's edge. Calls for the 2016 Metrobus plans to be implemented to the Avon Crescent Walkway (pedestrianisation with better cycling provision) with similar responses being made to the Western Harbour consultation. Watersports organisations have highlighted the importance of the Nova Scotia slipway to prevent overcrowding at Baltic Wharf, with advantages of having a space that can be segregated from the public being highlighted.

Transport

- Support for enhanced Metrobus provision with calls too for other local bus services connecting key sites like Baltic Wharf for commuters and watersport participants who may not find Metrobus convenient. Need for adequate parking stressed, particularly for residents, visitors, and water users requiring vehicle access for maintenance and transportation of equipment. Concern that plans may reduce the available boat storage

and that stacking boats on racks makes access more challenging and can compromise safety.

Water space

- Whilst there was general support for promoting swimming opportunities in the Harbour, concerns expressed about water quality, the safety of swimming, the potential conflict/risk of collision with watersports (in Baltic Wharf), and the noise generated

Areas of Change

BWC1: Baltic Wharf Watersports Centre

1. The Watersports Hub

- There was broad support for the development of a consolidated Watersports Centre and improved access to water activities
- Respondents gave details of the necessary elements this would need for their particular sport such as slipways, extending pontoons, ample/secure 24hr storage, car parking, facilities for vulnerable and disabled persons. Specific information about particular sports e.g. water polo. Suggestion was made of holding a workshop to work out what it could look like
- Concern about: the potential for water congestion if concentrating too many organisations in this area; whether an increase in visitors would clash with water users; that it could be difficult to share storage space; whether the hub would encroach on Underfall Yard; whether there would be enough space (on land and water) for each club's individual needs; that clubs would be forced to be moved to the Hub; that the development of a hub would mean that individual organisations lose their identities; where the existing boat park would go; comment about a since closed sailing center that didn't work; that swimming could clash with boats; that existing spaces should be improved rather than constructing entirely new facilities
- Comments about potential increase in costs for clubs and users due to new facilities and how costs such as electricity would be shared between users

2. Other Considerations

- Concerns about new developments disrupting wind for sailing
- Suggestion to provide water quality updates to for the safety of water users
- That a lido in the area would interfere with boats
- Check the labeling of the Underfall Yard area which is wrong in parts
- That Cumberland Basin should be better used for watersports
- Suggestion to leave this area to nature instead

BWC2: Avon Quay

1. Concerns About Safety and Accessibility

- Some existing businesses have highlighted the potential safety hazards of intensifying public access while maintaining safe operations for boat maintenance, water sports and youth programs/work with vulnerable people. Businesses have located here because it provides buildings/spaces that are relatively segregated from the public

2. Preservation of Maritime and Heritage Activities

- That Avon Quay should retain its maritime/boat building and water-related activities. The area is well placed for this as it is near to slipways at Underfall Yard and Nova Scotia Place
- That there will not be enough space to consolidate activities at Baltic Wharf, that Avon Quay is needed as well. In particular the slipways at Baltic Wharf have in the past become overcrowded.
- That Avon Quay should maintain its unique identity. That existing boat maintenance and restoration here is part of what makes the place feel like a ‘working Harbour’
- Any commercial development should be sensitive to existing users and local residents
- There is need for on indoor and outdoor facilities for boat maintenance, repair, renovation, cleaning, boat build projects, engine maintenance, boat storage and around maintaining and improving vehicle access for the current occupants. That this would need to be replicated at the new Watersports Centre at Baltic Wharf if removed from Avon Quay
- That peppercorn rent is necessary for the continuation of some charitable work in the area
- That there would be conflicting priorities between charitable and commercial interests, with caution urged against over-commercializing the area at the expense of current users

3. Support for exploring opportunities for new development at Avon Quay,

- Those in agreement, gave support for improved public access and accessibility
- Recommendations included enhancing Avon Quay as a visually appealing, even iconic space with public access and amenities like cafes, while avoiding overly commercialized development. One respondent envisioned the site being used for Bristol’s equivalent of the Sydney Opera House

BWC3: Caravan Park Redevelopment

1. On the loss of the Caravan Park

- Those that oppose the project view the caravan park as a unique and valuable tourist asset that is well-used throughout the year. Respondents emphasize its proximity to the city centre for visitors. Hopes that a replacement site can be found nearby
- That housing / relocation of the Caravan Park would reduce the diversity of the offer in the Harbour

2. Environmental Concerns
 - Resistance to the removal of trees and green spaces. That the site was of ecological benefit. That this could be a park for older people and children
 - Concern about the risks of flooding on the site
3. Nature of any new development
 - Suggestion of incorporating hospitality features into the redevelopment
 - Concern about the scale and nature of proposed residential developments, particularly high-rise buildings seen as out of character with the area. Call for prioritizing social housing. Calls for considering the wind for sailing when thinking about building heights.
 - Concern that facilities / amenities will not be sufficient to support a growing population here, including doctors, dentists and parking
 - Concern about how increased visitors might affect activities with vulnerable people / children
4. Relationships with the local community
 - That the decision process around resulted in a loss of trust amongst the local community

BWW1: Harbour Swimming

1. Support for swimming:
 - Comments expressed general support for swimming in the Harbour itself.
 - Comments expressed support for a lido - that it could draw people to the area and provide opportunities for year-round activities, especially if integrated with sustainable infrastructure like heat networks. Suggestion of having a sauna complex
 - On the need for adequate facilities such as changing rooms, toilets, and safe water access
 - That swimming should be allowed in the whole Harbour, not just a small area. That it should not be commercialised and that water activities should be free and accessible
2. Causes for concern:
 - On the water quality and potential health risks for swimmers. On safety of swimming near Baltic Wharf - the undercut edges of the Harbour present a risk of drowning to swimmers
 - On the potential conflict/risk of collision with existing water uses (both watersports and fishing) at Baltic Wharf. That there would be limited space for a fixed lido for this reason. Could swimming take place in Cumberland Basin to reduce this?
 - Opposition to the lido due to concerns about noise, disruption, and the impact on property values and views for nearby residents

BWW3: Cottage Inn Slipway

- That more information was needed regarding the precise details of improvements to the jetty. That attention should be given to its shape which will affect how boats launch in different winds. Also, attention should be given to the capacity for simultaneous users.

Public Realm Interventions

BWP1: Baltic Wharf Harbour Edge

1. Improvements to the Waterfront Design
 - Support for replacing the stones with terraces to make the area more usable, safe and visually appealing. That accessibility for those with limited mobility was particularly important
 - Conversely, also support retaining the current rough edge which provides safety for pedestrians from the water's edge
2. Sailing and Water sport's Needs
 - That this area is particularly good for beginner sailing due to its open space and wind conditions (lack of wind channeling between buildings). Reducing the space for this would mean that this is not possible. Cumberland Basin is also recommended for this purpose

BWP2: Avon Quay Walkway

1. Concerns included
 - That this could necessitate moving the current activities out of the area. That providing pedestrian access to this area would increase congestion in the area and would lead to existing organisations losing some of the outdoor space needed for their activities – this needs to be segregated from the public. Removal of slipways might also compromise access to the water
2. Labelling
 - That the ferry landing at Nova Scotia and Pooles Wharf are not marked

BWP3: Avon Crescent Walkway

1. Support for improvements
2. Suggestions:
 - That the 2016 Metrobus plans should be acted on (pedestrianisation with better cycling provision)
 - That the pedestrian access to Metrobus, and better lighting in the area should be part of the thinking for this area
 - Call to demolish Avon Crescent Substation

3. Support for improving signage and alternative route environments when the Yard is closed overnight or for operational safety reasons

BWP4: Nova Scotia Place Walkway

1. Support for improvements
2. That the footpath is currently locked at night due to concerns about vandalism and litter near Underfall Yard. However, locking this area is inconvenient for local sailing groups. That the slip way here is necessary to prevent overcrowding at Baltic Wharf
3. That there needs to be access here for water sports groups that is segregated from the public
4. That the opportunities for greening in this location are limited

BWP5: Underfall Waterside

1. Impact on Youth Sailing
 - Concern that a relocation of the ASCSS will not work. That they would not want to store their boats in Baltic Wharf due to their being heavy to transport, that slipways around Baltic Wharf would be overcrowded and that they would want to remain using those around Nova Scotia Place, that they need to preserve segregated access between their activities and the public
 - Dissatisfaction with the consultation process over this point. ‘Outstanding planning conditions of BCC’ noted

BWP6: Vauxhall Bridge

1. Support for this point, in particular for improving the route from Vauxhall Bridge with access from the Chocolate Path. Suggestion that the cycle provision on the bridge should be improved.
2. Comments encouraging the speedy repair of Vauxhall Bridge.

Other comments about public realm

1. Walkability and Accessibility Improvements
 - Support for enhancing walkways in the area, expanding cycling provision and opportunities for recreational activities. Note provision of cycle parking will be needed. Suggestion of pushchair storage as well. Recommendation that routes integrated with open spaces etc with quality streetscapes. Call for prioritizing sustainable modes of travel over private cars by some. Comment concerned about clashes between cyclists/pedestrian if sharing routes

- Calls for improved routes through the area, including through Cumberland Close and Canada Way towards the Caravan Park, access to the Chocolate Path along middle section and access to the Water sports hub
 - Support for improving safety and accessibility in general. In particular accessibility issues at Merchant Road bridge. Concerns about disabled access from distant coach parking to key landmarks like SS Great Britain
 - Calls for improved public realm for trees and places to sit near the water
2. Recreation and Outdoor Amenities
 - Need to include public conveniences and more outdoor seating near the water. Calls for additional outdoor space for hospitality businesses in popular areas. Ideas around building decks or seating in the harbour
 3. Heritage and Cultural Connectivity
 - Establishing a heritage trail linking major landmarks such as the M Shed, SS Great Britain, Harbour Railway, Underfall Yard, and other cultural assets
 4. Security Concerns
 - Concerns about the potential risks of increasing footfall on the operations of water sports organisations working with vulnerable youth

Transport Interventions

BWT1: Boat Storage

1. Comments in support of the plans.
 - That some organisations were already looking into this themselves
2. Concerns Over Boat Storage Rationalization
 - Concerns that plans may reduce boat available storage rather than optimising it. Comments that the changes are as yet unevidenced and underestimate the number of boats that are currently in different sites and the increasing demand on boat storage space. Existing storage arrangements were described as efficient and comparable to similar facilities
 - That stacking boats on racks makes access more challenging and can compromise safety. That different watercraft can be stacked in different ways, and some can't be stacked at all
3. Challenges for Current Boat Storage and Access
 - The current setup at Baltic Wharf faces challenges such as congestion at the slipway, particularly on busy weekends. Crowds near the Cottage Inn exacerbate launching difficulties, especially for trailer-drawn boats. While reversing vehicle movement routes may provide minor relief, altering the slipway direction is suggested as a better long-term solution

BWT2: Coach parking

1. That there is already ample underutilised coach parking on Spike Island.

2. That transport demand must be fully understood before increasing coach services.
3. That water sports businesses should be able to use coach parking for their own coaches.
4. Concerns that more coaches will increase air pollution in the area and threaten the character of the area. That focus should be on public transport instead, including park and ride services. That Cumberland Road is not wide enough to accommodate increased coach provision. Concerns that coach parking and access are at odds with future flood risk

GT1: Enhanced ferry provision

1. Support for the ferry service generally. That it should operate on Sundays and in the evenings if there is a market for this
2. That ferries should be affordable, especially for residents
3. That all passenger boat companies should be enhanced, not just the ferries
4. Concern that enhanced ferries, particularly between Avon Quay and Underfall Yard will interfere with marine businesses in the area.
5. That all services should be wheelchair accessible
6. That ferries should not receive public subsidy

GT2: Enhanced Metrobus provision

1. Accessibility & Price:
 - Concerns regarding limited transport options for individuals with disabilities or financial constraints
2. Limitations of Metrobus Services:
 - That the Metrobus route is limited. Perception that it was underutilised, particularly in South Bristol. That it was originally intended as a park and Ride facility
 - Support for the route running in the evenings, Sundays, and holidays
 - Concerns about the Cumberland Road bus gate, which respondents found under-used by the existing bus network and very inconvenient
3. Transport Infrastructure and Multi-modal Connectivity:
 - That there need to be other local bus services connecting key sites like Baltic Wharf. Reliance on the metrobus limits options for commuters and watersport participants who may not find Metrobus convenient. That the route to the airport should be reinstated
 - That the metrobus, along with the Harbour Railway should extend to the park and ride at Long Ashton
 - That the Metrobus system is a poor solution for external visitors, suggesting better integration with park-and-ride facilities
 - That parking will still be needed for watersports participants travelling with heavy kit as well as maintenance vehicles
4. Specific Route and Stop Issues:
 - Requests were made to rename the "SS Great Britain" Metrobus stop to better reflect its actual location ("Baltic Wharf") and add a stop directly outside Baltic Wharf to accommodate users with heavy boating equipment

Other comments about transport

1. Transport Infrastructure and Accessibility:
 - Concerns over bridge closures, such as Vauxhall Bridge – respondents noted the negative impact of these on local residents
2. Cycling and Walking Improvements:
 - Those which emphasised the importance of safe and integrated walking and cycling networks that integrate leisure and green spaces. Priority of active travel over cars. Comment opposed to cycle lanes
 - Dangerous pinch-points for cyclists were reported on Cumberland Road due to the design of the bus-gate and the kerb. Calls were made for better signage to mitigate this
 - Suggestion of more designated cycle lanes and the development of a tram network. There was also a request to prioritize smoother paths for skateboarders
3. Public Transport Challenges:
 - The lack of public transport options to the Harbour from other Bristol areas was criticised, particularly during evenings and weekends
 - That this area could become a node of a wider tram network
4. Parking and Vehicle Access:
 - The need for adequate parking was stressed, particularly for residents, visitors, and water users requiring vehicle access for maintenance and transportation of equipment
 - There was opposition to reduced parking along Cumberland Road and complaints about increasing road restrictions. It was felt that this impacts negatively impacts on accessibility, visitor experience, and economic activity
5. Road Design Concerns:
 - That Cumberland Road should be closed to all but pedestrians and cyclists
 - The proposed narrowing of Gas Ferry Road was flagged as problematic due to the congestion there
 - That Avon Crescent should be open to all traffic
 - That improvements should be made for cars on Hotwell Rd and Merchant Rd
6. General
 - That a car park is identified as an area for change but there is no clarification as to what this might be

Other comments

1. Preservation of Heritage and Operations at Underfall Yard
 - Important to highlight the heritage and particular operational needs of Underfall Yard
2. Underused Areas and New Opportunities:

- Suggestions to better utilize the New Cut for boating, with investments in infrastructure like slipways to enhance access while managing silt
 - Recommendation to renovate sites like the Underfall Yard electricity substation as part of broader maritime heritage initiatives
3. Development Sensitivity:
- That any changes should respect the historic character of the area, avoiding overly dense or intrusive changes
 - Preference for minor changes over large-scale redevelopment
 - That established entities like the caravan park and existing businesses should be maintained
 - Concerns that development could impact on areas used for sailing and other activities
4. Public Facilities and Amenities:
- Concern that current plans prioritize external visitors over local community needs. That the current proposals lack free spaces for residents like parks or skateparks, focusing instead on commercialized sports facilities
 - Calls for investment in adequate public infrastructure, such as toilets, showers, and waste collection
5. Clarifications and corrections
- Clarification that the Nova Scotia slipway remains actively used by multiple groups, contradicting descriptions in the plans
 - Check the labelling within Underfall Yard map
6. Community Engagement and Impact:
- Requests for consultation with local groups, such as rowing clubs (6 of them) and event organizers, including the Rotary Dragon Boat Festival
7. Concerns About Funding and Feasibility:
- Questions about how redevelopment costs will be managed. Perception that the increases in fees and charges will fund this

Spike Island

High Level Summary:

Areas of Change

- **SIC1a & b Albion Yard/Unit 15:** Creative intensification – support for creative growth and the preservation of Puppet Place. Concerns about displacement of businesses, changes to transport and access for existing businesses, and opening up the estate to the public.
- **SIC4: Maritime Car Park:** Concerns about residential development (affordability, overdevelopment, stress on facilities, loss of open space and views, impact on exiting

industry) and the impact of losing parking (tourists and water users). Creative and community-oriented alternatives to residential suggested.

Public realm

- Support for improvements to Brunel Square, Gas Ferry Road and the passage behind the Albion Dock. However, concerns that the public realm should not be sanitized, and historical assets should be protected and enhanced.

Transport

- Support for a Mobility Hub (although reservations over what facilities it would provide); support for enhanced ferry services (frequency/accessibility/vessel) and bus services (particularly frequency of service/routing) as a pre-requisite to any plans to reduce parking in the area. Vehicular access/parking needs retaining for some businesses, SSGB visitors and watersports organisations and that active travel is not an option for elderly/disabled/families. That coach parking should be relocated. That the Cumberland Road bus gate continues to create accessibility problems for residents. Ideas include a new bridge across the Harbour and use of the water for freight/green shipping.

Water space

- Aspiration to create a new waterside route past the SSGB if possible.

Areas of Change

SIC1a & b: Albion Yard - Creative Intensification/Unit 15 Albion Docks

1. Support for Creative Growth
 - Those that endorse the creative intensification plans, recognizing the potential for growth and innovation in the creative sector. Support for making the organisations there more visible
2. Preservation of Puppet Place
 - Those that stress the importance of Puppet Place – that it needs to be preserved as a place of work for many people. That plans should emphasise the importance of preserving spaces for existing creative organizations and fostering their development and upgrading their facilities
3. Concerns About Displacement
 - Those concerned about rising costs and redevelopment impacts potentially driving out longstanding organizations. That the ecosystem there is fragile and could be threatened by disruption and increased costs. They stress the need for affordable and stable conditions for creative and industrial enterprises
 - That existing tenants will not be helped by any future redevelopment
4. Parking and Access Needs
 - Caution against changes that could disrupt essential operations for industrial organisations, such as transport access or parking availability

5. Place making opportunities
 - That many businesses will not want their operations viewed by the public.
 - Suggestion of creating collaborative or educational opportunities to contribute to the area’s landscape in cases where opening doors to the public is not appropriate
6. Other
 - That a residential development could be a better use of the space
 - That Spike Island art gallery feels cut off from the rest of the area. It could do with more space. That it should face into the floating Harbour.
 - That the area needs to be better connected by bus, inc late and at weekends.

SIC2: Marina Quayside

1. That it should be possible to cut past the dry dock along the water’s edge if possible.

SIC3: Aardman Warehouse (Gas Ferry Road)

1. Support for being able to see more of Aardman when going past.
2. That buildings in the area provide space for water sports club houses which should be maintained

SIC4: Maritime Car Park

1. On Residential Development
 - Concerns over affordability, overdevelopment, stress on facilities and the loss of open space and views. That the area needs to attract tourists. That residential development could conflict with the noise making industry in the area
 - Emphasis on the need for developments to address social housing demands rather than market-rate housing
 - Call for sensitivity to the area’s history, biodiversity, and character, with proposals for low-rise buildings and green initiatives
 - Concerns about Environmental and Visual Impact - comments emphasised the need to retain views, green spaces, and the unique character of the area
2. Preservation of Parking and Accessibility
 - Those that emphasise the car park's role in supporting visitors to the SS Great Britain and the broader harbourside area. Fears about the negative impacts on tourism and accessibility for disabled people and families if parking is reduced
3. Alternative Uses for the Site
 - Suggestion of creative and community-oriented alternatives to residential development, such as parks, leisure spaces, playgrounds, creative workspace or cultural venues like museums

SIC5: Project Albion

1. That the plans were not for a ‘working shipyard’ as laid out, but a historical replica of a shipyard. That it should be used as a genuinely working, commercial shipyard instead.

1. That the project should incorporate public information about the slave trade and the origins of Bristol's wealth.
2. That the privatisation of the quayside by the SS Great Britain was unacceptable and should be addressed.

Other comments about areas of change

1. That pressure from housing development risks the area becoming solely expensive apartment blocks. Fear that this will replace the present eclectic and historical diversity which gives character to the area. That the area should not be sanitized.
2. That housing needs to be affordable for key workers and offer quality housing for people. That housing will need associated social infrastructure.

Public Realm Interventions

SIP1: Marina Quayside

No comments

SIP2: Hanover Passage

1. Correct spelling in document to 'Hanover Place'
2. That the passage feels unsafe at night
3. That it would be preferable for the route to go round the waterside in front of the SSGB. If this is not possible improving this route should be prioritised

SIP3: Gas Ferry Road

1. That this road is important for access for delivery, refuse and emergency vehicles to the Great Western Dockyard and visitors travelling by car to the maritime car park.
2. That the road should not be narrowed as needed by coaches and cars.
3. Calls to make the road more pedestrian friendly
4. Calls to plant more trees here

SIP4: Brunel Waterside

(note that this site is called 'Maritime Car Park on p 23)

1. Improvements to Brunel Square welcomed, if done in close dialogue with the SSGB Trust. This could include improved signage and legibility for the Harbour walkway, which many people perceive as ending at the SS Great Britain.
2. The Trust would be happy to explore the possibility of providing a board walk along the front of the SS Great Britain Museum, connecting through to the Marina.

GP1: Cumberland Road Tree Planting

1. That this is not an appropriate location for trees as both the pavement and road are too narrow to accommodate
2. That trees would be an asset to the road, that any greening possible would be great.

Other comments about public realm

1. That the public realm in this area should not be sanitized, and historical assets should be protected and enhanced

Transport Interventions

SIT1: Parking (Bristol Marina / Albion Industrial Estate)

1. That the car parks here are too expensive. That they are big and underused and could add to the public realm around the SS Great Britain
2. That the walkway here could be made more attractive

SIT2: Coach Provision

Excess coaches should park elsewhere (e.g. park and ride).

SIT3: Maritime Mobility Hub

1. Support for the Mobility Hub
2. However, there were reservations about including e-bikes and scooters in this.
3. That the hub should include provision for those with accessibility requirements such as wheelchairs and electric mobility scooters.
4. That car parking, even for electric cars should be excluded from the mobility hub as it is a waste of space and draws traffic to Spike Island. That EV charging is underused elsewhere.
5. That the hub could encourage antisocial behaviour

GT1: Enhanced Ferry Provision

1. Comments in support of the changes
2. Calls for increased frequency of ferries, with hours both before and after work hours
3. Calls for more ferry stops, especially connecting the Cumberland Basin with the rest of the Harbour
4. Aspiration for the creation of a public transport hub next to Brunel Square with the Metro bus being diverted down Gas Ferry Road (possibly outside of rush hours times) and connected with a new, modern, larger, cross ferry connecting the SS Great Britain with Hannover Quay and other parts of the harbour. The current ferry offers no protection from the elements for users and cannot cope with demand in peak periods.

GT2: Enhanced Metrobus Provision

1. Support for the enhanced Metrobus service, especially for it running over evenings and weekends
2. That this is necessary if parking is to be reduced, especially in a tourist area and with more people projected to live in the area.
3. That there needs to be more than one bus route into the area
4. That the length of time the bus takes discourages people from using it
5. Mention of the bus gate and the extended drive times from not being to go through it
6. That on weekends and on bank holidays there could be a drop off within the SSGB car park to enable more visitors to travel to the area by bus

GT3: Cross Harbour Connection

1. Comments in support of the ideas – that the current ferry is old and has only limited capacity. That more ferries would be welcome, especially with more projected residents in the harbour
2. That a chain link ferry could get in the way of other boat users in the harbour
3. That the ferry should be electric, automated, free and allow cycles and other wheeled users to get on and off easily.

Other comments about transport

1. Active travel
 - Comment that consideration needs to be given to how the space is used safely by both pedestrians and cyclists, e bikes and scooters.
 - That proper cycle parking facilities should be incorporated
 - That use of these options will need to be strongly advertised and encouraged
 - That a focus on buses and active travel is impractical and expensive for young families, families with elderly members, disabled and those with limited mobility. It also is not applicable to some of the businesses in the area who need deliveries of materials / loading to be factored in
2. That some parking needs to be retained to maintain tourist numbers and to service residential properties. That parking is necessary for those involved in water sports
3. Call to restore the Harbour Railway or to convert it into a tram
4. Fear that traffic will increase due to more people living in the Harbour and associated servicing. That the bus gate on Cumberland Road will cause even more disruption given this.
5. Calls for a pedestrian bridge between Princes Street Bridge and Junction Swing Bridge. That it is too far to walk without a bridge, especially for those with accessibility issues.

Other comments

1. That the Harbour could embrace new innovations in shipping, e.g. digital navigation and stabilisation, and propulsion. Call for a focus in developing green shipping businesses.
2. Disagreement with the whole plan
3. Perception that calling this area ‘Spike Island’ leaves out other parts, e.g. Wapping Road
4. That the plans risk concentrating all people in one area.

Wapping Wharf

High Level Summary:

- **Vision:** Support for making the area a cultural hub but concerns that changes may gentrify the area. Caution against attempts to emulate London’s South Bank, emphasizing the need to celebrate Bristol’s cultural diversity unique identity. Whilst Wapping Wharf/Cargo widely considered a success, need to also think about residents’ needs (e.g. late-night licensing restrictions)
- **WWP1:** Museum Square: Support for enhancing space (more seating; removal of fences/gates/barriers; shelter; space for sunbathing). Potential conflicts also highlighted (e.g. industrial character could be undermined by greening/events; a new cross Harbour ferry could get in the way of other vessels; attracting more people may undermine the safety of rail operations; anti-social behaviour). Suggestions included: terminating the historic railway further to the west so that it does not interfere with the pedestrian route via Gaol Ferry Steps.
- **WWP2:** Buttery Park: Support for enhancing the space close to The Buttery, with some safety concerns about encouraging children to play area near to the railway tracks. Retention of the area’s gritty and historic character is considered key, with concerns expressed that greening will be a detriment to the railway tracks. Similar comments about **WWP5 Railway tracks:** Comment that view them positively (playable/great to sit on/ give area charm) and some view them negatively (difficult to cross for people in wheelchairs or if visually impaired).
- **Other public realm interventions:** General support for public realm interventions albeit with concerns expressed about the potential to undermine the aesthetic, operational, and historical significance of the dock area. Some say this area should be a priority for investment given the high numbers of visitors whilst some say that funds should be allocated to more deprived parts of the city. Those seeking improvements focus on accessibility; greening; seating; and respecting the historic character. More inclusive indoor spaces are also suggested (for play, skate park, chill-out, seating and toilets). Concerns expressed about over-development in the area, including tall buildings.
- **WWT3: Prince Street Bridge:** Some support for the closure of Prince Street Bridge to vehicular traffic. Those against sited impacts it would have on local residents/elderly/those with mobility issues/South Bristol residents, and that it could lead to environmentally inefficient longer routes
- **Other transport Interventions:** Support generally for measures, although tensions have emerged between those wanting car parking retained as public transport is not considered good enough v those who feel less parking would create opportunities to enhance the public realm. Support that the area should be accessible to elderly and those with mobility impairments. Concerns were expressed about potential conflicts between coaches and pedestrians – suggestions included encouraging visitors to use Park and Ride instead and

designing the area so that coaches don't have to do difficult turning maneuvers. Concerns that vehicular access to the Buttery is maintained. There were suggestions that a new bridge crossing near Gaol Ferry Bridge was needed to meet demand from pedestrians and cyclists. There was general support for reopening the Harbour railway spur that runs along the Chocolate Path; enhancing Metrobus and ferry services (the need for a tram being highlighted); and creating a new cross Harbour ferry service between M-Shed and the Amphitheatre - although there were also respondents who did not view these interventions as priorities. Concerns were expressed about the safety of pedestrians on shared walkways due to fast cyclists and electric scooters. The need for cycle parking was highlighted

- **Water space:** Feedback from residential boat owners requesting improved facilities and ensuring their needs are considered in future planning.

Public Realm Interventions

WWP1: Museum Square

1. Public realm
 - Call to provide enhanced public space near the water for sunbathing
 - Calls for more seating
 - Call to remove the fences, gates and planted barriers in Museum Square
2. That the area should retain its industrial character rather than being used for events or greening
3. That the area could be covered in a glass canopy for wet weather
4. Fear that museum square will attract antisocial behaviour
5. Harbour Railway
 - That the old trains should be relocated to nearer A bond to aid the route to Gaol Ferry Steps
6. That the plans are over ambitious – questions as to what will be prioritised
7. That a cross Harbour ferry could get in the way of other boaters. That a ferry could bring in more people which will mean that the steam trains aren't able to operate safely

WWP2: Buttery Park

1. Play
 - Safety concerns around having a play area near to the railway tracks. That children should not be encouraged to play on the tracks
 - That play is at odds with the historic feel of the area
 - That play should be introduced in the sense of allowing adults to engage with understanding of historic machinery and introducing children to it under supervision
2. Cyclists should be re-routed down the Chocolate Path instead of being encouraged to cross the tracks
3. That proposals here need to discourage anti-social behaviour and think about waste management

4. That there is an Elsan (boat toilet) disposal facility here which is at odds with it being a leisure area
5. Historic assets
 - That the area should retain its gritty and historic character
 - That the railway tracks are needed for the working exhibits at M Shed.
 - That greening this area will be a detriment to the railway tracks. That this will make the tracks less visible. Questions as to who will maintain any greening.

WWP3: Chocolate Path Connection

1. That this path links along the whole Harbour so connection between different regeneration areas is necessary
2. That the 'chocolate' paving could continue through the improved tunnel section
3. That this path should be pedestrian only
4. That any new crossings incorporating the Chocolate Path across the New Cut have been abandoned in the past due to cost
5. That the path would be improved by improving the surfacing, lighting and vegetation

WWP4: Prince Street Bridge Entry

No comments

WWP5: Railway Tracks

1. That the railway tracks are difficult to cross for people in wheelchairs or if visually impaired.
2. Calls to remove unused tracks, or to raise the ground around them to stop them being hazardous
3. Railway Tracks and Play
 - Comments positive towards how people can interact with open tracks
 - That tracks are dangerous – that this teaches children the wrong lesson
4. Railway Tracks as public realm features
 - That railway tracks are great to sit on
5. That the railway tracks give the area its charm. That heritage around this area should be safeguarded and enhanced

WWP6: Safety Measures

1. Support for unobtrusive railings – that designs should be simple, low, and minimally intrusive to maintain the visual and operational character of the dock
2. Criticism of fixed barriers: that they impact on the aesthetic, operational, and historical significance of the dock area. They are described as impractical for the movement of ships,

trains, and cranes, and as obstructing museum operations. That they will not solve the safety issues in this area - that people should just be careful instead

GP1: Cumberland Road Tree Planting

1. Support for tree planting, comments that trees should not be planted in parking spaces and to be mindful of roots damaging the Chocolate Path
2. That focus should be given to removing destructive plants from the Harbour/New Cut walls rather than on tree planting.

Other comments about public realm

1. Comments advocate for public realm improvements that respect the historic character of the Harbour and focus on practical, low-impact enhancements such as walkways, seating, and planting. That improvements should work to make the area more accessible. That this area should be a priority given the high numbers of visitors here
2. Indoor and Public Amenities: Suggestions include adding inclusive indoor spaces, such as play areas for children, indoor skate park and chill-out zones, as well as increased seating and public toilets
3. Concerns About overdevelopment: respondents expressed apprehension over tall buildings, that buildings should remain mid-rise
4. Calls for greater emphasis on biodiversity, green provisions, and planting here
5. Some believe public realm interventions are unnecessary or that funds could be better allocated to deprived areas of the city

Transport Interventions

WWT1: Coach Provision

1. That instead of locating coaches in such a central area, visitors should use busses or a park and ride service instead
2. That the roads nearby should be designed so that coaches don't need to turn around. That pedestrianisation proposals threaten this
3. That coaches in this area could interfere with pedestrians and local businesses
4. Call for better coach and car parks.

WWT2: Wapping Wharf Harbourside Car Park

1. That reducing or removing parking will make the harbourside less accessible, particularly for individuals with disabilities, volunteers, and boat dwellers. Public transport is seen as insufficient for some users' needs, with calls for affordable parking options and consideration of disabled parking

2. Also support for removing parking to prioritize outdoor seating, local business opportunities, and enhanced public spaces, believing this will improve the area's ambiance and usability. Call to retain a small amount of disabled parking
3. Concerns raised about the inadequacy of public transport for providing an alternative to car travel, that reduced parking should be accompanied by significant transport improvements
4. Conflicts between vehicles and pedestrians are noted as an issue in the area
5. That longer-term feasibility studies should be carried out including on the impact on nearby areas if parking is displaced rather than eliminated

WWT3: Prince Street Bridge

1. Support for closing the bridge to cars. That it is currently unsafe for pedestrians and cyclists due to the disproportionate space allocated to cars. That it would improve pedestrian routes into Museum Quay
2. Opposition to the closure: that it limits essential access for residents, especially the elderly or those with mobility issues, and could lead to environmentally inefficient longer routes. That journeys for residents without both this and Bedminster Bridge should be considered
3. That it could be made one way instead

WWT4: Museum Street Restrictions

1. Support for the restrictions
2. That the low volume of traffic here does not need restrictions
3. That the area experiences many conflicting demands. That changes should not compromise its industrial character
4. That getting rid of parking spaces will mean that segregated pedestrian paths are not needed
5. That care should be taken to not restrict access to the Buttery

WWT5: Gaol Ferry Bridge

1. That it should be divided in half, with one side for cyclists and one for pedestrians
2. That it should be made pedestrian only – with cyclists put on segregated routes
3. Call to build an additional Gaol Ferry Bridge so that there is one for cyclists and one for pedestrians. Calls to build more footbridges further along New Cut as well
4. Calls to prioritise the repair of bridges along the New Cut

WWT6: Bristol Harbour Railway

1. Support for extending or reopening this connection for the Bristol Harbour Railway. That the line should extend into the Western Harbour area
2. That opening this section of the railway would be better than the section near where people sit/play operating

3. Suggestions of regular, reliable use of the railway as a public transport option or a light rail shuttle connecting the Cumberland Basin to the city centre
4. Indifference toward the railway, viewing it as non-essential and an annoyance for cyclists

GT1: Enhanced Ferry Service

1. Support for the enhanced ferry service

GT2: Enhanced Metrobus Provision

1. Support for increasing the times that Metrobus runs. That it should also be more frequent
2. That the Metrobus isn't particularly useful
3. That it would be better if standard buses were improved
4. That the Metrobus stops should be repositioned, in particular the one named "SS Great Britain" which is closer to Baltic Wharf

GT3: Cross Harbour Connection

1. Support for the cross Harbour ferry. That this should be fully accessible and bike friendly
2. That a new ferry connection is not needed

Other comments about transport

1. On Cars
 - Concern that transport changes disproportionately affect disabled people, people with short term injuries, families, those reliant on cars for access. That it disproportionately affects people who live in South Bristol and visitors
 - Comment against expanding car parking. Support for stricter parking controls, including extending restrictions to weekends, to prevent congestion from visitor cars
2. That public transport to the area is inadequate. Suggestions for better bus services, and a tram to improve connectivity
3. On Cycling
 - Comments on the need for secure bike parking if car parking is reduced
 - about the safety of pedestrians on shared walkways due to fast cyclists and electric scooters. Suggestions include physical deterrents, such as cobbled sections or barriers
4. Supports for making the area a cultural hub
5. Request to retain residential leases and mooring options at Wapping Wharf to maintain its character
6. Concern that changes will gentrify the area, that people with less money will no longer be able to visit

Water space Interventions

Wapping Wharf North Development Site

1. Preservation of Shipping Containers – that they are important for small independent businesses and Bristol’s food scene. That they add character to the area. That they are a favourite part of the harbour
2. Support for the shipping containers being made a permanent fixture on the site
3. Opposition to High-Rise Buildings: tall buildings could overshadow the area, detract from its heritage assets like the cranes, and diminish its character and environment. That density if being prioritised over amenity and a quality environment
4. Concerns About Overemphasis on Restaurants: that a focus on this could lead to over-saturation, risk vacancy, and harm the broader commercial landscape of Central Bristol

Other comments

1. Support for high-quality streets, multi-functional spaces, and infrastructure that promotes activity
2. General support for the enhancement of visitor experiences, with specific suggestions to repurpose underutilized spaces. That M Shed should face both North and South
3. Comments that caution against attempts to emulate London’s South Bank, emphasizing the need to celebrate Bristol’s cultural diversity unique identity
4. Feedback from residential boat owners requesting improved facilities and ensuring their needs are considered in future planning. Request that the area is protected from businesses serving alcohol late
5. That Wapping Wharf has been a success, it should be ensured that the vibrancy of the area is maintained
6. Questions about the cost of proposed changes. Question over who would pay for this, and whether it would be local residents. The increased mooring fees were raised
7. That the area is fine as it is
8. That similar ideas could be applied to the area near the Arnolfini

City and Backs

High Level Summary:

- **Vision:** That any changes should ensure that the area doesn’t become too noisy or busy for residents
- **CBC1:** The Grove: Concerns raised about the potential impact of new housing on established venues like Thekla and Mud Dock (loss of parking, compatibility); lack of affordable homes; losing the openness, waterside views e.g. to St. Mary Redcliffe, and the area’s unique ambiance; and high-rise or insensitive development. Suggestions included the creation of a waterside park and the need for a masterplan to guide development. It was

flagged that people become fond of meanwhile uses and object when space used for this is turned into something bland.

- **CBC2: Castle Park Waterside and Walkway:** Support, with a call for it to be fully accessible and a quality design. However, safety concerns about bringing people to the water's edge, and a concern the pontoon would reduce width of the watercourse
- **Other Area of Change proposals:** Calls for Redcliffe Wharf to be used for something pending development. Query whether development of the site next to Harbour House would impact the adjacent moorings?
- **Public realm interventions:** Support for proposals, with calls for greater emphasis on better lighting; retention of the historic fabric; more regular seating and more opportunities for greening/nature in this part of the Harbour. Some feel more could be done to create a continuous waterside walkway e.g. along Welsh Back. The Redcliffe railway tunnel and cutting were flagged as historic features that require greater acknowledgement. Quayside improvements need to allow for continued access to vessels, sensitively incorporating mooring chains e.g. to the Lightship. It was flagged that events such as the Bristol Harbourside Festival can make the Harbour less accessible for a period.
- **Transport interventions:** Support generally for measures, although tensions have emerged between those wanting car parking retained (for disabled people and those coming from outlying areas) v those who feel less parking would create opportunities for new development, public spaces, boating activities, or alternative transport options. Quayside car parks could benefit from improved lighting, removal of fencing and bollards, and better demarcation of spaces. An enhanced Metrobus service is supported with calls for a stop on Commercial Road by Bathurst Basin. Support for better cycle integration; an enhanced ferry service, particularly for commuters; better visitor information and facilities.
- **Water space interventions:** Objections to the proposals for commercial moorings in Bathurst Basin (unsympathetic to surrounding residential areas; water space needed for children's water activities and boat maneuvering). A call for greater appreciation for the John Sebastian lightship T

Areas of Change

CBC1: The Grove

1. Concerns raised about the potential impact of new housing on established venues like Thekla, with calls for safeguarding against noise complaints from new residents. That Mud Dock and Thekla are historic establishments in the area
2. That the car parking in this area is necessary for Mud Dock and Thekla. That consideration should be given to access by road to any housing
3. Support for affordable / social housing. Concerns that housing will not be unaffordable for most residents. That car parking here is underuse
4. Opposition to additional housing due to concerns about losing the openness, waterside views, and the area's unique ambiance, which are linked to community wellbeing

5. Greening and Public Space Enhancements: Suggestions include creating a waterside park to mitigate tree loss in other parts of the Harbour and enhancing the Harbourside walkway with better signage, seating, and greenery for public enjoyment
6. Resistance to high-rise or insensitive development. That it is important to maintain sightlines to iconic landmarks like St Mary Redcliffe Church
7. Calls made for a dedicated masterplan to guide development
8. That people become fond of meanwhile uses and object when space used for this is turned into something bland.

CBC2: Castle Park Waterside and Walkway

1. Comments in support, especially around more outdoor space, seating and new hospitality businesses. That accessibility should be prioritized
2. That it should be a quality design
3. Concerns that bringing people to the water's edge is dangerous
4. That the HPSS says little about Castle Park itself
5. Concern that the pontoon would reduce width of the watercourse

CBC3: Redcliffe Wharf

1. That the development appears to be stalled. If there has been commitment to development, it should actually happen. That residents don't appreciate large empty spaces. Calls for accessible accommodation there and social rented homes.
2. That there should be something in this location to encourage visitors, such as a fountain, a big wheel or an observation tower.
3. That this would be a good location for a multi-story car park

CBC4: Redcliffe Bascule Bridge

1. That locked gates in this area prevent access
2. Calls to bring back into use the two disused buildings located on the bridge

CBC5: Harbour House

1. Question as to whether the Live / Leisure mooring space change as part of the plans

CBC6: Phoenix Wharf (Bristol Watersports Network)

No comments

Public Realm Interventions

CBP1: Bathurst Basin Walkway

1. Calls for better pathways around the Ostrich pub and Bathurst Basin area to improve pedestrian access and safety
2. Preservation of Historic Features. Support for preserving and enhancing views and public information of the Redcliffe railway tunnel and railway cutting
3. Calls for sensitivity to the mooring chains to boats, such as the Lightship. Calls for additional bollards in this area and protection mats
4. That the walkway around Bathurst basin and Merchants Quay is already as open as possible

CBP2: Welsh Back Walkway

1. That this is not a pleasant part of the Harbour to walk through as the route does not go along the waterside

CBP3: Phoenix Wharf Walkway

1. That this element should refer explicitly to the Redcliffe Railway tunnel and cutting which was crucial to the operation of the Harbour Railway. An information plaque telling people about the tunnel should be installed
2. Calls for better lighting around the Harbour
3. Calls to retain the cobbles which are part of the historic character of the area

Other comments about public realm

1. Comments on a lack of seating in the area, both covered and uncovered
2. That there should be more mention of nature and provision for wildlife in the section
3. Calls to ensure the whole floating Harbour is walkable along the water's edge
4. Accessibility
 - Note that wherever there are steps, there also needs to be provision for wheelchair users
 - That over the Harbour Festival, the placement of stalls means that people with accessibility needs are forced onto cobbles. That stalls should be removed from Queen's Square
5. Calls to improve the quality of architecture in the area.
6. Calls to preserve the industrial and maritime heritage of the area, including the LV55 lightship, the remains of the old entrance to the Harbour via Bathurst Basin, the railway cutting next to the Ostrich pub (and other remnants of the railway) and Redcliffe caves.

Transport Interventions

CBT1: Parking (The Grove)

1. Complaint that residents are not allowed free spaces in the Grove car park.
2. That parking in The Grove should be retained, that there should be more parking in the city center, not less
3. Support for the removal of parking as it detracts from area, reduces the enjoyment of the waterfront and that there is no easy route through for pedestrians
4. That the surfacing around here should be improved

CBT2: Parking (Bathurst Basin)

1. That bollards and fences should be removed to allow better use of the car park for both cars and pedestrians
2. Car parking spaces should be repainted opposite the entrance to Lower Guinea Street by the Cut
3. That LCD streetlamps should be installed in the car park to reduce crime and facilitate the safety of visitors to the area
4. That a new access ramp should be provided to the bandstand along with a new pedestrian entrance to allow access onto Commercial Road for wheelchair users.
5. That parking still allows people to enjoy the water

CBT3: Parking (Phoenix Wharf)

1. That parking still allows people to enjoy the water

GT1: Enhanced Ferry Service

1. That ferries should provide an expanded, more commuter friendly service
2. That the ferry infrastructure should be fully accessible, including to reduced mobility and partly sighted passengers

GT2: Enhanced Metrobus Provision

1. That this is much needed. Support for expanding the timings of the service. That this is one of the most important aspects of the plan
2. That it should include stops on Commercial Road by Bathurst Basin
3. Call for rapid transit upgrades to support the bus.

Other comments about transport

1. Roads and parking. Suggestions of closing certain roads or restricting parking in key harbourside areas, viewing it as an inefficient use of space which causes traffic. Suggestions include replacing parking with development, public spaces, boating activities, or alternative transport options. Other comments however were concerned about over-restricting car use, which could negatively affect accessibility, particularly for disabled people and those coming from outlying areas. That complicating route causes congestion which leads to greater pollution
2. Public Transport - calls for better public transport, such as expanded park-and-ride facilities, improved bus and ferry services, and seamless connections between modes of transport. There is particular concern about poor evening services and limited access from areas like Avonmouth
3. Support for better cycle route integration, fewer obstacles for cyclists, and reducing motor traffic to make the harbourside more pedestrian and cyclist-friendly
4. Suggestion to make Prince St Bridge pedestrian only
5. Tourist and Visitor Infrastructure. Respondents propose improvements to tourist information and real-time updates at ferry terminals, as well as better integration of transport facilities with major transit hubs like Temple Meads

Water space Interventions

CBW5: Bathurst Basin Commercial Moorings

1. Objection on the grounds of
2. That boaters feel increasingly alienated by the Harbour Authority and BCC, that talk of Bathurst Basin as a marina does not help.
3. That more appreciation should be given to the John Sebastian lightship in Bathurst Basin (it's one of only two Victorian lightships, and nearly as old as the SS Great Britain). That the city should be investing in its continued upkeep - it could make a great focus for the basin, and volunteers would welcome interest from the public.
4. That plans for additional moorings in Bathurst Basin are unrealistic as it is already used for moorings of the Cabot Cruising Club. Remaining space is needed for maneuvering the lightship.
5. That the suggestion of a hotel/spa in the basin is not sympathetic to the surrounding residential areas.
6. That given the quiet nature of Bathurst Basin it is frequently used by children for kayaking and paddle boarding. This could be compromised by additional moorings and commercial activities

Other comments

1. That the development at Redcliffe Wharf is disappointing – it should be a national museum dedicated to civil unrest and grass roots activism

2. That there is a water tunnel which starts at the top end of Castle Park and goes all the way underground to the crossroads of Castlemead and Harvey Nichols which could be used for light shows, while explaining the history of Bristol
3. That Redcliffe Backs should be incorporated into the plan as well
4. That any changes should ensure that the area doesn't become too noisy or busy for residents
5. That the survey structure does not allow for nuance in the mode of gathering answers.

Canon's Marsh

High Level Summary:

- **Vision:** Calls to improve the evening economy in this area, creating family friendly evening events / activities which also increase the diversity of visitors to this area. Calls for good complementary modern design. Increased greening (on land and on water).
- Areas of Change:
 - **CMC1 Narrow Quay Commercial:** Narrow Quay highlighted as particularly challenging for those with accessibility needs. Plans were highlighted to improve Broad Quay House's activation and relationship with the public realm which aligns well with proposals.
 - **CMC2: Hannover Quay Commercial:** Support for increasing visitors here, but questions over how expanded event space in the area will sit alongside any permanent structures associated with play.
 - **CMC3 Millennium Square diversification:** Suggestions included greening; shelter; family-friendly features; bike storage; toilets; and EV charging points; inclusive and affordable events; and avoiding chain establishments. Support for retaining the existing water features, which are popular with children, with a concern that new fountains will never be switched on.
 - **CMC4 Amphitheatre:** Support for proposals. Issues highlighted include closure of space during events; lack of animation from the adjacent Canon's House; hard surfaces; lack of shade; and insufficient seating.
 - **CMC5 Waterfront Place:** Some feel the site should not be developed as it has value as a public space. Any building should be beautiful and enhance waterside views. Question why it is being promoted for offices rather than housing?
- **Public realm interventions:** Calls for more seating; lighting; destination play areas; better waste management; incorporation of sustainable urban drainage systems/rainwater harvesting; and more greening (trees, bushes, vertical greening, floating etc.). Use of planters suggested to prevent tree damage to pavements. Also, some concerns expressed about proposals for tree planting along Anchor Road. Criticism of current reliance on

commercial venues for amenities such as toilets. Better linkages required between Amphitheater and Millennium Square.

- **Transport interventions:** Key local stakeholders need to be consulted with as transport proposals are further developed. Concerns that any changes to Narrow Quay would impact servicing of the existing office buildings, and access for street vendors. Proposals to remove on-street parking in the vicinity of Canon’s House generated both positive and negative feedback. Suggested improvements to Canon’s Road shouldn’t incorporate coach parking but should reinstate disabled car parking. Support for a new cross Harbour ferry service as it would link cultural sites around the Harbour but concerns about whether there would be sufficient patronage and whether a chain link ferry would impact navigation. Calls for better public transport and coach access.
- **CMT4 Pero’s Bridge:** Bridge is considered too narrow, with congestion being exacerbated by pedestrians sharing with cyclists/e-scooters, and buskers creating bottlenecks. Suggestions included widening the bridge, considering an additional bridge nearby, or exploring alternative transport methods such as a cable car!

Areas of Change

CMC1: Narrow Quay Commercial

1. This area is particularly difficult for those with accessibility needs. Comments cited paving issues, obstructions to paths from cafes and cobbles not allowing for accessible seating.
2. Calls for more seating here – in particular disabled seating
3. Question around what ‘dwell’ means
4. That there are plans to improve Broad Quay House’s activation and relationship with the public realm which aligns well with the plans for Narrow Quay here.

CMC2: Hannover Quay Commercial

1. Support for increasing visitors here. Suggestion for children’s play and skateboarding.
2. Question over how expanded event space in the area will sit alongside any permanent structures associated with play.
3. Request that interventions in this area take account of the proposed building users (office workers and restaurant visitors/occupiers) and pedestrian movement patterns between the public space and the restaurant entrance.

CMC3: Millennium Square Diversification

1. That Millennium Square was underutilized and unwelcoming, particularly in poor weather.
2. Suggestions to improve the space
 - Breaking up the space, adding character, and improving its appeal with greening, shelter, and family-friendly features
 - Including infrastructure improvements such as bike storage, toilets, and EV charging points

- Hosting inclusive, diverse, and affordable events. Supporting local attractions and avoiding chain establishments
- 3. Support for retaining the existing water features, which are popular with children. Concern that new fountains will never be switched on
- 4. Concern that the project is not viable
- 5. We The Curious are the custodians/hold an 150-year lease for 11-acres of the Canon's Marsh place – including Millennium Square, Anchor Square and Canon's Road, including the public realm area next to Watershed – and hold the lease until 2147. As such they will also review the suggested ideas and explore feasibility as part of BCC's own plans to redevelop the site

CMC4: Amphitheatre

1. Support for improvements to the Amphitheatre area
2. There were concerns around events in the amphitheatre, including closure of routes through the area before and after events. Request that the route is kept open as much as possible or for a permanently open waterside route alongside the amphitheatre. Request for notice about events. That the diversion takes a long time. Comments on the impact of frequent live music events on residents
3. That the vacant Lloyds Building (aka Canon's House) is an eyesore. Some called for its demolition and redevelopment, some for it to come back into use as soon as possible. The lack of active frontages along the Lloyds Building and amphitheatre was highlighted
4. The amphitheatre is seen as uncomfortable and unwelcoming due to hard surfaces, lack of shade, and insufficient seating. Respondents advocated for tree planting, greening, and creating more comfortable public spaces
5. Suggestion of a ferry from the Amphitheatre to M Shed

CMC5: Waterfront Place

1. That increased office space isn't needed in this area. That there are already unused office blocks in Bristol
2. That this is not a good site for building height
3. Calls for the building to be beautiful and to enhance waterside views
4. That this area should not be developed at all, and used instead for temporary use, play and exhibitions. That the space is well used at present, where will these uses go?
5. That this place is an opportunity for social rented housing / mixed use development

Other comments about areas of change

1. Calls to improve the evening economy in this area
 - Calls for family friendly evening events / activities
 - Calls for increasing the diversity of visitors to this area – that having places which are not centered around alcohol is important for this
2. Support for mixed uses in the area, similar to Wapping Wharf

3. That empty business units around Bristol indicates that there are too many leisure businesses already
4. Calls for good complementary but modern design in this area
5. Calls for respectful engagement with unhoused people who live in the area and black communities who may not visit at all

Public Realm Interventions

CMP1: Canon's Road

1. Watershed keen to work with BCC around changes to Canon's Rd
 - That the shaded walkway be included. It is important given climate projections, and they would be keen to reimagine it
 - That the areas behind Watershed should be a priority for public investment. That if Watershed were to reverse its frontage this would make the space more attractive and improve the walkway from St Augustine's' parade into Millenium Square
 - Calls to improve disabled parking here
 - That this is a prime space and unsuitable for coach parking
 - That the area could be pedestrianized with innovative 'final mile' transport solutions.
2. Support for greening the areas. That enhanced greening could happen in Millenium Square as well
3. Request for the inclusion of points on climate adaptation and renewable energy interventions, including SUDs and infrastructure for rainwater harvesting and shade (with integrated solar panels)

CMP2: Anchor Road Tree Planting

1. Support for rewilding Anchor Road – that this should go beyond trees to include shrubs, brushes, flowers, grasses, and vertical gardens on buildings
2. Concern that leaves will block drains and cause flooding
3. Concern that the sunlight shining through the trees will cause traffic hazards. That trees cause damage to buses.

Other comments about public realm

1. Calls for more greenery, including trees, planters, and floating gardens, to improve the harbourside environment and provide habitats for wildlife. Concerns were raised about isolated trees being insufficient, calling for integrated green solutions. That planters were better than trees that may damage pavements
2. Demand for more public toilets, seating (covered and uncovered), and shade along the waterfront. Criticism of current reliance on commercial venues for amenities

3. On the need for improved infrastructure and maintenance of infrastructure including paving (which should be level), lighting, and waste management to make the area more attractive and safe
4. That some spaces could be better utilised with free entertainment, social amenities, and features like destination play areas to encourage activity
5. Calls for more bars around the harbour
6. Calls for better integration between key harbourside areas, such as linking the Amphitheatre and Millennium Square, and for a new bridge across the harbour
7. Concerns about excessive development
8. Concerns about e scooters going too fast on pavements in this area

Transport Interventions

CMT1: Service Yard (V Shed)

1. Request that We The Curious collaborate closely in decisions around transport
2. That Millennium Square should be sold to make way for a hotel

CMT2: Access and Parking (Narrow Quay)

1. That Narrow Quay is already pedestrian friendly
2. ABRDN Investments (who own Broad Quay House) are not supportive of removing vehicles from Narrow Quay or limiting access to commercial moorings only on the grounds that this would negatively impact the access to and servicing of the existing office buildings.
3. That food vendors who trade from St Augustine's Parade use Narrow Quay for access. That plans should not remove or restrict necessary access or servicing from Narrow Quay

CMT3: Parking (Canon's House)

1. Support for removing parking around Cannon's House. That this will help to facilitate ease of movement for pedestrians and improve accessibility with the level access routes around and the building.
2. Concern about reducing parking in the city generally. That this mainly affects those who are older or disabled. That it is used by people attending the Harbourside events

CMT4: Pero's Bridge

1. That Pero's Bridge is too narrow, which affects pedestrian flow and leads to congestion, especially during busy periods. Suggestions included widening the bridge, considering an additional bridge nearby, or exploring alternative transport methods such as a cable car
2. Maintenance issues were also highlighted, such as the bridge's uncleanliness and padlocks, which some find culturally insensitive

3. The bridge's safety and shared use with cyclists and e-scooters were mentioned as problematic, with calls for traffic calming measures like bumps or a ban on cycling on the bridge
4. The presence of buskers was viewed as contributing to congestion and disruption, with some advocating for stricter policing
5. Suggestions were made to improve flow around the bridge's vicinity, particularly on the West side, to alleviate bottlenecks caused by queuing and stalls
6. Scepticism about the feasibility of addressing these issues without a shift in public attitudes
7. That Millennium and Anchor Square should be prioritised as the key thoroughfares in the area.

GT2: Chain Link Crossing

1. Support for the new cross Harbour ferry service – that it would link cultural sites around the Harbour and build a sense of cohesion in the area
2. Request for more information about the chain link crossing
3. Request for integration of buses and ferry services
4. That all ferries should be accessible

Other comments about transport

1. Parking, both that parking should be retained in the area, with more blue badge bays – and that parking should be reduced
2. Support for a new ferry, but also questions as to how popular a ferry service would actually be. That ferries are expensive. That they are more for entertainment than transport. That any new ferry crossing should be accessible. That a ferry should run between Lloyds Amphitheatre and M-Shed. That a chain link ferry could reduce access for boats with a deep draught.
3. Calls for better public transport, including a bus interchange at the Harbourside
4. Calls for more and improved coach parking

Water space Interventions

CMW1: Harbour Inlet Floating Market

1. Calls for more public toilets – especially with increased visitor numbers

Other comments

1. That the development in Canon's Marsh should be modeled on the now demolished CWS building. Calls to not overdevelop the area
2. To focus on swimming and ecological enhancements along the Harbour
3. To include a landmark in the area
4. That a Maritime Museum could be created between Cascade Steps and the Neptune statue

5. That music in the Harbour should be not allowed after 10pm for the benefit of residents

Hotwell Road

High Level Summary:

- **Areas of change:** Comment in support for Mardyke Wharf proposals tempered by confusion as to why watersports are proposed here given the proposal for a consolidated centre at Baltic Wharf and calls for integration of the approach to the two areas to avoid any confusion. Hotwell Road highlighted as needing significant uplift for local shops, restaurants and facilities (although the main shopping area is outside of study scope)
- **Public realm:** Concern about conflict between cyclists, scooters, pedestrians and cars (including car parking). Proposed solutions include widening the walkway, creating segregated cycleways, along Hotwells Road, or creating a water-level footpath along certain stretches to enhance accessibility and visual appeal. A particular need was identified to widen the path at the inlet pinch point next to Rownham Mead. Maintenance of existing paths was emphasised, particularly in relation to tree damage. Whilst there was support for sheltered seating areas, concerns were raised about there being sufficient space.
- **Transport:** Concerns that excessive traffic on Hotwell Road detracts from the Harbour with suggestions of 20mph speed limit and enhancing public transport. Like elsewhere in the Harbour, opinion was divided about reducing car parking. Whilst support for prioritising parking needs of disabled and watersports at the Mardyke Car Park, concerns were also expressed about the impact on other struggling businesses. Pedestrian priority was a key aspiration for Merchant’s Road Bridge (aka Junction Lock bridge).
- **Water space:** Concerns that increased moorings opposite the SS Great Britain will impinge on space for watersports, as will proposals to create temporary moorings here during the Bristol Harbour Festival. It was highlighted that many moorings are currently underused

Areas of Change

HRC1: Mardyke Wharf (Bristol Watersports Network)

1. Support for improvements to the Young Bristol facility
2. That a watersports shop at Mardyke Wharf would be unsustainable given that people usually shop online
3. Confusion as to why there are watersports proposed here given the proposal for a consolidated center at Baltic Wharf. That this plan replicates what All Aboard are doing
4. That all watersports’ plans need to be integrated – that charitable funders like to have clarity in issues like this
5. That money should not be spent on the Youth Bristol Site

Other comments about areas of change

1. That Hotwell Road needs significant uplift for local shops, restaurants and businesses and more facilities for residents. This is especially important in light of the changes proposed at Western Harbour
2. Calls for more things on Hotwell Road for people who aren't interested in sports.

Public Realm

HRP1: Hotwell Walkway

1. Support for more planting and biodiversity but concerns about tree roots damaging paths and reducing the visibility of the Harbour for residents. Calls for increased maintenance and tree management
2. Concern about congestion / safety issues due to conflict between cyclists, scooters, pedestrians and cars (including car parking). Proposed solutions included separating pedestrian and cycle traffic by widening the walkway or creating distinct zones. That the footpath could be lowered to water level along certain stretches to enhance accessibility and visual appeal
3. Support for sheltered seating along the water's edge and the creation of characterful areas. Concern that shelters could obstruct views and take up valuable space. Maintenance of existing infrastructure was emphasized, with concerns about the current state of the path in areas like Pooles Wharf Houses

Other comments about public realm

1. Calls to prioritise the views over to the SS. Great Britain from the Hotwell side.
2. Calls to improve the pedestrian and cycle route in the inlet near the lock through to Cumberland Basin. There is a dangerous pinch point here which is tight and difficult to navigate, unlike the path round the rest of the Harbour. Suggestion of building the path out over the water.
3. That the Harbour walks should link up to the Portway routes
4. Support for increased greening and provision for wildlife
5. That Hotwell Road is noisy and polluted at present, especially in rush hour
6. That increasing visitors to the area will require more public toilets. That all bars and cafes could be required to provide free access to toilet facilities for non-customers

Transport Interventions

HRT1: Parking (Mardyke Car Park)

1. Parking
 - Support for removing the car parking here. Support for increased accessibility of Mardyke Car Park. Support for 100% blue badge parking with space for the Young Bristol minibus.

- Opposition to the loss of car parking spaces and calls for an increased number, especially in the wider context of losing spaces on Hotwell Rd. That these are necessary for local businesses and visitors
- 2. That walking and cycling in this area is fine as it is
- 3. That businesses are perceived to struggle in this area. That there isn't demand for more

HRT2: Merchants Road Bridge

1. Support for making the bridge more accessible
2. That the pavement is too narrow for cyclists / pedestrians to share. That cyclists / e scooters should not be allowed here, that it should be pedestrian only.
3. That pedestrians should be prioritized over cars here. Improvements would support active travel
4. That the bridge gets very congested when the Plimsol Bridge swings

GT1: Enhanced Ferry Service

1. That the ferry needs to be cheaper (in line with bus ticket prices)
2. Comment not supporting the enhanced ferry service. That it would not be good for commuters
3. That Ferry pontoons need repairing for passenger services like the Balmoral and Waverley

Other comments about transport

1. Cycling Infrastructure and Pedestrian Safety:
 - Comments on the need for segregated cycleways, particularly along Hotwells Road, to improve safety and reduce pedestrian-cyclist conflicts
 - Calls for better cycling and pedestrian connections between Hotwells Road and the Harbourside and key routes like the Portway, the Chocolate Path, the Pill Path, the M2 cycle track, and Merchants' Road Bridge
2. Traffic problems:
 - Concerns about high traffic volumes, noise, and pollution on Hotwells Road. Suggestions of 20mph speed limit reductions, traffic reductions and enhancing public transport. That excessive traffic detracts from the Harbour
 - Suggestion of underground car parking
3. Public Transport Improvements:
 - Support for upgrading bus and coach services, including real-time information systems, better lighting, seating, shelters, and CCTV
 - Concerns about unreliable bus services and reduced parking impacting travel to the Harbourside are noted, with calls for a comprehensive transport plan
4. General Concerns:
 - Skepticism about the commitment to traffic management and sustainability

Water space Interventions

HWR2: Mardyke Commercial Moorings

1. That increased mooring opposite the Great Britain will impinge on space for watersports.
2. That moorings are currently underused, and many boats never move

HRW3: Temporary Mooring Infrastructure

1. That increased mooring here will impinge on space for watersports, sailing in particular

Other comments

1. Support for this section
2. That people don't really linger here as its so noisy with nothing going on – that there needs to be more of a draw to encourage people to do so
3. That this area detracts from the view of Clifton Wood
4. Concern that the plans will cost taxpayers a lot
5. Skepticism that the proposed changes will make much difference, that it lacks detail and that elements are contradictory. That the survey is inadequate for people to truly get their views across
6. Calls for more independent shops.
7. Support for new affordable homes on Hotwells road and in Hotwells