



Harbour Place Shaping Strategy

Formal Consultation Response Report
January 2025

Contents

1.0 Executive Summary.....	3
2.0 General/Overview.....	4
3.0 Vision.....	6
4.0 Waterspace Plan	9
5.0 Baltic Wharf Place Plan	14
6.0 Spike Island Place Plan	15
7.0 Wapping Wharf Place Plan	16
8.0 Canon’s Marsh Place Plan.....	18
9.0 City & Backs Place Plan	20
10.0 Hotwell Road Place Plan	22

Harbour Place Shaping Strategy

Summary of consultation feedback and proposed response

1.0 Executive Summary

Bristol City Council has recently consulted on a draft Harbour Place Shaping Strategy (HPSS). Consultation feedback is set out in a companion report: Harbour Place Shaping Consultation Report. Overall feedback on the HPSS has been generally positive. For example, typically three quarters of respondents to the survey strongly agreed or agreed with proposals. Respondents also provided valuable constructive criticism about how the document could be strengthened. Whilst there is often broad consensus about some of the challenges and aspirations for the harbour, there are some issues that illicit very divergent views. This was not a surprise as many of these issues had already been surfaced as part of the extensive engagement that had been undertaken to inform the preparation of the HPSS and are documented in the [Engagement Reports](#).

This report sets out Bristol City Council's proposed response to consultation feedback. It seeks to set out the key issues raised through consultation on the Vision document and the accompanying Place Plans (Waterspace, Baltic Wharf, Spike Island, Wapping Wharf, City and Backs, Canon's Marsh and Hotwels Road).

The document provides a high level summary of feedback received (combining feedback from the survey, written responses and events and drop-ins), and a response to key themes emerging through this feedback. Broadly speaking responses can be categorised as follows:

- Document has been updated to respond to feedback
- No response proposed (the reasons being provided). More often than not, this is because the feedback has been quite detailed and is not considered appropriate to include in a high-level document of this nature. Such feedback will however become useful when a project moves into a more detailed phase of development

In some instances, the feedback highlights issues that are 'out of scope' for the HPSS and are more relevant to other related workstreams. Where this is the case, those related workstreams are highlighted e.g. the proposed Harbour Strategy and Moorings Policy currently being prepared by the Harbour Authority, and the emerging masterplans for Western Harbour and Temple Quarter.

This document does not include relatively minor proposed changes to the document following consultation. These are numerous and are considered to be non-contentious.

Over 100 potential projects are highlighted in the HPSS. Consultation has usefully highlighted some additional projects to be added, a project to be removed and projects that need to be significantly redrafted. These are set out below:

New projects to be added

SIP5: Chocolate Path/Gas Ferry Road: Explore new opportunities to access the Chocolate Path close to where Gas Ferry Road joins Cumberland Road. It is proposed this is explored further through work on the Bristol Avon Flood Strategy.

SIC6 SSGB Quayside Walkway. Working with the SSGB, the potential to create a new walkway along the front of the SS Great Britain Museum will be explored.

CMT4: Millennium Square Cycle Park - Explore feasibility of providing a secure bike park within the underground car park or elsewhere around Millennium Square, with a modest charge for bike parking to replace car parking income.

CBT4: King Street Bridge. Whilst improvements to pedestrian and cycling movement over Bristol Bridge and the Bascule Bridge have been made in recent years, the long-standing aspiration to create a new pedestrian bridge link connecting King Street with Redcliffe Quay remains. Future management and maintenance would need to be agreed between the Harbour Authority and Bristol City Council.

HRT3: Rownham Mead Cycle Bridge - Potential opportunity to remove the pinch point on the Quayside Walkway by creating a bridge over the small inlet. There will need to be further stakeholder consultation to identify concerns and aspirations. Future management and maintenance would need to be agreed between the Harbour Authority and Bristol City Council.

CBC7 Redcliffe Caves Opportunity to use the caves more actively for a range of commercial uses and events

CBP4 Redcliffe Backs signage This relatively underused route from Redcliff Wharf to Bristol Bridge on this Eastern side of the harbour needs improved signage, to encourage greater use of this pleasant car free route.

BWW1: Repair mooring Explore the option of creating a dedicated repair mooring along the low quay wall next to the Underfall Yard café, close to the existing boat repair and manufacturing area. This would enable small boat owners to undertake simple repairs and maintenance themselves.

Projects to be removed

BWP5 Underfall Waterside removed as a proposal, as the existing boat yard is considered to provide useful boat storage in close proximity to the Nova Scotia slipway.

Projects significantly redrafted

CMW3 St. Augustine’s Reach Moorings New commercial mooring opportunities in St. Augustines Reach reduced from 10 to 5 to enable boats to manoeuvre

BWW1 Swimming Reference to a lido at Baltic Wharf is removed. whilst there is an appetite for expanding swimming, further feasibility is required to find a suitable location.

CMT4: Pero's Bridge - Longer term explore the feasibility of creating a new bridge alongside Pero's Bridge to increase capacity along this key thoroughfare and segregate pedestrians and cyclists.

It should be noted that there will be opportunities for further consultation on individual projects as they are progressed into a more detailed phase of development.

2.0 General/Overview

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
Trade Offs – The HPSS does not sufficiently highlight the trade-offs that will need to be struck between different factors. For example, the tension between commercial and non-commercial activity, and between increasing “animation” of the public realm and the equally important need for tranquil public spaces, and underlying everything is the need for the Harbour Authority to seek more income.	Early engagement has surfaced many of the tensions between competing uses that exist in the harbour and has helped inform the preparation of the HPSS. Balancing these competing needs is at the core of the HPSS. For example, whilst the HPSS identifies opportunities for more commercial activity in the harbour, it also identifies opportunities to open up parts of the quayside that are currently inaccessible to allow for public enjoyment of the waterspace.
Delivery - The HPSS does not cover the feasibility or delivery of the aims and interventions, especially what comes first and how that will be delivered. Whilst it is helpful to get agreement on the aspirations first, this	The Committee paper will highlight priority projects for delivery in the first five years, and the likely funding sources, and will provide context in terms of the Harbour Authority’s financial position

<p>needs to be accompanied by delivery plan which gives a sense of what the early priorities will be. Eliminating the Harbour Authority revenue deficit will need to be an early driver.</p>	
<p>Capital investment – The HPSS fails to address/highlight the key infrastructure which will require capital expenditure to make a sustained difference for the long-term future supported by an adequate operating expenditure to maintain and operate the asset</p>	<p>A consideration of key harbour infrastructure requiring capital expenditure/on-going maintenance is out of scope for a ‘place-shaping’ strategy and will be considered within the forthcoming Harbour Strategy being prepared by the Harbour Authority. BCC has already successfully secured funding to repair bridge infrastructure and will be seeking further funds to cover other infrastructure investment.</p>
<p>Harbour finances/wider benefits - Concerns about the HPSS’s aim to make the harbour ‘...Thrive economically so that the docks become financially self-sufficient...’ There is a belief that there is no amount of development or economic activity that would make the harbour financially self-sufficient without risking altering the harbour’s character and diminishing the asset and its essential attraction to the people of Bristol and visitors. There needs to be a recognition of the wider benefits of the harbour to the City’s economy and its citizens health, wellbeing and happiness reflected in the Council’s funding priorities and its mechanisms for leveraging funds from regional and national agencies</p>	<p>A decision was made by BCC in July 2023 to ring-fence Harbour Authority finances with a view to the medium-term objective for the Harbour to become self-sufficient. Finances have been ring-fenced since April 2024. Financial self-sufficiency is a legal requirement of the updated Harbour Revision Order. The HPSS needs to be aligned with this, and help identify opportunities for income generation to help support the Harbour Authority.</p> <p>Work will continue to quantify the significant benefits the harbour brings to the city, thus helping build a compelling case for external investment that will bring multiple benefits to the city/region. As benefits are better understood, the Atlas will be updated to incorporate.</p>
<p>Geographic scope – There was criticism of the HPSS for not including the New Cut, the eastern reaches of the Harbour as far as Hanham Lock and Cumberland Basin within its scope.</p> <p><i>The New Cut:</i> Need to interconnect the 'Harbour Strategy' with a new strategy for the 'The Cut' as both are the two largest water assets of the city - interlinked and both require massive capital investment and maintenance support programmes.</p> <p><i>Eastern Reaches:</i> Aspiration to create a Place Plan for the area to the East of Bristol Bridge and to extend the plan to Hanham Lock</p>	<p>The New Cut is outside the geographic scope of the HPSS. Place shaping ideas for the New Cut will instead be developed as part of the Bristol Avon Flood Strategy work.</p> <p>The scope of the HPSS is on the waterspace in the eastern reaches of the harbour and hence covered in the Waterspace Plan. Land based opportunities will be explored more fully through the Temple Quarter Masterplan currently being prepared.</p> <p>Proposals for the Cumberland Basin and environs are being taken forward through the Western Harbour masterplan currently being prepared. That said, the Waterspace Plan will be updated to demonstrate that Cumberland</p>

<i>Cumberland Basin</i> : Aspiration for the scope of the Waterspace Plan to include Cumberland Basin	Basin is a key part of the proposed Bristol Urban Waterspace Network.
Harbour Safety On one hand the strategy wants more people to come to the location but says nothing to protect and enhance their safety (e.g. allocating a permanent space to allow Rescue Ribs & support equipment to be permanently based within the harbour; increasing CCTV coverage; enhanced lighting; consistent harbour edge treatment; conflict between pedestrians and bikes/scooters; raw sewage discharges)	The Harbour Atlas will be updated to include any available information on existing safety in the harbour. Detailed comments made in relation to safety will be considered at a more detailed stage of project development.
Consultation: Some criticised the consultation material/process: there was a sense that the consultation document was rather full of leading questions and platitudes that it is hard to object to; that local residents have not been consulted sufficiently and that the length of the document would have been off-putting to many. It was felt that the document lacked a detailed map with all the place names that would help with the understanding of what is being proposed	We sought feedback from survey respondents on the survey. Of those that responded: 73% strongly agreed/agreed there was enough information to answer the questions; 66% strongly agreed/agreed the question made it easy to give their views; and 70% strongly agreeing/agreeing the survey met their accessibility needs. The Vision will be updated to include a detailed map

3.0 Vision

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
Introduction: The Vision does not sufficiently acknowledge the needs of existing residents	'The needs of residents, businesses and visitors' added to the list of outcomes that the Harbour Authority needs to balance
Active and Accessible Theme 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. Note that the water channel needs to be accessible. There were concerns that the Harbour will become inaccessible to those on a low/average income 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	Getting there: Text updated to say: The harbour will be easier to get to by public transport, cycle, ferry and on foot and become more accessible for disabled people.....The walking routes across the New Cut will continue to play a vital role with onward journeys enhanced. There will be better cycle parking provision. Comfort: Reference will be made to the aspiration for 'Changing Places' toilets, catering for people who need toilets with more space and the right equipment to enable them to get out and about and enjoy the day-to-day activities which many of us take for granted. Openness: Text will be strengthened to say: Other drivers will increase activity and

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. Calls for improving servicing to the harbour.

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

commercial space, but they must not crowd out the ‘places to be’

Safety: Text will be strengthened to say: Navigating the harbour can be troublesome due to busy roads, cycle lanes, open water and bridges. Far more people are reaching and exploring the harbour by foot than driving, and in future space will be redistributed to support greater walking, reducing collision and pinch points. Clear, well lit, and easy-to-follow routes will provide safe connections around the harbour regardless of people’s mode of travel. *Where possible, cycles and scooters will be segregated from areas of significant pedestrian activity.* Signage, safety equipment and clearly marked designations around the harbour will educate people about how to keep themselves and others safe around the water.

Welcoming and inclusive public realm: Updated to highlight the need for the harbour to be affordable

Harbourside Walkway: Text updated to say ‘Vast majority of visitors and residents explore the Harbourside on foot.....’

Servicing: New section added: To reduce the impact of freight in and around the harbour, the creation of freight consolidation hubs will be supported as well as access by e-cargo bikes and other forms of e-mobility for deliveries and servicing

Living in the harbour: Text added to say ‘New housing should be well designed and fit well into the context’. Priorities for investment in existing moorings is out of scope of the HPSS but will be considered as part of the proposed Harbour Strategy being prepared by BCC City Docks Team.

The harbour will offer a unique playable quayside for all: Principle revised to acknowledge the harbour should be playable to all users, not just children

Working out: Text expanded to say: The harbour of the future will further promote physical activity and sport to aid wellbeing

	<p>Active and Accessible Map: Updated to say: Thinking on how to make the eastern reaches of the harbour more active and accessible will evolve further through the Bristol Temple Quarter masterplan being developed from 2024</p> <p>Feedback relating to the water is repeated and responded to in the Waterspace section</p>
<p>Resilient and Sustainable Theme</p> <p>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</p> <p>Principle 2: That environmental measures in the Harbour should be prioritized but implemented with a sensitivity to accessibility and also maintained. Flood risk and water quality highlighted as particular issues for strengthening. Particular attention was given to improvements to public transport, including coaches. Disagreement around the priority that should be given to cars and parking. Disagreement over the utility of ferries</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Principle 4: That tourism and local community needs should 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.</p>	<p>The development of the harbour will underpin the sustainability of the Harbour and Dock’s Estate: No changes proposed. Financial self-sufficiency is a legal requirement of the updated Harbour Revision Order. The HPSS needs to be aligned with this, and identify opportunities for income generation to help support the Harbour Authority. The setting of fees and charges is outside the scope of the HPSS. Priority projects for progression in the first five years are highlighted in the Committee report with potential funding sources identified</p> <p>Resilient and Sustainable plan</p> <p>Updated to highlight additional opportunities for green infrastructure:</p> <p>Land: Baltic Wharf water's edge, Ampitheatre edge, Edge of Maritime Car Park, Nova Scotia Place</p> <p>Water: Next to the Left Handed Giant</p> <p>Resilience to flood risk</p> <p>New section added: Having a river at the heart of the city comes with challenges, especially as climate change and rising sea levels increase the risk of flooding. The harbour will continue to fulfil a fundamental part of the River Avon Flood defences. Implementation of the Bristol Avon Flood Strategy will better protect homes and businesses in the central area from flooding, giving businesses the confidence to invest in Bristol.</p> <p>Low carbon transport</p> <p>Text updated to say: Coach parking provision and drop-off will be expanded and improved to attract visitors from outside the city and provide a sustainable alternative to long distance car trips..... There will be an increase in the amount of electric vehicle charging points.</p>

	<p>Water Quality Text updated to say: Measures to stop raw sewage outflows into the harbour will be explored.</p> <p>Car Parking New text saying: Continued parking provision for disabled visitors will be essential.</p>
<p>Creative and Industrious Theme 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</p>	<p>Film making New section added: Bristol boasts a rich history of film and TV production, with many well-known programmes and films made here over the years. The harbour will continue to facilitate and support this, both as an increasingly popular location for film-makers and home to the UK's first media centre - the Watershed.</p>

4.0 Waterspace Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>Vision General support for the criteria listed relating to a successful waterspace 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.</p>	<p>Criteria will be updated to include:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Well maintained infrastructure such as the docks walls, sluices, locks, bridges etc</i> • Well-designed, and <i>well-maintained</i> moorings and facilities, with new moorings being introduced to further animate the harbour
<p>Moorings <i>Those in favour of increasing moorings highlight:</i> 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.</p>	<p>Priorities for investment in existing moorings is out of scope of the HPSS but will be considered as part of the proposed Harbour Strategy being prepared by BCC City Docks Team. Relevant feedback from this consultation will also be fed into the preparation of the proposed Bristol Moorings Policy. The setting of fees and</p>

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 not 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 measures such as 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; need for a dedicated repair mooring.

In terms of commercial moorings: These should be confined to designated areas, preserving tranquility in other parts of the harbour. Aspirations expressed for floating hotels, restaurants, market, spas, and shops to maintain the harbour's vibrancy. Concerns expressed about commercial moorings being created at Bathurst Basin (unsympathetic to surrounding residential areas; water space needed for children's water activities and boat manoeuvring) and St. Augustine's Reach (ferry maneuvering). Concerns also expressed about creating a marina at Bathurst Basin.

Concern that there are contradictions between the consultation document and the recent planning permission that has been given regarding the moorings proposed outside Capricorn Place in terms of the size of the craft and the type of moorings.

A range of views on administration / cost of moorings

charges is also outside the scope of the HPSS.

New commercial mooring opportunities in St. Augustine's Reach to be revised down from 10 to 5 due to concerns about the impact of manoeuvring ferry boats.

A proposal to potentially make Bathurst Basin a marina remains despite concerns expressed by some boaters, as BCC City Docks feel that a marina-type operation offers the best potential to make the most of this attractive, self-contained part of the harbour, and bring investment into boater facilities. The document already acknowledges that any new commercial moorings would need to be implemented sensitively with consideration of the surrounding residential neighbours and existing uses. Any future proposals will require planning permission which will provide opportunities for further consultation.

Incorporate advice from the EA: *New moorings are likely to need planning permission, approval by the Marine Maritime Organisation and a FRAP from the Environment Agency. The Environment Agency advise that water and sewerage services would need to be designed to allow a boat to move up and down to the design flood level and that in channel structures would need to be strongly tethered to avoid them breaking free during a flood.*

The HPSS will be updated to include a dedicated repair mooring close to Underfall Yard

The moorings specification will remove reference to Capricorn Quay as this is incorrect.

Greater prominence given to the value of heritage moorings in the harbour

<p>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 is suggested that the focus for new floating eco spaces should be on underused parts of the harbour. Bathurst Basin was also identified as a potential location. Calls for creating public seating nearby and involving volunteers in their maintenance.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p>No changes proposed to the proposals for creating a further 5500sqm floating ecospace in the harbour. These have been located where they do not encroach on navigation channels. However, text to be updated to make clear that all new floating ecospace will require planning permission and permission from the Marine Management Organisation. This provides an opportunity for detailed consultation on proposals.</p> <p>Additional opportunity of floating ecospace in association with the space next to the Left Handed Giant at Finzels Reach.</p> <p>The forthcoming Moorings Policy may provide additional opportunities to address issues raised about environmental harm from boats.</p>
<p>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.</p> <p>Those with concerns about expanding water activities highlight issues such as: overcrowding; conflict of between uses; safety; and water quality</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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 move to less congested parts of the harbour (e.g.</p>	<p>Swimming text to be updated to say the following: <i>Any swimming area in the Harbour needs to compliment other watersports activity through programme and coordination. This makes expansion of the existing swimming offer at Baltic Wharf challenging as it is already a well-used area for other watersports. It is particularly challenging to accommodate swimming alongside sailing for example. That said, there is clearly an ambition to expand the swimming offer in the harbour. In terms of broadening participation to include children and people learning or improving their swimming skills, this is likely to require a purpose built, controlled facility such as a lido. Further work is required to test the feasibility of such a solution, and identify a suitable location. Ideally a location is required that would enable quayside facilities to be delivered such as changing rooms, alongside complimentary commercial uses that could generate income to</i></p>

<p>Cumberland Basin) to reduce interference with other activities such as sailing,</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p>	<p><i>subsidise the costs of operating and maintaining the swimming facilities e.g. health and wellbeing businesses, food and drink businesses.</i></p> <p>Cumberland Basin should be identified as part of the Waterspace Network Focus Areas, but with the caveat that thinking on the Cumberland Basin will evolve further through the Western Harbour masterplan. Text and diagrams will be updated to make clear that the Bristol Marina and the Nova Scotia slipway also form a key part of the urban watersports network, however infrastructure and water access is already in place here and no further improvements are proposed</p> <p>Baltic Wharf should continue to be the preferred site for a consolidated watersports centre, and BCC will continue to work with water sports organisations to further develop proposals.</p> <p>Section on operations will be updated to highlight that Avon Quay is used for boat building/repair</p>
<p>Water Transport</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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).</p>	<p>Additional information will be included about the existing ferry services.</p> <p>Significant investment in the ferry service is predicated on demand increasing as a result of Western Harbour and Temple Quarter regeneration (longer term)</p> <p>Feasibility study undertaken to inform the preparation of the HPSS has highlighted challenges with the replacement of the cross harbour ferry service with a bridge and as a result this option has not been progressed within the HPSS</p>

<p>Public Access</p> <p>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.</p> <p>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.</p> <p>Request for more pedestrian/cycle bridges across the Harbour.</p>	<p>Update text to say: A number of projects have been identified to improve public access to the water's edge (Amphitheatre, Totterdown Basin, Castle Park, SSGB, Baltic Wharf, Avon Quay). Where possible, improvements should be made on the quayside rather than on the water itself as on-water structures are more costly to maintain in the long-term. That is not always possible, however. On-water walkways need to consider the navigation channel and any impacts on vessel movement and harbour operations. There should be ambitions to integrate greening, water access, and provision for adjacent commercial activity. These should not be fixed structures but be designed to rise up to the design flood level with capped mooring piles.</p>

5.0 Baltic Wharf Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>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. Likely to be difficult to share storage space. Concern that clubs would be forced to be moved to the Hub when they thought this unsuitable.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to BWC1 as consultation demonstrated high levels of support for this proposal, although reference to the incorporation of complementary commercial uses added. HPSS updated to emphasise the continued importance of the Nova Scotia slipway in providing an alternative access point onto the water</p> <p>BCC will continue to work with watersports organisations to test the feasibility of the watersports centre which includes consideration of congestion on the slipways/quayside etc. Continue to emphasise that the watersports centre provides an opportunity for participating clubs to consolidate facilities but that clubs won't be forced to move to the watersports centre</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No proposed changes to the text.</p> <p>BCC will work closely with existing businesses to develop mutually acceptable proposals.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>No proposed change, as the Local Plan already identifies this as a development site, and planning permission has been secured by Goram Homes.</p> <p>Further work required to establish whether wider benefits could be delivered to the harbour on the back of this development e.g. projects that enhance the biodiversity along the water's edge in front of the development</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>BWP5 Underfall Waterside removed as a proposal, as this is considered to be a useful area of boat storage, conveniently located close to the Nova Scotia</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Only modest changes to text proposed as consultation demonstrated support for public realm proposals.</p> <p>More acknowledgement of the Nova Scotia slipway will be made.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Further consideration of the Avon Crescent area will be progressed as part of the Western Harbour masterplan. Feedback has been passed onto the Western Harbour team</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>Only modest changes to text proposed as consultation demonstrated support for transport proposals.</p> <p>HPSS is proposing the retention of the Baltic Wharf car park.</p> <p>Boat storage is being investigated further through feasibility currently underway in relation to the watersports centre.</p>
<p>Waterspace: 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</p>	<p>Waterspace Plan will be updated to respond to concerns expressed by both water users and local residents, with the lido proposal being removed from Baltic Wharf. Text will make clear that whilst there is an appetite for expanding swimming, further feasibility is required to find a suitable location.</p>

6.0 Spike Island Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The intention is to work with existing businesses to develop mutually acceptable proposals, with a view to taking forward a pilot project involving Units 15,18 and 33, securing external funds where the need for investment is greatest. Opportunities in the wider estate are likely to be longer term and determined by the needs of existing businesses.</p> <p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The site has already been allocated in the Local Plan for housing-led redevelopment. The intention is to work with Goram Homes and the SSGB to develop mutually acceptable proposals. Consultation feedback will be shared Goram Homes.</p> <p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>
<p>Public realm: Support for improvements to Brunel Square, Gas Ferry Road and the passage behind the</p>	<p>BCC will continue to try to secure public realm improvements to the existing harbour walkway from</p>

<p>Albion Dock. However, concerns that the public realm should not be sanitized, and historical assets should be protected and enhanced.</p>	<p>the SSGB entrance to the marina via Gas Ferry Road and Hanover Place.</p>
<p>Transport: Support for a Mobility Hub (although reservations from some 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.</p>	<p>Priority will be given towards ensuring investment in the public transport serving the area.</p> <p>Add new project SIP5: Chocolate Path/Gas Ferry Road: <i>Explore new opportunities to access the Chocolate Path close to where Gas Ferry Road joins Cumberland Road. It is proposed this is explored further through work on the Bristol Avon Flood Strategy.</i></p> <p>No other changes to the current text proposed. More detailed comments will be picked up as individual projects are progressed.</p> <p>Changes to the Cumberland bus gate arrangements are out of scope for this project.</p> <p>The feasibility of creating a new bridge crossing (SSGB to Harbour Inlet) has already been tested and rejected in the early stages of this project, due to the impact it would have on navigation in the harbour (e.g. hindering passage of large ships such as the Matthew)</p>
<p>Waterspace: Calls to create a new waterside route past the SSGB if possible.</p>	<p>Add a new project: SIC6 SSGB Quayside Walkway. <i>Working with the SSGB, the potential to create a new walkway along the front of the SS Great Britain Museum will be explored.</i></p>

7.0 Wapping Wharf Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>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 and unique identity. Whilst Wapping Wharf/Cargo widely considered a success, need to also think about residents' needs (e.g. late-night licensing restrictions)</p>	<p>Reference to London's South Bank will be removed from the vision and replaced with an aspiration for this to be a family-friendly, uniquely Bristol weekend destination. Acknowledgement will also be made that this is a residential neighbourhood.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>The text will be updated to acknowledge that this is a complex space with lots of competing uses and that a detailed landscape and public realm plan will be required to resolve some of these tensions.</p>

<p>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.</p>	<p>Reference to Bristol’s South Bank will be removed.</p> <p>Text will be updated to highlight that Northpoint House on the opposite side of Museum Square should be opened up to make a more positive and active frontage.</p>
<p>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: Some 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).</p>	<p>The text will be updated to acknowledge that this is a complex space with lots of competing uses and that a detailed landscape and public realm plan will be required to resolve some of these tensions.</p>
<p>Other public realm comments: 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.</p>	<p>WWP6: Safety Measures will be updated to acknowledge that new quayside railings will need to incorporate removable sections to facilitate dockside operations</p> <p>GP1: Cumberland Road Tree Planting – updated to say that this needs to consider as part of future work developing the Bristol Avon Flood Strategy</p> <p>WWP1: Museum Square -Text will be updated to highlight that Northpoint House on the opposite side of Museum Square should be opened up to make a more positive and active frontage.</p>
<p>WWT3: Prince Street Bridge: Whilst there was 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</p>	<p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>On-going discussions relating to the planning application for final stage of Wapping Wharf will consider a range of transport measures including the design of Museum Street, coach parking and drop-off, and cycle parking.</p>

<p>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.</p>	
<p>Waterspace: Feedback from residential boat owners requesting improved facilities and ensuring their needs are considered in future planning.</p>	<p>Recently created Harbour Stakeholder Group provides a forum for future discussions with representatives of the boaters. It is proposed that the forthcoming Harbour Strategy being prepared by BCC City Docks Team will set out more detail relevant to the boating community.</p>

8.0 Canon's Marsh Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>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).</p>	<p>Vision will be updated as follows: Canon's Marsh will be refreshed as a contemporary, inclusive and family-friendly focal point for Bristol's civic and public life. Its significant public spaces - among them the Amphitheatre and Millennium Square - will be rejuvenated, making them great spaces to visit both during and outside of formal events. There will be better amenities, more abundant seating, more opportunities to play, increased greening and enhanced shelter and shade for increasingly unpredictable weather. A new cross harbour ferry will connect the Amphitheatre directly to the M-Shed. Floating commercial activity will be boosted along St. Augustine's Reach whilst the harbour edge beside the Amphitheatre will be a natural home for tall ships and other 'special' visiting craft</p>
<p>CMC1 Narrow Quay Commercial: Narrow Quay highlighted as particularly challenging for those with accessibility needs. Plans were highlighted to</p>	<p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>

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.	No changes to the current text proposed.
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.	Document will be updated to reflect detailed comments provided by We The Curious and to acknowledge that We The Curious will be reviewing ideas and further exploring feasibility for Millennium Square as part of their own plans to refresh and renew public spaces that sit within their site.
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.	No changes to the current text proposed.
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?	No changes to the current text proposed. Waterfront Place is a valuable development site which could help towards making the Harbour Authority becoming financially self-sufficient A high-level options appraisal is currently being prepared for this site for BCC Property.
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.). The use of planters is 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.	Summary of public realm interventions will be updated to say: Canon’s Marsh public realm will be improved as an accessible, safe place to dwell, play and engage in local activity. This includes retrofitting and activating the Amphitheatre and Millennium Square to support events and informal urban sports. Increased greening throughout the public realm will increase biodiversity, promote rainwater harvesting/reduce flood risk and create much needed shade.
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	Summary of transport interventions will be updated to say: Pedestrian and cyclist accessibility will be improved around the harbour edge. It will also be improved north-south through the area through the provision of a new cross harbour ferry service, and east-west by

<p>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.</p>	<p>improvements to Pero's Bridge. Where possible, cyclists will be separated from pedestrians e.g. Anchor Road and Prince Street, and cycle storage will be significantly increased. Vehicular access and servicing will be managed in ways that reduce its impact on the public realm.</p> <p>Add new CMT4: Millennium Square Cycle Park - Explore feasibility of providing a secure bike park within the underground car park or elsewhere around Millennium Square, with a modest charge for bike parking to replace car parking income</p> <p>Rewrite the text as follows: CMP1: Canon's Road Public realm improvements and activation to back of house service space along Canon’s Road, to make this a more welcoming and bustling place with enhanced greening. Opportunity to provide better frontages from surrounding buildings e.g. Watershed. Extend public realm improvements to include the walkway from St. Augustines Parade into Millennium Square.</p>
<p>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!</p>	<p>Add following text to CMT4: Pero's Bridge - Longer term explore the feasibility of creating a new bridge alongside Pero's Bridge to increase capacity along this key thoroughfare and segregate pedestrians and cyclists.</p>
<p>Waterspace: Concerns that commercial moorings may restrict navigation in St. Augustine’s Reach</p>	<p>Commercial moorings to the west quay of St. Augustine’s Reach to be removed (5). Waterspace Plan to be updated to align.</p>

9.0 City & Backs Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>Vision: That any changes should ensure that the area doesn’t become too noisy or busy for residents</p>	<p>Vision will be updated to recognise that this is also a residential area</p>
<p>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 in any new development; 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</p>	<p>The site has already been allocated in the Local Plan for mixed-use redevelopment. The intention is to work with Goram Homes and other stakeholders in the area to develop mutually acceptable proposals. Consultation feedback will be shared Goram Homes. The ‘Agent of Change principle’ (within the National Planning Policy Framework) will ensure that unreasonable restrictions should not be placed</p>

<p>development. It was flagged that people become fond of meanwhile uses and object when space used for this is turned into something bland.</p>	<p>on existing businesses such as the Thekla as a result of development permitted after they were established.</p> <p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p> <p>When developing meanwhile use proposals, the emphasis will be on prototyping uses that can eventually be incorporated into the permanent development</p>
<p>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</p>	<p>Work is to start in early 2025 on developing detailed landscape plans for Castle Park which includes the waterside area. Consultation feedback will be shared with the team taking forward this work.</p> <p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>
<p>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? Call for Redcliffe Caves to be more actively used</p>	<p>Add opportunity: CBC3 Redcliffe Wharf: <i>Whilst the priority remains the development of this site, opportunities exist to introduce meanwhile uses pending development. Meanwhile uses could enrich the public and commercial life of the harbour and take advantage of the site’s waterside location</i></p> <p>Revise CBC5 as follows: CBC5: Harbour House <i>Opportunity to use the underutilised site on the junction of Redcliffe Bascule Bridge and The Grove for commercial activities that animate the harbour, whilst retaining access to the moorings in this location.</i></p> <p>Add new project: CBC7: Redcliffe Caves <i>Opportunity to use the caves more actively for a range of commercial uses and events</i></p>
<p>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 and Redcliffe 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.</p>	<p>Consultation feedback will be used to inform more detailed public realm design work as and when the opportunity arises.</p> <p>The pattern of use, ownership and physical layout make the creation of a continuous path along Welsh Back and Redcliffe Back challenging. A new project has been added CBP4 Redcliffe Backs signage <i>This relatively underused route from Redcliff Wharf to Bristol Bridge on this Eastern side of the harbour needs improved signage, to encourage greater use of this pleasant car free route.</i></p>

	<p>Document to be updated to acknowledge Redcliffe railway tunnel & cutting (significance plan), and to preserve and enhance views to it (CBP1)</p> <p>Feedback about accessibility will be fed back to the team delivering the Bristol Harbour Festival</p>
<p>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.</p>	<p>The site has already been allocated in the Local Plan for mixed-use redevelopment. The intention is to work with Goram Homes and other stakeholders in the area to develop mutually acceptable proposals. Consultation feedback will be shared Goram Homes.</p> <p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p>
<p>King Street Bridge: A number of the written responses queried why King Street Bridge proposal was not included in the HPSS</p>	<p><i>CBT4: King Street Bridge. Whilst improvements to pedestrian and cycling movement over Bristol Bridge and the Bascule Bridge have been made in recent years, the long-standing aspiration to create a new pedestrian bridge link connecting King Street with Redcliffe Quay remains. Future management and maintenance would need to be agreed between the Harbour Authority and Bristol City Council.</i></p>
<p>Waterspace interventions: Objections to the proposals for commercial moorings in Bathurst Basin (unsympathetic to surrounding residential areas; waterspace needed for children’s water activities and boat maneuvering). A call for greater appreciation for the John Sebastian lightship</p>	<p>No proposed changes to Bathurst Basin (see comments in Waterspace Plan section)</p> <p>The Waterspace Plan will be updated to include a photo of the John Sebastian lightship with a caption emphasising its historical importance</p>

10.0 Hotwell Road Place Plan

<i>Feedback</i>	<i>Response</i>
<p>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</p>	<p>Update HRC1 to clarify that Mardyke Wharf is one of seven locations identified in the harbour that together comprise the Bristol Urban Watersports Network.</p>

<p>facilities (although the main shopping area is outside of study scope)</p>	
<p>Public realm: Concern about conflict between cyclists, scooters, pedestrians and cars (including car parking). Proposed solutions include widening the walkway, creating segregated cycleways, along Hotwell 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.</p>	<p>Add new project: 'HRT3: Rownham Mead Cycle Bridge - Potential opportunity to remove the pinch point on the Quayside Walkway by creating a bridge over the small inlet. There will need to be further stakeholder consultation to identify concerns and aspirations. Future management and maintenance would need to be agreed between the Harbour Authority and Bristol City Council.</p>
<p>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).</p>	<p>No changes to the current text proposed.</p> <p>Traffic management along Hotwell Road is outside scope of this study.</p> <p>Proposals for Merchants Bridge will be progressed through the Western Harbour Masterplan.</p>
<p>Waterspace: 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</p>	