

## **Summary of preliminary consultation – Revised 16.5.06**

### **Summary Format**

The public consultation on the first ideas for regeneration of Great Yarmouth and Lowestoft was launched with exhibitions held over three days in the two town centres from March 2-4 2006. The consultation continued until 21 April 2006.

Information was available in both towns through a roadshow of exhibitions on display in public venues with survey forms to take away. The survey could be completed on line using the 1st East website and comments also came in by e-mail from the site.

Stakeholders received copies of the survey by post. Presentations were also made by the board and the executive team to a wide range of community groups.

Responses were made via the exhibition voting boards\*, through postal submission of questionnaires, an electronic survey on the 1st East web site, letters, emails, design-your-own-masterplan and post cards from the future.

*\*(on display at the launch events and, subsequently, in council offices, the two colleges, community venues, shopping centres and library buildings),*

All representations made will be supplied to 1st East, Suffolk County Council, Waveney District Council, Norfolk County Council and Great Yarmouth Borough Council.

This summary considers two strands of the consultation:

- Analysis of the exhibition voting boards and questionnaire responses – mainly from the public, although several local businesses also responded.
- Fuller responses through letters and emails – statutory consultees and local authorities

### **Introduction**

Firstly, we consider the exhibition voting boards and questionnaire responses.

6,000 questionnaires were distributed through the post to stakeholders (2,500), via visits to the exhibitions (1,600) and through other outlets such as the council offices and libraries (1,000), at presentations (400), by post to individuals on request and at community events (500).

At the time of producing this report 767 questionnaire responses had been received (a response rate of 13%). In addition, 195 questionnaires were completed on the 1st East web site (although 320 web hits were made, some of which were only written comments), and of these 195, 79 made detailed comments. The statistical analysis is therefore based on 962 responses to the questionnaire (paper responses plus web responses).

Table 1 summarises the numbers of comments made:

	Number of comments made about.....		
	Lowestoft Ideas	Great Yarmouth Ideas	Total
Exhibition Boards sticky dot voting (dots / votes, not people)	2929	2271	<b>5200</b>
Questionnaire Statistics	n/a	n/a	<b>767</b>
Questionnaire Comments	205	127	<b>332</b>
Web Site Statistics	n/a	n/a	<b>195</b>
Web Site Comments	n/a	n/a	<b>79</b>
Emails	33	28	<b>61</b>
Letters	n/a	n/a	<b>42</b>
Masterplans (including schools)	23	6	<b>29</b>
Post cards (including schools)	209	33	<b>242</b>

Table 1

## Strategic Framework – Overview

On the questionnaires, respondents were asked to rank 13 key objectives in order of importance to them (1 being the highest importance, 13 being the lowest). The analysis reveals the three highest priority objectives are:

- Making the towns a better place to live, work and visit - 30% consider this to be the most important. This figure is based on 212 paper ticks plus 73 web ticks (total = 285) voting for this objective as Number 1 the most times. The 30% is based on 767 paper responses plus 195 web responses (total = 962);
- Improved ability to get around by road, on foot, bike and public transport - 23% consider this to be the most important. This figure is based on 170 paper ticks plus 56 web ticks (total = 226) voting for this objective as Number 1;
- Attracting new money to invest in our area - 21% consider this to be the most important. This figure is based on 154 paper ticks plus 58 web ticks (total = 212) voting for this objective as Number 1.

In contrast, the three lowest priority objectives are:

- Better links to Europe - 20% consider this to be the least important. This figure is based on 171 paper ticks plus 21 web ticks (total = 192) voting for this objective as Number 13 the most times;
- Lowestoft and Great Yarmouth working together - 15% consider this to be the least important. This figure is based on 124 paper ticks and 24 web ticks (total = 148) voting for this objective as Number 13 the most times;
- Avoiding conflicts between where you work and where you live - 9% consider this to be the least important. This figure is based on 75 paper ticks and 10 web hits (total = 85), voting for this objective as Number 13 the most times.

Voting on the exhibition boards confirms the same priorities. However:

- 'a better choice of jobs and community activities' is a higher priority than 'attracting new money'.
- 'avoiding conflicts' is a higher priority than 'high quality design for buildings' and 'managing the changing ports', which are equally placed.

## The Ideas – Overview

### Lowestoft Key Themes

The over-riding theme emerging for Lowestoft is ***the need to reduce traffic congestion and pollution within and around the town*** (Using the analysis in Table 2 as a guide, supplemented by other comments made on the questionnaires, in emails and letters)

Related to this, is the request for a **third crossing over Lake Lothing**. This is the highest occurring questionnaire comment made for Lowestoft - 11% of all comments make this request (i.e. 82 out of 741 questionnaires – 741 out of 767 received analysed at time of writing), and the second highest occurring email comment made for Lowestoft (13% - i.e. 8 out of 61 emails). While these percentages may initially sound low, these figures are based on those questionnaire or email responses that *specifically* made an *additional* comment on the third crossing, over and above voting for the ideas. It is likely that many respondents felt that they had already made their opinion known through the voting procedure and did not necessarily need to make an additional comment.

In addition, the need for **better public transport, footpaths and cycle paths** and traffic management in and around the town is requested – 7% of all questionnaire comments request traffic management and 5% request better public transport – and – 16% of all email comments request better public transport and 9% request better footpaths and cycle paths.

The other highest occurring comments are for accessibility between the two towns, likely to be related to previous comments made about traffic management (4% of all questionnaire comments make this request) and **against relocation of Lowestoft Station** (9% of all email comments).

### Great Yarmouth Key Themes

As with Lowestoft, the over-riding theme emerging for Great Yarmouth is **the need to reduce traffic congestion and improve public transport within and around the town**. The highest occurring comments made for Great Yarmouth - 5% of all questionnaire comments (i.e. 37 out of 741 questionnaires) and 9% (i.e. 6 out of 61 emails). of all email comments made – are for **traffic management and better public transport**. Specifically, **congestion occurring at the Vauxhall roundabout** features highly, with 8% of all email comments highlighting this and again, requests for **better footpaths and cycle paths** (9% of all email comments request these). Again, these figures are based on comments made over and above the voting procedure.

Interestingly, the **town's image / marketing / perception** to the outside world etc is the second highest comment made for Great Yarmouth – 4% of all questionnaire comments and 9% of all email comments highlight this. Related to this are requests for **town centre improvements**.

### The two towns - key similarities and differences

The over-riding encouraging similarity between the two towns is the recognition that positive change is needed and that regeneration, through 1<sup>st</sup> East, will provide long term benefit for the wider town and local communities within it. This is reflected through positive voting made on questionnaires and exhibition boards – 95% of voters in Lowestoft and 89% in Great Yarmouth considered the Strategic Framework objectives as “Important”.

In Lowestoft, on average, 90% of board voters and 59% of questionnaire voters considered the regeneration ideas to be “Important” or that they are “Strongly Supported or Supported”. In Great Yarmouth, 85% of board voters and 56% of questionnaire voters considered the regeneration ideas to be “Important” or that they are “Strongly Supported or Supported”. There is a disparity between responses made on the boards and questionnaires. This is likely to be as a result of the layout of the questionnaire versus the display, with the questionnaire providing a wider range of options along the voting scale (i.e. strongly support, support, neutral, against, strongly against), as opposed to important or not important on the boards.

It is clear that the two towns have similar emerging issues and problems and it is recognised that good traffic management, better public transport and good footpaths and cycle paths will help to ease congestion and pollution occurring in both towns and start to get people out of their cars. In both towns, there is recognition of the ability of third crossings - of Lake Lothing in Lowestoft and of the River Yare in Great Yarmouth - to assist in better traffic management and circulation around the towns.

## Lowestoft - Overview

The questionnaire plus web analysis reveals that the three highest priority ideas for Lowestoft are:

- Outer Harbour (Lowestoft): Tourism and Business park (71% strongly support or support this idea);
- Lakeside / Station Square: Reconfigure Lowestoft Station (70% strongly support or support this idea);
- Lakeside / Station Square: Public Open Space (70% strongly support or support this idea).

In contrast, the questionnaire voting reveals that the 3 lowest priority ideas for Lowestoft are:

- Lake Lothing 3rd crossing: Peninsula and west of Bascule Bridge (26% are strongly against or against this idea).
- Lake Lothing 3rd crossing: Lake Lothing Peninsula (23% are strongly against or against this idea).
- Lake Lothing 3rd crossing: Lake Lothing Central and Lake Lothing Central / East (equal placing) (19% are strongly against or against these ideas).

Voting on the boards indicates the highest priorities to be:

- “Reconfigure Lowestoft Station” as the highest, followed by;
- “Outer Harbour: Renewable Energy District” and;
- “Lake Lothing South Quay: New Lake Lothing crossing”.

Voting on the boards during the consultation period indicates the lowest priorities to be:

- “Lakeside / Station Square: Cultural urban district”;
- “Lakeside / Station Square: Public open space”;
- “Reconfigure Lowestoft Station”.

Interestingly, “Reconfigure Lowestoft Station” and “Public Open Space” feature in both the highest and lowest priorities, suggesting controversy and perhaps, inclination towards voting, for these ideas over others.

### Lowestoft Third Crossing

From analysis of the questionnaire responses plus the web responses for the third crossing alone, West of Bascule Bridge or Lake Lothing Central are the two most voted for ideas. However, when considered against questionnaire plus web voting for the other Lowestoft ideas, reconfiguration of the station is a popular choice, resulting in limited clear steer from the questionnaire plus web responses as to the crossings.

Table 2 summarises the questionnaire voting (as a %) for the Lowestoft ideas, based on the 741 questionnaire responses analysed to date:

Lowestoft		% Strongly Support and Support (of all votes for specified option)	% Neutral	% Against and Strongly Against
Outer Harbour	A) Renewable Energy District	69	22	9
	B) Tourism and Business park	71	20	9
Lakeside / Station Square	A) Reconfigure Lowestoft Station	70	14	15
	B) Public open space	70	21	8
	C) Cultural urban district	44	39	17
Lake Lothing South Quay	A) New Lake Lothing crossing	68	18	14
	B) Water related Peninsula	62	30	8
Lake Lothing 3 <sup>rd</sup> crossing 3 <sup>rd</sup> crossing	A) Peninsula and west of Bascule Bridge	46	31	23
	B) Lake Lothing Central	54	28	19
	C) West of Bascule Bridge	47	34	19
	D) Lake Lothing Central / East	54	28	18
	E) Lake Lothing Peninsula	44	32	26

Table 2

Table 3 summarises the raw data from the questionnaires plus web responses for the third crossing only:

Option	Questionnaire plus web response	
	Number of Votes (Strongly Support and Support added together)	Priority Order (third crossing only)
A	315	4
B	374	2
C	316	3
D	383	1
E	297	5

Table 3

## Great Yarmouth – Overview

The questionnaire plus web voting reveals that the three highest priority ideas for Great Yarmouth are;

- Leisure: New Leisure Broad: (72% strongly support or support this idea);
- Gateways 1: Gateway to Great Yarmouth – Breydon Area (72% strongly support or support this idea);
- Gateways 2: Gateway to Great Yarmouth – Haven Bridge Area (60% strongly support or support this idea).

In contrast, the questionnaire plus web voting reveals that the 3 lowest priority ideas for Great Yarmouth are;

- River Crossing: Low bridge north (28% are strongly against or against this idea);
- River Crossing: Low bridge south (25% are strongly against or against this idea);
- South Denes: River Port (21% are strongly against or against this idea).

Voting undertaken on the boards during the consultation period concurs exactly with the questionnaires plus web survey on the highest 3 priorities.

However, the lowest priorities on the boards were in contrast with the questionnaires plus web survey:

- “New leisure broad”,
- “Gateway to Great Yarmouth – Breydon Area”
- “Concentrated EastPort”

## Great Yarmouth Third Crossing

There were three ways to vote for the River crossing options – through the exhibition voting boards, through the questionnaire and through the web site. Table 4 shows that there is an overwhelming vote in favour of Idea 1 – High bridge to Southgate Road;

Table 4 summarises the analysis for the Great Yarmouth ideas:

Great Yarmouth		% Strongly Support and Support	% Neutral	% Against and Strongly Against
Leisure	New Leisure Broad	72	17	11
Gateways 1	Gateway to Great Yarmouth – Breydon Area	72	23	5
Gateways 2	Gateway to Great Yarmouth - Haven Bridge Area	60	31	9
	Gateway to Great Yarmouth - West Quay	59	34	7
River Crossing	High Bridge to south gate road	56	28	16
	High Bridge to south beach parade	52	29	20
	Low bridge north	32	40	28
	Low bridge south	35	41	25
South Denes	Concentrated EastPort	59	30	11
	Expanded EastPort	56	30	13
	River Port	49	31	21

Table 4

Table 4 summarises the raw data from the questionnaires and web responses for the third crossing only:

Option River Crossing Idea	Questionnaire plus web response	
	Number of Votes (Strongly Support and Support added together)	Priority Order (third crossing only)
1 – High bridge to Southgate Road	287	1
2 – High bridge to South Beach Parade	272	2
3 – Low bridge north	163	4
4 – Low bridge south	184	3

Table 5

## What Stakeholders say

As a brief summary, the following key stakeholders in Table 6 responded by letter or email to the consultation. For the purpose of the summary below this table, only the statutory consultees, the council’s comments and the port authorities have been included. However, all comments have been logged on the consultation database and considered in the Masterplan.

Statutory consultees / other key national organisations	Councils	Interest Groups	Key local companies
Sport England	GYBC Housing and Social Policy	Cobholm Residents Association	Compass
G0-East	NCC - Norfolk Landscape Archaeology	Runham Vauxhall Residents Association	CareTrade
English Nature (Norfolk only)	NCC – various Officers	Railfuture	Lowestoft Tool Hire (L)

RSPB	SCC Rail, Policy and Freight	East Suffolk Travellers Association	Capelli
Highways Agency	SCC – various Officers	STEER (Sustainable transport for the East of England Region)	Lowestoft Harbour Maritime Businesses Group
Network Rail		The Wherry lines community rail partnership	NSC Eastern
Environment Agency		The Excelsior Trust	Lafarge Aggregates (L)
ABP		Norfolk Wildlife Trust	Port Authority (GY)
		East Coast mobility	Lowestoft Cruising Club
		Inland Waterways Association	GY Port Users Association
		Passenger Focus	
		Right to Ride Network	Brass Age
		Waveney Cycling Campaign	
		Suffolk Preservation Society (also WDC Cllr)	
		Great Yarmouth Chamber of Commerce	

Table 6

### ***Associated British Ports (ABP)***

Lowestoft:

- Outer Harbour - option A preferred. No objections to marina at the Trawl Dock but wave action and siltation need to be addressed. Land needs to be allocated for the existing fishing industry. Pleased to see improved linkage with the town centre and retention of employment use on the land tip. Option A is unacceptable.
- Lakeside/Station Square – All three options are unacceptable in their current form.
- Lake Lothing/South Quay – option A is less of a compromise for existing port operations and both options need to resolve the relationship between the proposed road and railway line. Support improvement of the Brooke Marine site.
- Lake Lothing third crossing – Support the need for a crossing but careful consideration needs to be given to the site of a crossing and any crossing at grade must be openable.

### ***Sport England***

Lowestoft: Use of the rivers and waterfronts for recreation is supported, as is new open space, particularly around station.

Great Yarmouth: Leisure proposals are supported, particularly the new Broad, as are the tourist / sports area under Idea C at South Denes.

### ***Go-East***

No comments on ideas; representation concentrates on procedures.

### ***English Nature (Norfolk / GY only)***

Great Yarmouth:

- Support the new leisure Broad, with careful design for biodiversity.
- Also support new link roads within the urban area, rather than the A47 / A149 protected route. Against development on the allotments.
- Concern over marina proposed on green space within Idea Gateway 1 before survey undertaken and on control of boats entering Breydon Water.
- Support open space within Idea Gateway 2.

### ***Environment Agency***

Representation relates to detailed comments on the SEA rather than the ideas for consultation.

### ***RSPB***

Lowestoft:

- Against reconfiguration of the station as against sustainable travel objectives - want to retain easy public access to the Broads.
- Support traffic management, public transport, footpaths and cyclepaths
- Against third crossing over Lake Lothing.

Great Yarmouth:

- Important to balance tourism with nature conservation.
- Support new leisure Broad but concern over impact upon biodiversity in Breydon Water, in general.
- Against River Bure road crossing but support public transport, footpaths and cyclepaths and traffic congestion reduction measures.

### ***Highways Agency***

Lowestoft:

- Focus on infrastructure that reduces severance caused by the A12;
- completion of Northern Spine Road, upgrade to Denmark Road, public transport improvements and interchange, footpaths and cyclepaths.

Great Yarmouth:

- Support third river crossing.
- Concern over capacity of Gapton Hall and Vauxhall roundabouts.

### ***Network Rail (Lowestoft only)***

- Against reconfiguration of station; concern over passenger perception and use, disruption to service during construction, cost of re-signalling work.
- Support public transport interchange close to station.
- Concern over road crossing the railway line "at-grade" on safety grounds; suggest alternative at Leathes Ham where railway is in cutting.
- Support additional linkages across Lake Lothing.

### ***Great Yarmouth Port Authority***

- Support extension of tourism package; a high quality hotel would help.
- Support new leisure Broad, with caution.
- Concern over impact of new residential on River Yare waterfront on commercial interests and note that bank retention needs to be considered when proposing residential on waterfronts.
- Support Runham Vauxhall upgrade and road link to seafront.
- Support Idea Gateways 1 as long as development is kept to north of Haven Bridge. Note that the Port Authority own and operate Haven Bridge and operate Breydon Bridge on behalf of the Highways Agency; costly to operate, particularly if River traffic increases.
- Concern over new water basins and dredging implications.
- General support for moving of port related businesses further down the river but conditions need to be right, such as quays needed for loading.
- Support in principle for third river crossing but concern over navigational requirements and leases of existing tenants. Crossing should be a tunnel, a high level bridge or a lifting bridge.

- Question over relocating port activity that is currently located to north of Berths One to Eight but have a Quay Strategy in place that makes some suggestions including concentrating activity in an area from Atlas Terminal to Harbour's Mouth. Note that EastPort does not replace port activity on the River Yare.

### ***Great Yarmouth Port Users Association***

- Both towns will continue to rely on port related operations.
- Harbour inlets will not work due to tidal flow and siltation and flood protection needed.
- Marina at Cobholm will only work if constructed with lock gates.
- Retention of Angles Way footpath along the waterfront where the marina is proposed.
- Concern over relocation of businesses at Eurocentre with new leisure Broad.

### ***Great Yarmouth Borough Council - Housing and Social Policy***

- Interface between new residential areas and commercial areas should be considered carefully; want to avoid conflicts.
- Concern over Idea C where residential is isolated from shops and services and considers that to make this area successful, there would need to be a major attraction such as a marina.
- Concern over third river crossing that it will sever communities to the north and south of a bridge.
- Concern over increased congestion in the Runham Vauxhall area, if leisure Broad idea is implemented.

### ***Norfolk County Council Archaeology (Great Yarmouth only)***

- Under Idea Gateways 1, new connections through the historic town centre will affect archaeology within the town walls. Concern over impact of increased traffic, vibration and pollution upon historic buildings and over visual impact of landmark buildings upon historic town.
- Under Idea Gateways 2, archaeology under the Southtown Quays should be considered.
- Concern over high bridge over River Yare which will have unacceptable visual impact upon historic town and Nelson's monument.

### ***Norfolk County Council – various Officers***

#### **Great Yarmouth:**

- Support leisure Broad but question road link between A47 and A149; congestion in new areas. Question access to Eurocentre and costs involved plus employment land needs to be found elsewhere if employment land lost here. Support visitor / education resource linked with Broad.
- Support Idea Gateway 1 as long as townscape character retained and pedestrian and cyclist links are enhanced around the town, seafront and along the rows. Support restoration of railway bridge, redevelopment around station and new offices. Support upgrade of Cobholm. Support visual arts facility.
- Support Idea Gateways 2 for environmental enhancement to Pasteur Road and surrounding area, although recognise that may only be possible following traffic reduction. Support open space but need to consider new retail warehouses. Support waterfront development, access to the waterfront and transition to mixed use but note that employment land lost should be replaced elsewhere.
- Support third crossing but other alternatives should be considered too and protect setting of Nelson's column. Support city park but not at detriment to port related activity. New tourist / leisure uses should compliment and link the seafront. Concern over conflict between residential on seafront and casino.

**Lowestoft:**

- Support mixed use development of the Outer Harbour, connected to town centre. Support marina, although consider that Inner Harbour is better location. Market easterly point and renewable energy theme and support technology innovation centre.
- Support business park but need to link with renewable energy industry.
- Support waterfront development, including a third crossing and minor station configuration as long as access to the town centre is not reduced.
- Support environmental enhancement and open space, particularly around the station but would prefer to see a wider mix of uses around the station. Green spine cycleway around / across Lake Lothing is required. Lake Lothing peninsula should form development focus

***Suffolk County Council Rail Policy and Freight (Lowestoft only)***

- Concern over reconfiguration of station and detrimental impact upon local businesses and negative message to users. Consideration of reports about to be released on East Suffolk line should be taken.

***Suffolk County Council – various Officers***

- Masterplan needs to be clear about how it reflects the wider objectives set out in the Regional Spatial Strategy. Main issues are for a sustainable transport strategy, a third crossing and new pedestrian and cycle routes, particularly through to Oulton Broad. New links with existing rights of way could enhance tourism.
- Concern over managing the A12 and wider road network and how links between it, the town centre and the seafront can be made.
- No sway on moving the station.
- Note that the east-west spine through Lake Lothing South Quay could become the principle route through the area rather than Victoria Road / Waveney Drive.
- In general, requirement for new schools through new residential development can be met within existing schools, unless there was a particular concentration in one area. Very sheltered housing and supported housing is needed, potentially linked with social employment such as a café.

***Waveney District Council***

- Support tourism / leisure related uses on Whapload frontage.
- Against reconfiguration of the station.
- Support mixed use, as long as character maintained.
- Concern over development affected by coastal erosion and flooding and recommend risk assessments undertaken.
- Option A is WDC preferred idea, maximising OREC and renewables. Consideration of wider traffic movements in relation to third crossing is needed, plus also in relation to port activity. Consider that environmental improvements outside of the URC boundary are needed. Fishing industry should be maintained. Views across Lake Lothing retained.

***Lowestoft Harbour Maritime Business Group***

- All new bridges across Lake Lothing need to be operable.
- Multiple crossings add to port operating costs and reduce harbour function.
- Concern over port viability. Support extended access to northern side of Inner Harbour

**Key Stakeholders we await responses from:**

English Heritage has requested an extension and we also await formal responses from other stakeholders.

## **The Preferred Option – statistics gained from the exhibition voting boards by adding together voting results from BOTH towns:**

### **Great Yarmouth**

- New Broad – 89% thought that “Create New Broad connecting the River Bure” was important and 63% thought that “New access road off Acle New Road” was important.
- Regeneration of Runham Vauxhall – 90% thought that this was important.
- Northgate Regeneration – 96% thought that “Restoration or replacement of old railway bridge as pedestrian gateway to link town and railway station” was important and 93% thought that “Local shops, housing and offices around the station” was important.
- Bure Harbour Quay – 98% thought that “Improve way into new marina/housing area” was important and 93% thought that “Public access to the waterfront” was important.
- Haven Bridge area – 86% thought that “Local shops, houses and office development by waterfront” was important
- Pasteur Road key site – 65% thought that “Landscaping Pasteur Road and Bridge Road” was important and 86% thought that “Gateway public open space” was important.
- Southtown intensification - no statistics available
- West Quay transformation – 98% thought that “Gradual transformation in to local shops, houses and offices” was important, 94% thought that “Attractive quay with pedestrian access” was important”, 89% thought that “Additional attractive water basins including dry dock” was important and 100% thought that “Extension of road to the quays” was important. A pedestrian / cyclist crossing is proposed linking over the River Yare (in addition to the main “third crossing”). Although this was not actually voted upon during the consultation period, the statistics for public access to and along the waterfront on both sides of the River is considered important and the statistics for the more general comments reflect this.
- New river crossing – 90% thought that “Low bridge North” was important and 96% thought that “Low bridge South” was important.
- South Denes industrial estate – 95% thought that “Port activities concentrated in the South” was important, 79% thought that “Area to north functions as small to medium scale light industrial area with offices” was important
- East Port – 85% thought that “Expanded Port and growth of related industries” was important and 90% thought that “Expanded Port and growth of related industries” was important.

### **Lowestoft**

- Lakeside / Station Quarter – 95% thought that “Reconfigure station to improve access and create attractive development opportunity” was important. This also scored highly in the questionnaire and web response survey. However, it is not a popular idea with stakeholders, with several letters explicitly stating that to move the station would be highly costly and would send out negative messages to the public that rail travel is not important.
- Lake Lothing Crossing – the preferred option indicates 2 crossings – a combination of Ideas B and C. From the voting boards – 98% thought that “New bridge crossing Lake Lothing allowing for improved traffic circulation” was important, a general comment surrounding an additional crossing. However, when specifically voting for the crossing, 95% thought that C was important, closely followed by A and B in equal second place. This contrasts to voting on the questionnaires and on the web, where 54% equally strongly supported or supported B and D, with 47% strongly supporting or supporting C. No clear steer on location of a third crossing is provided from additional comments, emails or letters, although there is strong support in favour, with the favourable option being one that relieves town centre congestion and provides good accessibility throughout the area.
- Outer harbour redevelopment – 97% thought that “Technology innovation centre linked with renewables and offshore energy” was important and 93% thought that “Employment focus in harbour” was important.

- Seafront regeneration area – 96% thought that “Make the most of and improve historic “scores” and getting to the town centre” was important and 82% thought that “Employment focus north of the harbour, in Business Park” was important. However, only 44% thought that “Key public building” was important, even though this appears on the preferred option. This could be rebranded as “landmark building”.
- South Quay central and New Claremont / South Belvedere Road – 88% thought that “Development of local shops, housing and offices in the south” was important
- South Quay industrial estate – no statistics
- South Quay residential quarter – 88% thought that “Local shops, houses and offices development with a strong, water related character” was important, 77% thought that “New access road” was important, 58% thought that “Waterfront floating houses” was important.
- Central crossing Lake Lothing (option B) – 92% thought this crossing was important.
- Shell Quay – no statistics available
- Lake Lothing West regeneration area – no statistics available