



LOWESTOFT

FLOOD RISK MANAGEMENT PROJECT

Appendix 2. Communications plan (inc. stakeholder analysis)

Lowestoft Flood Risk and Coast Management Strategy

Communications and engagement plan

Author and revisions	
Sharon Bleese (author)	Resilient Coastal Communities and Businesses Manager/Strategic Communications Lead
Alysha Stockman	Partnerships and Engagement Support Officer (revisions)
Sharon Richardson	Senior Partnerships and Engagement Advisor (revisions)
Charlotte Flight	Engagement Officer (revisions)

Version	Date
V15.	28.2.23

Sign off/for information

Name	Organisation	Sign off/information
Karen Thomas	Coastal Partnership East	Sign off
Matt Hullis	Suffolk County Council	Information
Jonathan Glerum	Anglian Water	Information
Philip Ridley	East Suffolk Council	Information and comment
Tamzen Pope	East Suffolk Council/CPE	Information and comment
Tom Duit	Associated British Ports	Information and comment
Jonathan Rudd	New Anglia Local Enterprise Partnership	Information and comment
Aaron Dixey	Environment Agency	Information and comment
Cllr David Ritchie	East Suffolk Council/Project Board Chair	Information and comment
Nick Khan	East Suffolk Council Strategic Director	Information and comment

Contents
1. Plan purpose and background
2. Situations analysis
2.1 Analysis of current situation
2.2 Analysis of stakeholders
3. Objectives
3.1 Business objective
3.2 Strategic communications objectives
3.3 Communications plan objectives
4. Risks and mitigating action
5. Strategy for communications and engagement
5.1 Key messages
5.2 Audiences
5.3 Tactics
6. Resources

6.1 Budget
6.2 Branding
7. Evaluation and monitoring

1. Plan purpose and background

What is the purpose of this plan?

More targeted and meaningful engagement helps build longer-term trust with our stakeholders and publics. This can help significantly when potentially contentious issues arise, when we run wider consultations, and even with our wider coastal management responsibilities.

This communications and engagement plan specifically focuses our engagement on the development of a flood risk management project for Lowestoft that includes the reduction of risk from rivers and extreme rainfall and tidal defences; including flood walls and the introduction of a 40m tidal barrier. It aims to ensure that people inside and outside our organisation understand how engaging our stakeholders and publics is important in helping us make the right decisions for a sustainable solution for long-term management of flood risk in Lowestoft.

This plan should help guide the project team to spend our time and resources wisely, communicating with and engaging the right people about the right things, at the right time. As a result, we should be seen as an honest, transparent and efficient public body that communicates and achieves its purpose and priorities effectively.

Background

The Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project will develop a way forward in managing flood risk from all sources, pluvial, fluvial and tidal, which will allow for the economic growth and regeneration of this coastal town. Primarily though, it will reduce the devastating impacts of flooding to people, homes and businesses. It will introduce measures to protect existing residential and commercial properties as identified in the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Plan and improve Port infrastructure and access to the inner harbour.

This communication plan is being developed on behalf of Suffolk County Council and East Suffolk Council to promote project activities as initially described in the Lowestoft Flood Risk and Coast Management Strategy (LFR&CMS) and subsequently the Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project.

The project completed preliminary investigations in 2014/15, confirming the need for and viability of a suite of flood protection works. These investigations improved understanding of all flood risks plus further investigation into the viability of a tidal barrier and associated protection works.

This plan sets out communications objectives, key milestones and activities that will form the basis of engagement with identified stakeholders and to publicise the strategy and project to a range of internal and external audiences. The intention then, is to develop an approach that will involve communities, businesses, organisations and schools in the project and through

their involvement, deliver a project which is understood and supported by those who live in, work in and visit Lowestoft.

2. Situation analysis

2.1 Analysis of current situation

To reflect the constraints and scope of what can and can't be influenced, particularly with reference to tidal flooding, and to support the formation of tools, techniques and tactics it is helpful to understand what is in scope and out of scope for engagement.

In scope	Out of scope
Siting and type of barrier	Formulae for Flood Defence Grant in Aid is fixed
Design and scope of all forms of defences (limited input)	Design and delivery should not limit access to and operation of the inner and outer harbour
Funding providers could influence options	There will be disruption during the course of the works. This will be mitigated and limited where it is possible but a project of this size and nature cannot be delivered without inevitable disruption.
Engagement, involvement and collaboration with stakeholders and publics that are directly affected by the proposed project	Links to the construction of the third crossing are likely to be out of scope but the project won't inhibit it and opportunities for collaboration fully explored.
Proportionate engagement with those not directly affected by the project in the interests of clarity and transparency.	Broader involvement and collaboration with those not directly affected by the proposed project will most likely be limited to inform in most cases.

Why do we want to work with the community and other stakeholders?

- To help people understand what the flood defence management scheme is and the true level of flood risk they face (both now and in the future)
- To explain the policy framework within which we are working to identify management options and develop the scheme
- To encourage public support for our recommended options and to avoid total adverse reactions
- To minimise public challenge to the outputs of the scheme
- To understand people's continuing concerns and where possible to provide responses to them within the final programme
- To follow guidance to consult

Why might the community and other stakeholders want to engage with us?

- To hear what the project team have to say.
- To make our sure our proposals are 'sustainable'.

- To understand how policy options have been determined and to ensure a level playing field.
- To seek reassurance that the necessary steps are being taken to protect their lives, homes and way of life.
- To remove risk of flooding by getting our commitment to maintain defences.
- To ensure views expressed are taken into account
- To challenge decisions of public bodies.
- To influence the project team to fully recognise the economic value of businesses as worthy of protection.
- To pressurise for more money to be made available from the Central Government, Environment Agency and the Council.
- To understand how they can contribute financially.
- To challenge / blame.
- To voice their views and change the outcomes.
- To demonstrate to others how they have influenced the project team.
- To understand if there are any alternatives.
- To identify any omissions or errors within the scheme and any planning applications

Observations and recommendations from this analysis

From this analysis we can see that the nature of the proposed project presents some challenges in terms of meaningful engagement. Particularly for the tidal works, there are constraints due to the fact that channel division is not possible and the nature of the barrier options available. However, the opportunities exist to engagement people through the process to raise awareness and understand concerns. Where it is reasonably possible and practical changes can be made to the method of construction and timing of construction. The social value delivered by the contract will also add to the sense of ownership and value that the project offers to communities and businesses in Lowestoft.

The work is necessary to protect Lowestoft from impacts similar to those experienced during the December 2013 tidal surge. The main affects and influence will be from stakeholders who are directly affected or can directly affect the proposed project. However, every effort will be made with our communications to ensure that the broader base is fully informed of the project and involved wherever possible. Particularly in the case of schools and colleagues in the area.

These findings will be reflected in our strategy and tactics for engagement and help to guide appropriate and proportionate engagement and resource allocation.

2.2 Analysis of stakeholders

The project aims to reduce the risk of flooding to Lowestoft from all sources, tidal, fluvial and pluvial. However, the nature of the work involved and the people involved means that it would be more beneficial to identify stakeholders and their interests separately: whilst maintaining the need for cross referencing of stakeholders throughout the project lifetime.

Key stakeholders – tidal element

Level of interest

→ High

Level of power

<p>Wind farm operators Rambles Association Cleveland boatyard Fisherman's Mission ICE Company (George Bunning) Mastersons LG Roberts Bus companies providing bus services Suffolk Police Coastguard (Maritime Coastguard Agency) Recreational users of South Beach</p> <p>Minimal effort</p>	<p>BFP (Eastern) Off Shore Group Newcastle Windcat Workboats Businesses (affected by potential construction and those flooded in 2013) Excelsior Trust Jeldwen site owners Nexen Media Residents (local to potential construction site and those flooded in 2013) Excelsior Trust Lowestoft Maritime Business Forum (john Wylson) Tourist Board Destination Management Organisation Marina Owners GPS Diving Proudman Oceanographic Dudmans RNLI Developers or potential developers (through economic development) Bird's Eye</p> <p>Keep informed</p>
<p>Claridge (Tank Farm) Network Rail The Crown Estate RSPB Suffolk Wildlife Trust English Heritage Essex and Suffolk Water Schools and colleges</p>	<p>CEFAS MMO Royal Yacht Association New Anglia LEP Lowestoft Cruising Club International Boat Building College Environment Agency Natural England Anglian Water Broads Authority Recreational River Users Commercial river users Broads Authority Associated British Ports Lowestoft Marina Gordon Haywood (Harbour Road jetty) Peter Colby Trinity House Defra Secretary of State Boston Putford Landowners Brookes Business Park RNSYC (yacht club) County and District Councillors Members of Parliament</p>

High

<p>Keep satisfied</p>	<p>NFFO (fishermans organisation) Transco Highways Agency Suffolk County Council East Suffolk Council Suffolk Chamber of Commerce Lowestoft Town Council Oulton Broad Parish Council</p> <p>Key players</p>
------------------------------	--

Key interests and concerns – tidal element

The following key interests and concerns analysis is a supplementary exercise to support the tidal element of the project through the engagement which will be required for the Transport Works Act Order. This will provide additional support in helping the project team to understand what each stakeholder may see as their primary concerns and specific interests. The exercise benefitted from evidence and experience from similar projects elsewhere in the UK, for example the Ipswich Tidal Barrier and Boston Barrier.

Key player

Who	Interest	Concern
Royal Yacht Association and leisure users	Navigation – any adverse impacts and/or benefits to their boatyard	Negative impacts during construction and during operation once the gate is in place.
Broads Authority	Environmental impacts	Construction impacts, geomorphology of channel Environmental impacts upstream
Businesses, Associated British Ports and their customers	Adverse impacts and/or benefits to their business/operation/customers	Height of walls and changes to docks during construction. Longer term adverse effects Environmental impacts Impacts on Wind Energy projects using the harbour
Highways Agency	Impacts on their asset/need to protect their asset	Operation of gates on their asset Impacts on planning and installation on the third crossing
Associated British Ports	Strategic interest in navigation and environmental interests	Spoil disposal Operational concerns Impacts on their tenants Impact on the environment – will have conditions to add to any Transport Works Act

		Order and/or planning permission
UK Power Networks	Impact on their assets	Potential damage to assets during the construction
Landowners (potentially affected by the tidal works inc. walls)	Access to their land/assets. Potential blight/enhancements	Rights of access Long-term maintenance Long-term impacts Links to other schemes such as a Third Crossing

Keep satisfied

Who	Interest	Concern
Historic England	Grade 2 listed buildings around yacht club	Impact upon listed buildings. Will want to be consulted on conservations matters and listed buildings
Environmental bodies	Environment and conservation impacts upstream (hydraulic modelling) SPA	Construction impacts, geomorphology of channel Migration and release of contamination
Network Rail	Protecting their assets	Will the work will have any implications for their assets
The Crown Estate	Marginal interest	Disposal of material at sea

Key stakeholders – fluvial and pluvial element

Interest

Insurance Company Wider Community Local Recreation Clubs	Suffolk Wildlife Trust Utilities Meadow Priory School Environmental Interest Group IDB Emergency Services Lowestoft Tourism Group Businesses Kirkley Fen users/ fishermen Pakefield Riding School Lowestoft Vision Lowestoft Rising Suffolk Chamber of Commerce Oulton Broad Business Group
Minimal	Keep informed
Peter Aldous MP Media Natural England Highways England Broads Authority	District Councillors Ward Councillors House holders / residents – impacted by flooding Carlton Colville action group

County Councillors Hot Spot Communities (those not already mentioned) Land Owners (ABP)	Carlton Colville Town Council Landowner with short listed option on their land Residents of Colville Rd Kirkley Residents Association Kirkley Business Group SCC LLFA SCC Highways Aldwyck Way Housing Association Velda Close / Aldwyck Way Residents Tutorial Media Teams All Saints Road residents Cllr Matthew Hicks WDC Landowner (Meadow Park) Risk Management Authority Planning Authority Environment Agency Anglian Water Kirkley Stream Riparian areas Residents of The Street (Carlton Colville) RFCC LEP Lowestoft Town Council Oulton Broad Town Council
Keep satisfied	Key Players

Observations and recommendations from this analysis

Options for the project, whether tidal, fluvial or pluvial need to be technically feasible, economically viable and environmentally sound. We will share these options with the community but there will be elements where there is limited scope for people to influence or affect what can be achieved. We will need to closely manage expectations. There will also be the need to articulate these limitations clearly to those with whom we intend to involve and collaborate.

Ensuring that this project remains closely linked to other initiatives, plans and consultations in the area is also key, particularly the Gull Wing. We will also need to ensure that we link closely to Lowestoft Rising and the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Plan.

The economic development and regeneration and planning teams are key internal links in terms of assisting to identify and unlock potential investment which would benefit the project.

3. Objectives

3.1 Business objective

The objective of the project is to reduce the risk to Lowestoft of all forms of flooding – tidal, fluvial and pluvial and vulnerability to coastal erosion. The project will protect existing homes

and businesses and support economic growth and development in the town alongside other potential infrastructure improvements identified in development in the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Plan (LTIP).

3.2 Strategic communications objectives

Although, due to the scale of the project and resource available, the scope for significant participation and influence beyond those directly affected is limited, the overall impact of the project affects many people and businesses in Lowestoft. The project also links with other plans and aspirations for the area through the local plan, Lowestoft Rising and the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Plan. Therefore, key strategic communications objectives are to:

- Raise awareness of the project, activities, what is achievable and limitations among partner staff (all levels), the media (including trade), key politicians and policy makers, stakeholders and the public.
- Through targeted involvement, unlock potential funding sources and contributions.
- Achieve a broad understanding and support for the project from partner staff (all levels), the media (including trade), key politicians and policy makers, stakeholders and the public.

3.3 Project team objectives

- To follow guidance to consult.
- To update key stakeholders and the local community on progress of the scheme's development.
- To explain the work we are doing.
- To demonstrate to people the long term risks.
- To make the community aware of what we can do, what we can't do and what might be possible (for example, what they can do).
- To help people understand what the scheme is and gain support.
- To help people understand and react to the true level of risk faced.
- To understand people's continuing concerns and do all that is possible to address these, to provide reassurance or explain what is or can/cant be done.
- To provide responses, as part of the planning process and Transport Works Act Order, to these concerns.

3.3 Communications plan objectives

The following communication plan objectives will be revisited and refined as the project progresses.

1. By 1st April 2022, we will have established and met with a Navigation Working Group, creating a forum in which concerns of marine users can be raised ahead of the Transport Works Act Order.
2. By 31st March 2023 we will have used a range of communications activities to continue to raise awareness in the community about the tidal flood wall works and associated disruption and have consulted them on the final options, construction methodology and implications ahead of preparation for the Transport Works Act Order.

3. By 31st March 2023, we will have used a range of communications to promote an understanding of the benefits of the tidal flood wall works to businesses and residents.
4. By 31st March 2023, we will ensure that over 60% of those surveyed in the community believe that the project is for the benefit of the community.
5. By 31st March 2023, we will have identified objections from the wider stakeholder groups and publics with relation to the Transport Works Act Order.
6. By 31st March 2023, we will have worked to overcome any objections from the wider stakeholder groups and publics that we have identified.
7. By 31st March 2023, we will have worked with local schools and colleges to facilitate a flood risk scenario activity, to help fulfil one of our Social Value KPIs and raising the profile of the project.

4. Communication risks and mitigating action

Trigger	Escalators	Impacts	Mitigating Action
Raised expectations of the ability to influence/change the scope of the project.	Failure to clearly communicate the limitations of influence during stakeholder engagement.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Objections to the TWAO result in a public inquiry. Increased project costs due to delay. Reputational damage.	Open, honest and transparent communication which clearly sets out what is in scope and what is out of scope for change.
The project's objectives, process and communications are impacted by a change in politics or become part of the political debate.	Funding streams changed or cut. Lack of interest/ support for the project.	Project cannot be fully funded. Project paused or not completed. Increased costs due to delay.	Significant effort is made by all partners to ensure that the project remains politically neutral and that information is shared widely irrespective of party politics.
Stakeholders that are directly affected by the project are not sufficiently involved resulting in disagreement on the proposed project.	Insufficient stakeholder engagement. Poor/ unclear communication.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Objections to the TWAO result in a public inquiry. Increased project costs due to delay. Reputational damage.	Sufficient opportunities are offered to get involved with the project and stakeholders can see where their feedback has helped shape the final outcome.

Negative media coverage.	Lack of correct information. Social media trolls.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Possible pause to activities whilst problems resolved. Increased costs. Reputational damage.	Ensure broader engagement is sufficient. Inform media of progress in open, honest and transparent manner. Make sure CPE spokesperson available for radio, television and print media equipped with all key facts, figures and messaging. Employees to adhere to social media policy. Use social media monitoring and listening to detect negative changes in online conversation and identify potential risks. Include social media crisis plan as part of social media strategy.
Project is delayed as more time is needed for stakeholder engagement.	Opportunities for stakeholder engagement missed. Poor planning resulting in time lost.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Project delayed resulting in funding loss. Increased costs due to project delay.	Ensure adequate time is built in the programme for communications and engagement including time needed to reflect and provide feedback on how views have shaped the final plan.
Strategy requirements to meet the demands of stakeholders directly affected are unaffordable.	Failure to identify unaffordable expectations resulting in missed opportunities in communications to manage expectations.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Project delayed resulting in increased costs. Reputational damage.	Ensure communications manage expectations.
The funding gap for the tidal barrier remains open and there is little or no chance of this element of the project progressing.	Unsuccessful funding applications. Funding lost as a result of project delays.	Project delayed. Possible pause of project.	Open, honest and transparent communications led by the Leader of the Council, Member of Parliament and key partners, with next steps to and a clear policy for community safety.
Covid-19 restrictions impact upon the ability to engage stakeholders and	Insufficient effort is made to explore alternative	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities.	Suite of virtual engagement tools used to ensure that our engagement can still progress.

publics in the project development and construction.	engagement options. Virtual engagement options are not made accessible to those without access to the internet/ technology required.	Objections to the TWAO result in public inquiry. Increased project costs due to delay. Reputational damage.	Full accessibility considered and other methods of engagement such as postal used to ensure actions are inclusive. Media informed of the project progress including adherence to Covid-19 safe practices. Social media monitored and positive posts put out about project progress including adherence to Covid-19 safe practices.
Loss of key project staff.	Unable to access information. No alternative resources.	Unable to access project information. Project delayed. Increased costs.	All project information including documents, correspondence, emails etc to be saved on central location accessible by all project staff. Ensure IT department able to grant access to Sharepoint, Teams and email inboxes in event of problem. Project Manager to identify deputy when project planning. Any delay to be communicated with stakeholders
Technological failure.	Project information lost.	Increased costs. Project delayed. Reputational damage.	Ensure sufficient filing and back-up procedures are in place and adhered to.
Navigation Simulation Results lead to change in design, potentially increasing costs and changing impact on stakeholders.	Poor/ unclear communication. Opportunities for stakeholder engagement missed.	Lack of support and cooperation for project activities. Project delayed. Reputational damage. Increased costs.	Open, honest and transparent communications which clearly sets out how the design has changed and why.
Legal agreements for the tidal floodwalls are not agreed in time to meet programme.	Works stop (package 1) and/ or delayed (package 2)	Project delayed. Increased costs. Loss of reputation.	Keep in regular contact with project team to understand likelihood. Prepare key messages for this eventuality.
Supply chain issues lead to programme delays.	Works are delayed.	Project delayed. Increased costs. Loss of reputation.	Keep in regular contact with project team to understand likelihood and how exactly construction will be affected. Prepare key messages for this eventuality.

Tidal wall works programme over runs into the summer months	Works are disruptive and negatively affect tourism in the area.	Reputation loss, lack of support and cooperation for the project, loss of income for businesses, negative impact of tourism economy as a result of the project.	Keep in regular contact with the project team to understand the impact. Open, honest and transparent communications which clearly sets out potential impact with as much notice as possible.
---	---	---	--

Mitigating action will be reliant upon which point in construction and phasing of the project has been reached. If a funding gap remains this could also be viewed as an opportunity to lobby Central Government.

Critical to this is public safety and the continued involvement of the Suffolk Resilience Forum and emergency planners remains essential as the project progresses.

5. Strategy for communications and engagement

5.1 Key messages

We are working in partnership to identify ways of reducing the risk of flooding from surface water, rivers and the sea for many years to come, taking in consideration all factors including climate change.

In December 2013 over 150 homes and businesses were flooded and Lowestoft was effected for many days after the tidal surge. The Lowestoft Flood Risk Management Project will provide valuable protection for people, homes and businesses for many years to come.

We will be exploring all forms of funding to help us to do this work.

Lowestoft is the only highly urbanised area in the UK without formal flood protection. This is infrastructure which is critical to support the economic growth and development of Lowestoft. It is also critical in reducing the risk to people, homes and businesses.

A robust approach to future flood protection will remove the obstacles to economic regeneration, protect existing property and commercial assets as identified through the Lowestoft Transport and Infrastructure Plan.

Through this project we want to unlock the potential for economic growth, in particular associated with tourism and inward investment from offshore development.

We want to stimulate development and creation of jobs by removing the barriers caused by having areas which are vulnerable to the risk of flooding.

Lowestoft is a strategic area nationally for the Wind Energy Projects, we are ensuring that the port stays operational throughout the key points of the year to enable their work to continue.

In December 2013 over many hundreds of homes and businesses were devastated by the East Coast tidal surge. With climate change and sea level rise a reoccurrence of these devastating consequences is inevitable.

Specific key messages and expansion relating to issues arising during construction will be developed as appropriate, for example as traffic management and noise issues arise during Ground Investigations or construction.

5.2 Audiences

1. Internal – Members, staff, working groups, partner organisation leaders/senior personnel.
2. Media - local media and trade press. National media where possible.
3. Key politicians/policy makers - county and district councillors, MPs, MEPs and relevant ministers. LGA officials.
- 4 General public, resident's groups, community groups, local businesses and business groups.
5. Other partner organisations, other local authorities.

5.4 Tactics

Inform

Social media and electronic media

- Twitter
- Facebook
- YouTube (potential for YouTube diaries and clips as work progresses)
- Instagram
- Website – a project website has been developed so that people can find information easily and to showcase individual elements of the project.
- Virtually engagement centre
- Virtual careers fair
- VR/AR tools to demonstrate the potential tidal barrier
- Film and film clips to capture social history and current views for use to drive SEO and develop social channels.

Traditional media

- Newspapers/radio/television
- A traditional media campaign is vital to ensure that all opportunities to inform those directly and indirectly involved are capitalized upon.

- Press releases and campaigns will be developed at specific points in construction, for example:

Phase 1.

- Ground breaking and completion for flood tidal flood walls
- Completion for fluvial/pluvial works
- Press invitation for property level protection launch
- Completion of the tidal walls project and barrier naming competition

Phase 2.

- Ground breaking for tidal barrier
- Programme of media involvement throughout project construction, at key points
- Completion and opening ceremony

Marketing opportunities

- Posting information on key partner and key group websites

This allows us to provide targeted information, for example, information important to businesses who may be seeking to invest/locate/identify key suppliers may be posted on the New Anglia website or in their regular ezine update. This could be repeated with parishes included in the strategy, using their local magazines, newsletters and parish websites.

- Signage and information boards

These could be placed at key sites to ensure that we are keeping local people up-to-date with the latest information, particularly in key areas of progress.

- Internal briefings

We would use these much the same as signage and information boards externally to ensure that key internal stakeholders are kept informed to progress.

- MP and local council briefings

To provide the same level of information as above.

- Newsletters

These will provide stakeholders with updates as the project progresses once construction on package 1 of the tidal flood walls has begun.

- SEO optimisation and development of social channels

Through the use of episodic film clips linked to social history, current views and forward look.

- East Anglian Coastal Conference

Marketing the project widely through this conference and through the live-streaming and hybrid approach to a wider geographical audience.

- LGA Coastal Special Interest Group

Marketing the project and best practice to local authorities across the UK

Information Gathering

Broad

Public engagement activities will be used to gather information as widely as possible from the community. This may include:

- Drop-ins
- Virtual Project Updates
- Social Media
- Virtual engagement information points and tools

Targeted

Targeted meetings with external and internal partners and colleagues will provide specific information needed to inform.

- Property Landowners Group formed to engage landowners beyond ABP.
- Bite size project updates for specific groups including Marine and Oulton Broad
- Section 5 and 6 stakeholders invited to request project update as needed.

Involve

The process of involving stakeholders who are key to the project is time consuming and therefore needs to be proportionate to the desired outcome.

The majority of this involvement is likely to be through face-to-face meetings but may also include:

- Workshops
- Focus groups (theme or location related)
- Business groups (topic related)

The above can also be applied to internal stakeholder. For the media, it may be appropriate to consider strategic press launches.

Collaborate

The nature of this type of engagement has less resource implications as the above in terms of frequency as it involves a smaller group of stakeholders who are coming together to achieve a specific outcome or decision. But the time taken with actions and outcomes should not be underestimated. This is also likely to then impact upon time and resource for more involvement with key stakeholders as actions and outcomes are taken forward. For example it will include:

- Project meetings such as the Strategic Flood Steering Group
- Specific topic meetings such as funding

6. Resources

6.1 Budget

A budget of £5,000 per project year has been allocated to delivering the communications and engagement activities from this project. This covers venue hire, materials etc. but does not cover resource. Additional funds have been allocated to reflect the need for virtual tools to combat the challenges presented by the global pandemic.

Engagement will be proportionate and appropriate with resource provided partners and where appropriate, supporting consultants. Communications planning and delivery will be managed and delivered, in the main part, by Coastal Partnership East. Engagement support will also be provided by the contractor as part of the design and build stage of the project.

6.2 Branding

Within standard guidelines of partners.

7. Evaluation and monitoring

The overall programme for evaluation outlines the criteria for judging what is effective. Below is set out the specific ways that we will measure success against our objectives, tackling these using three criteria:

- Awareness
- Acceptance
- Action

Timing is also crucial to the evaluation and monitoring process, building in enough time in our programme of engagement to reflect upon actions and to review and refresh if these are not delivering the outcome desired.

Awareness – this is linked to campaigns and questionnaire so evaluation would be linked to:

- Media coverage and calculation of media impressions for media campaigns
- Google analytics of social media response.
- Number of questionnaires returned for surveys (including consultation feedback)

Acceptance – this is linked to requests for information and expressing interest and support so evaluation would be linked to:

- Percentage of positive/neutral media coverage
- Google analytics of social media response
- Positive/neutral feedback from public consultation events and on-going enquiries
- Positive/neutral feedback from business and community advisory group

Action – this is a measurement of results so evaluation would be linked to:

- Limited/no objections to Transport Works Act Order (tidal works)
- Limited/no objections to planning applications (tidal walls/fluvial/pluvial works as appropriate)
- Local endorsement of fluvial/pluvial options and resulting work
- Positive media response/social media response to overall project

- Level of continued involvement of members of business and community advisory group

8. Communications Activity Plan

Date	Action	Audience	Responsible	Output/further action
29/01/2021	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Strategic Steering Group Members	CF	
01/02/2021	Regular comms debriefs to evaluate feedback (mid-monthly)	Stakeholders, publics	LF/ CF/ SB	
23/02/2021	Key Stakeholder Group Meeting	Key Stakeholder Group Members	CF	A repeat of first meeting in 6 weeks; second meeting in 12 weeks. Set up meetings with property owners and navigation working group.

12/03/2021	Social Media Updates - weekly	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
26/03/2021	Property landowners Group Meeting	Property Landowners/ Landlords	CF	
06/04/2021	Key Stakeholder Group Meeting	Key Stakeholder Group Members	CF	
30/04/2021	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Strategic Steering Group Members	CF	Meetings to be quarterly.
04/05/2021	Stakeholder and Publics workshop	Stakeholders, publics	CF	Attendance low – to be rebranded as bite size sessions with specific area of concern focus.

06/05/2021	Stakeholder and Publics workshop	Stakeholders, publics	CF	Attendance low – to be rebranded as bite size sessions with specific area of concern focus.
10/05/2021	Stakeholder and Publics workshop	Stakeholders, publics	CF	Attendance low – to be rebranded as bite size sessions with specific area of concern focus.
21/05/2021	Ground breaking Physical event withing Covid restrictions and live stream	Stakeholders, publics	LF/ CF / SB	

24/05/2021	Virtual Engagement goes live	Stakeholders, publics	LF/ CF	
01/06/2021	SM/ Web – Access Community Trust providing onsite catering	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
02/06/2021	Key Stakeholder Group Meeting	Key Stakeholder Group Members	CF	
10/06/2021	SM/ Web - East Suffolk College Presentations re. Apprenticeships – filming for SM & web	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	105 students attended Video provided to ESC - insufficient quality to shar
14/06/2021	SM/ Web - Constructionarium – Women in Construction event w/ BB apprentice	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
21/06/2021	Meeting with Luke Utterly re. school engagement 21/22	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
01/07/2021	Project update Newsletter, particular	Stakeholders, publics	CF	

	focus on Section 5 and 6 stakeholders			
10/08/2021	SM/ Web – Nuffield Work Experience Placement	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
22/09/2021	Full Council Meeting re. 40m Barrier	Stakeholders, publics	TEP	
22/09/2021	RNSYC Meeting re. 40m Barrier	Stakeholders, publics	TEP	
01/10/2021	Press release re. temporary defence exercise	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
01/10/2021	Offer Kwik-Fit some comms support re. open as normal, different car parking	Stakeholders, publics	CF	

07/10/2021	Norfolk and Suffolk Coast Conference – LFRMP Schools Session, Apprentice talk and Careers Fair	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
25/10/2021	Meeting with Luke Utterly re. schools engagement – re-advertising of live session, Schools naming of LFRMP and potential future Careers engagement	Stakeholder, publics	CF/ LF	Luke to introduce CF and LF to his contacts in schools
25/10/2021	Social media – work experience placement from East Coast College	Stakeholder, publics	CF/ LF	
28/10/2021	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF/SB	
03/11/2021	Key Stakeholder Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ SB	

09/11/2021	Meeting (virtual) with artist Genevieve Clarke to explore possible collaboration	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
22/11/2021	Social media - Work placement as part of Prince's Trust Scheme	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
22/11/2021	Social media – Weekly construction updates with photos	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ LF	
25/11/2021	Meeting (virtual) with Heritage Action Zone – Aly Tipping, Rebecca Styles	Stakeholder, publics	CF/ LF	
12/2021	Social media/ poss. Press release – Salvation Army gift appeal	Stakeholders, publics	LF/CF	
01/12/2021	Update Virtual Visitor Centre re. 40m barrier	Stakeholders, publics	CF	

01/12/2021	Newsletter re. 40m barrier, Package 2 of tidal floodwalls and Port Entrance works	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
04/01/2022	SM/ comms around donation of racking to Re-Utilise	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
17/01/2022	Press Release/ comms around Package 2 of the tidal floodwalls	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ AS	
17/01/2022	Press release/ comms re. Port Entrance Works	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ AS	
24/01/2022	Newsletter – Jan update	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ AS	
14/02/2022	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	SB/ CF	

28/02/2022	Key Stakeholder Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	SB/ CF	
31/01/2022	Press release/ comms re. Navigation Simulation	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
08/02/2022	Press release/ comms re. project donation of van costs for Access Community Trust	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
10/03/2022	Internal workshop review (TWA0)	Project team	SB/ CF	
01/04/2022	Letter to residents and SM around Waveney Road night closure and footpath closure and works on Station Square.	Stakeholders/ publics	CF/ LF	

08/04/2022	Comms around finishing on South Pier for the Summer – explain where up to, why stopped and when continuing	Stakeholders/ publics	CF	
27/04/2022	East Coast College Careers Fair	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
29/04/2022	April Newsletter	Stakeholders/ publics	CF	
02/05/2022	Defra briefing ahead of MP meeting with minister	Stakeholders	CF/ SB	
09/05/2022	Comms around Hamilton Road works – Global Assets International	Stakeholders/ publics	CF	

17/05/2022	Visit to Dell Primary School	Stakeholders, publics	SB/CF	
05/07/2022	TWAO Development meeting	Internal	CF/ SB	
08/07/2022	Deployment Plan workshop	Stakeholders	CF/SB	
01/07/2022	LFRMP Newsletter	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
01/08/2022	Comms around completing SPR/ Hamilton Road progression	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
01/08/2022	Comms around completion of the Port Entrance Works	Stakeholders, publics	CF	

08/2022	Update Virtual Visitor Centre	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
08/ 2022	EIA Consultation	Stakeholders, publics	Jacobs	
09/09/2022	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF/CB	
01/10/2022	Comms around re-commencement of package 2	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
13/10/2022	Norfolk and Suffolk Coast Forum Conference Schools Stage	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
21/10/2022	Key Stakeholder Group hosted workshop – EAI/ NIA/ BOP	Stakeholders, publics	CF/SB	

31/10/2022	Review responses from workshop	Stakeholders, publics	CF/SB	
11/11/2022	Key Stakeholder Group meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ SB	
14/11/2022	Issue public consultation documents	Stakeholders, publics	SB/ CF	
14/11/2022 – 07/01/2023	Public consultation period – must include residents effected by construction	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ SB	
23/11/2022 – 24/11/2022	Public consultation event	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ SB	Concern adverse weather affected attendance – further targeted engagement planned.
12/ 2022	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF/SB	Postponed until after TWAO application submission.

01/2023	Review consultation responses	Stakeholders, publics	SB/ CF	
01/2023	Respond to consultation responses	Stakeholders, publics	SB	
01/02/2023	TWAO consultation report	Stakeholders, publics	SB	
09/02/2023	TWAO Navigation Stakeholder Engagement	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
15/02/2023	Forward plan schools activities; tidal barrier competition	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	Invite gone out to schools – primary and secondary.
20/02/2023	Communication to stakeholder database re. red line drawing amendment and channel closures	Stakeholders, publics	CF	Sent to database.

03/2023	Project newsletter	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
03/03/2023	Update consultation booklet	Stakeholder, publics	CF	
03/03/2023	Factsheet – Hamilton Road works restart	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
06/03/2023	Social media/ comms around reaching £5m social value	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
04/2023	Comms around extended working in the South Pier area	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
05/2023	Social media/ comms – drone footage of walls progress	Stakeholders, publics	CF	

05/2023	Strategic Steering Group Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
05/2023	Key Stakeholder Meeting	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
02/05/2023	Pre TWAO submission consultation complete	Stakeholders, publics	SB	
02/05/2023	Site Visit – Sir John Leman – Barrier naming competition	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
10/05/2023	School Visits – Barrier naming competition	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
24/5/2023	School Visits – Barrier naming competition	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	

06/2023	Comms around the reopening of Royal Green car park/ green	Stakeholders, publics	CF/LF	
09/2023	Press release re. Glass Tidal Flood walls opening	Stakeholders, publics	CF	
09/2023	Opening event Glass Tidal Flood Walls incl. school children	Stakeholders, publics	CF/ SB	

Supporting documents:

Appendix 1: Engagement Log

Appendix 2: tidal walls engagement plan

Stakeholder database