



# *Lymington Technical Services Ltd*

*Deacons Boatyard Ltd*

*Application for Harbour Works Consent  
for Proposed Marina Re-build  
and Associated Dredge*

*Includes Method Statement*

*June 2012  
10093HWCv21*

# Deacons Boatyard Ltd

---

Application for Harbour Works Consent for Marina  
Re-build and Associated Dredge

---

Supporting Statement

---

---

## CONTENTS

APPLICATION HISTORY	4
1 BACKGROUND	5
2 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHEME	7
3 STATUTORY DESIGNATIONS	7
4 APPLICATION PROCESS	8
5 OPERATIONAL DETAILS	8
6 COASTAL PROCESSES	9
6.1 Existing coastal process characteristics	9
6.2 Tidal prism and flow characteristics	9
6.3 Sediment Budget	10
6.4 Intertidal Areas & Dredging	10
6.5 Beneficial disposal	11
6.6 Independent Hydrodynamics Assessment	11
7 ECOLOGY	12
8 NAVIGATION	13
8.1 Issues raised as part of the MMO application process	13
8.1.1 Secondary channels and the HYS appeal	13
8.1.2 Public Slipway immediately upstream of Deacons	14
8.1.3 Vessel numbers	14
8.1.4 Marine Management Organisation	15
8.2 Potential impacts on navigation during construction	15
8.3 Potential navigation impacts during operation	15
8.4 Navigation-related mitigation	15
9 POSSIBLE IMPACTS ON INTERNATIONALLY DESIGNATED SITES	16
9.1 Water quality	16
9.1.1 Potential impacts on water quality due to dredging	16

9.1.2	Potential impacts on water quality arising from marina operations	16
9.2	Possible Impacts of Development	16
9.3	Possible impacts on birds	16
9.3.1	Disturbance to birds during construction	16
9.3.2	Mitigation proposals during construction	17
9.3.3	Disturbance to birds during operation	17
9.3.4	Mitigation proposals during operation	17
9.4	Migrating salmonids	18
9.4.1	Existing environment	18
9.4.2	Re-suspension of sediments	18
9.4.3	Noise impacts	18
10	ARCHAEOLOGY	19
11	LOCAL COMMUNITY AND OTHER USES	19
11.1	Potential impacts on the local community	19
11.2	Potential traffic impacts	19
11.2.1	Potential traffic impacts during construction	19
11.2.2	Potential traffic impacts during operation	19
11.3	Potential noise impacts	19
11.3.1	Existing noise climate	19
11.3.2	Potential noise impacts during construction	20
11.3.3	Potential noise impacts during operation	21
11.3.4	Mitigation measures for noise	21
12	VISUAL IMPACT	21
12.1	Description	21
13	SUMMARY	22
14	METHOD STATEMENT	24

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

ABPmer Report R1784 Hydrodynamic Assessment

## APPLICATION HISTORY

This document has been produced to provide supporting information for the Harbour Works Licence application. This document is a revised version of that previously submitted to the Harbour Authority which resulted in Harbour Works Consent being granted on 12<sup>th</sup> September 2011. At that time the only outstanding consent was from Eastleigh Borough Council.

In February 2012 EBC refused consent on safety of navigation and loss of open recreational area.

Following the refusal we considered the reasons for refusal and have taken on board the suggestions by the LAC members to produce a compromise scheme. Rather than make small changes we chose to make a radical change to the previous layout in order to fully address the concerns, this radical change has taken the viability of the project right to the limit.

We have had discussions with the main objectors to the previous scheme. At these meetings at the yard the view was that the current proposal was more acceptable and would be supported.

The key changes are listed below:

1. Revised layout with significant part of Y jetty as current
2. Access channel now 2m wider
3. Entry and egress to marina more in line with main channel
4. Space for vessel to 'stem the tide' whilst waiting
5. Entrance is now 27 metres wide as opposed to 21 metres wide
6. No 90° turns required at southern end
7. Access no longer shared with Elephant – significantly less vessel traffic
8. Potential for small craft to avoid narrower section of main channel
9. The layout retains some mid-stream moorings as requested by third parties
10. Note also that the assessment of the previous scheme concluded that the number of vessels leaving and entering would be 5-10 per day at the *height* of summer. This is much less than the numbers of vessels that transit the navigation channel.

The application was considered by Eastleigh Borough Council on 28<sup>th</sup> June 2012 and consent was granted. The planning officer highlighted the fact that unlike the previous application the level of objections had reduced to two private individuals and no objections were received from organisations that use the river.

The next stages in the application process are to update the previous consents to reflect the revised layout. No changes are proposed to the dredging.

This document relates to the Harbour Works Consent.

## 1 BACKGROUND

Deacons Boatyard is a medium sized boatyard and marina situated on the western edge of the River Hamble just downstream of the A27 Bridge. The boatyard has been operating continuously since 1922.

Deacons Boatyard has been in the same ownership since the early fifties providing a fully functional boatyard and marina. During that time (60 years) the clients' vessels have ranged from the larger boats through to dinghies.

Deacons are very well known and regarded within the industry as a yard that supports the 'ordinary mans' boat, a philosophy that continues today. This is where the major part of the business lies.

In order that Deacons can continue to serve the existing and future customer base the marina requires modernisation. Over the last 10 years Deacons has undertaken significant reconfiguration of the boatyard (land) itself.

The boatyard infrastructure and layout integrates with the proposed marina and the consented buildings which are yet to be built as the last phase of a well-designed facility in the heart of the south coast's premier yachting location. The whole facility has not been increased in size nor designed to allow an increase in the size of boats, the infrastructure will not accommodate that.

The proposed development remains within the footprint operated for nearly 60 years, both afloat and ashore.

The potential for this site continues to grow each year as Deacons adapts to the economic climate and the change in the basic design of the boats that customers bring.

As Deacons develops they will be providing more facilities for commerce and leisure. In unison with that goes employment, the yard has the ability to increase the employment on site considerably over the next few years both by new companies coming to site in the new buildings and also the boatyard as the facilities on site develop.

Deacons Boatyard is committed to improving the facilities and, despite the economic climate, are undertaking a large financial investment in the site. This combined with the new marina and facilities proposed, will continue to support their customers and the local economy as the business continues to grow.

The photo on the next page shows the site with the Crown Lease indicated in blue.



The River Hamble is widely considered to be the Mecca of sailing and the existing boatyards/marinas provide essential services to maintain this centre of excellence. Continued investment in such facilities is necessary to maintain this status.

The marina consists of a mix of both wet and drying berths in a similar layout to the adjacent yards.

In the last few years the site has undergone investment leading to improved land facilities. The floating pontoons forming the marina are some 40-60 years old and require replacement. Additionally the piles all require replacement.

The existing linear layout is no longer suitable as boats are now wider and the current layout is making operation difficult. As part of the replacement the opportunity will be taken to modernise the layout whilst keeping the same number of berths. In order to prevent any negative impacts the rebuild will be within the current site operational footprint.

The modern style of marina berthing is designed specifically to accommodate the current distributions of vessel sizes and is common in this river. The current layout is prone to double berthing which makes operation difficult. This can be seen in the lower part of the photo (Elephant Boatyard).

Over the years the levels of silt have built up within the marina area and the opportunity will also be taken to reinstate practical operational depths as were previously available. In terms of marine licences this is classed as a capital dredge because dredging has not been undertaken within the last 10 years. In operational terms it is a maintenance dredge.

## 2 PHYSICAL CHARACTERISTICS OF SCHEME

The proposed marina will provide pontoon moorings for a similar number of vessels as at present. There will be no increase in vessel numbers. The following drawings are supplied:

Drawing 10093/25A - shows the existing layout with soundings

Drawing 10093/26 - shows the proposed layout

Drawing 10093/27 - shows the proposed layout over the existing layout

Drawing 10093/28A - shows the proposed layout with dredge area indicated

The main construction activities are:

-the removal by dredging of approx 6,000m<sup>3</sup> of material for disposal at sea. Dredging will be conducted using a backhoe dredger and split hopper disposal barges. The use of the dredged material in a beneficial disposal operation is considered unrealistic at this time (see later).

-the installation of marina pontoons using pre-assembled components that connect together on site. Steel tubular piles driven from floating plant will be used to hold the units in position. Non-percussive techniques will be used wherever practicable.

The following coordinates (WGS84) define the area of the works:

50° 53.0161' N 1° 18.2664' W  
50° 52.9850' N 1° 18.2089' W  
50° 53.0696' N 1° 18.1027' W  
50° 53.0805' N 1° 18.1230' W  
50° 53.0760' N 1° 18.1776' W

## 3 STATUTORY DESIGNATIONS

Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI) - The nearest SSSI (Lincegrove and Hackett's Marshes) is approximately 500m downstream of the site.

The Special Protection Area (SPA – Solent & Southampton Water) and Ramsar site overlay the SSSI, i.e. some 500m downstream.

The Special Area of Conservation (SAC – Solent Maritime) boundary has been drawn on the River Hamble using a small scale map which has presented some anomalies in the past. When this boundary was established it was intended to follow the MLW mark except where development existed (i.e. marinas and boatyards). In the majority of cases the boundary excludes hard areas such as marinas and shore connected pontoons (Mercury Yacht Harbour being a relevant example).

At Deacons Boatyard the boundary follows approximately the MLW mark and hence includes the bulk of the pontoons. This is an anomaly that has occurred at other locations (principally Swanwick Marina and Universal Marina) where similar work has been permitted.

Site of Importance for Nature Conservation (SINC) – No part of the works is within the SINC boundary.

#### **4 APPLICATION PROCESS**

The following main applications are necessary for these works:

LPA – Primarily for the land based components down to the MLW mark (Town & Country Planning Act boundary). It is usually accepted that works crossing this boundary (the pontoons in this case) are included in the planning application because of associated impacts. This would include environmental, transport and general development issues. It *does not* include the dredging works.

##### **CONSENT GRANTED**

MMO (Marine Management Organisation) – CPA/FEPA licences (2 No.) are required for the dredging and disposal of the material and for the installation (deposit on the sea bed) of the marina. This includes all the marine aspects of the work up to MHWS. (Note that this system changed in 2012 and a single Marine Licence would now include both construction and dredging). **CONSENTS GRANTED, LAYOUT CONSENT TO BE UPDATED**

Harbour Works Consent – this is primarily concerned with safe navigation and environmental impacts on the existing waterway.

Flood Defence Consent (formally Land Drainage Consent) – primarily concerned with any works that may have an impact on flooding. **CONSENT GRANTED – TO BE UPDATED WITH REVISED LAYOUT**

It should be noted that the above applications overlap (for example the MMO consult all of the others as statutory consultees).

#### **5 OPERATIONAL DETAILS**

The boatyard will continue to be operated as at present. The proposed works should be seen as a full scale maintenance operation as is carried out at other marinas, the recently permitted works at Swanwick Marina being a prime example.

The new layout has been designed and will be operated in accordance with the Yacht Harbour Association's Code of Practice. Additionally, the Green Blue initiative will be adopted to ensure best environmental practice. Recycling is already in operation.

Although no fuel services will be supplied an oil spill kit will be kept on site in order to deal with any spills.

## 6 COASTAL PROCESSES

### 6.1 Existing coastal process characteristics

The boatyard is sited in the upper reaches of the estuary in a highly developed area. Tide flows through the A27 Bridge just upstream are constrained and hence relatively strong. At the midpoint of the outer berthing at Deacons the tide has a typical flow velocity of 0.75m/s flood and 1.3m/s ebb (1.5kn and 2.6kn respectively), (ABPmer Report R1784). It is for this reason that the site has not required dredging within the 10 year maintenance cut-off as the levels of deposition have been small per annum.

Following the construction of Swanwick marina (in the 1960's) a sheet pile training wall was installed to replicate the edge of the removed bank and encourage the tidal flows to pass round the bend in a smooth manner. The wall position is somewhat further into the channel than the original banks leading to the higher tidal flows. Due to problems with the training wall on a flood tide (large cross currents at the end) holes were cut to dampen the effect.

On the flood tide these holes allow the tidal flow to head more towards Deacons Boatyard than was previously the case. This flow (which carries the suspended sediment) explains why the inshore area does not self-scour.

The tidal levels (in metres above CD) for this area are as follows:

HAT	5.1m
MHWS	4.6m
MHWN	3.8m
MLWN	2.0m
MLW	1.4m
MLWS	0.7m
LAT (CD)	0.2m

### 6.2 Tidal prism and flow characteristics

Impacts on tidal prism (volume of water between HW and LW) and the flow characteristics are an area that requires examination for any potential impact.

The total volume of dredging proposed is approx. 6000m<sup>3</sup> but this includes material removed below Chart Datum.

The volume of material to be removed that would contribute to an increase in tidal prism is 850m<sup>3</sup> on the basis of CD. However, as this level is only rarely reached it is more reasonable to take MLWS as the base of the tidal prism calculations. This gives an increase of 350m<sup>3</sup>.

Taking MLW (1.4m) to MHWS gives a prism increase of 45m<sup>3</sup>

The tidal prism for the Hamble estuary is approximately 6.5 x 10<sup>6</sup> m<sup>3</sup>.

In terms of the effect on the tidal prism of the estuary the volume of increase in the prism is not significant. The volumetric change is so small that it is well below measureable values.

In terms of the flow regime the local deepening will have two possible impacts on the flow. By deepening the section there will be less effect of bed friction on the flow so it will tend to travel faster. However, the increase in cross section will tend to reduce the flow velocities. Additionally, the frictional effects of the piles, pontoons and moored vessels will add another complexity.

Modelling the combination of such effects is difficult and can be misleading. In similar situations of marina dredges and constructions that we have been involved with (e.g. Universal Marina, River Hamble, Hampshire) it has been apparent that the combination of such changes balance well with no adverse impacts being identified. This is discussed further in the ABPmer report on the hydrodynamics.

### 6.3 Sediment Budget

The initial dredge will result in a net loss of approximately 6000m<sup>3</sup> of material. Future maintenance dredges would remove siltation. However, on the basis that a dredge has not been required in the past it is anticipated that a maintenance dredge would not be required for at least 5 years. This figure is conservative (i.e. short) and is necessary to cover any potential impacts of the large dredge planned at Swanwick.

Siltation plots for nearby marinas indicate a low level of deposition of approximately 0.2m at inshore locations.

Re-distribution of this material (beneficial re-use) within the harbour is considered impractical at this time. It will, however, be considered during future dredging operations (see also later).

Due to the locally low levels of deposition no long term effects on suspended sediment levels or the sediment regime are anticipated. There will be very localised, short-term increases in suspended sediment during dredging operations but due to the plant selected the dispersal area will be very local to the dredger.

### 6.4 Intertidal Areas & Dredging

The proposed dredge has been carefully designed to minimise any loss of intertidal areas. This is achieved by sloping the inshore section of the dredge such that the top of the slope is at MLW (1.4m ACD). By reducing the permitted dredge tolerance in this region the area removed has been further reduced. The area to be removed above this level is 114m<sup>2</sup>. This is primarily a narrow strip along the edge of the bank.

In order to mitigate this loss some of the inshore berthing is to be removed (as indicated on drawing 10093/26). This effectively frees up some 424m<sup>2</sup> of inter tidal area.

To summarise, careful arrangement of the dredging and removal of some inter tidal berthing has provided a net gain of 310m<sup>2</sup>.

## 6.5 Beneficial disposal

Beneficial use of dredged material is method of disposal that many sites would consider to be an advantage. The most likely use of dredged material is for the re-nourishment of intertidal mudflats. In order for this to be effective the nature of the material needs to be similar to that of the mudflats.

A practical method of beneficial disposal results from the use of agitation (or dispersive) dredging. In this process deposited material is agitated so that it becomes suspended within the water column. Tidal flows are then allowed to carry this material throughout the estuary. This provides a relatively natural re-distribution of material. In the Hamble Estuary (and others locally) such dredging is not permitted.

For the Hamble the use of backhoe dredgers is the accepted (by the authorities) method. For this type of dredger the removed material is contained within the hopper barges so beneficial disposal operations need to operate from the barges.

Two methods of disposal present themselves, either spraying the fine material over the mudflats (a technique known as 'rainbowing') or dumping the material just seawards of the mudflat and allowing the hydrodynamics to re-distribute the material.

There are currently issues with both of these methods. Rainbowing (commonly used for beach replenishment) may well damage the fabric of the mudflat by the mechanical action of the displacement. Dumping material may locally alter the hydrodynamics. Dumping material in a gradual manner is not practical with the type of split hopper barge used in this area (impossible to ensure gradual release). In both cases it seems likely that small-scale trials need to be undertaken.

It is considered that beneficial disposal, whilst a good idea in principle, is beyond the scope of this project. The volumes of material involved are not significantly different to the annual maintenance dredges undertaken at most of the larger marinas. To date no site on the river has undertaken beneficial disposal, all material being disposed of at sea.

We are prepared to work with the authorities with a view to using beneficial disposal in the future but this must be a joint exercise and not one instigated by the dredge material producer alone.

## 6.6 Independent Hydrodynamics Assessment

Following initial discussions with the Harbour Authority regarding the previous layout the Harbour Master requested an independent assessment of the proposal. This was to determine the following:

- Potential changes to the tidal flows in the area of the boatyard and the main channel
- Implications to the sediment behaviour outside the footprint of the boatyard

This assessment was undertaken by ABPmer as report R1784. A copy of this report is included with the submitted documentation.

The summary from this report is reproduced over:

## Summary

*ABP Marine Environmental Research Ltd (ABPmer) has been commissioned to undertake a desk study assessment of the hydrodynamic and sedimentary implications of the proposed capital dredge and new mooring configuration at Deacons Boatyard, Bursledon, on the River Hamble.*

*The proposed reconfiguration of pontoons/berths at Deacons Boatyard is designed to bring the site up to modern operational standards whilst maintaining the same number of berths within the same overall area of water. This is to be achieved by removing the existing detached pontoon structures, which are aligned parallel with the bank and river flows, and replacing them with finger pontoons and pontoon hammerheads. The capital dredge will be undertaken to a depth of 1.5m below Chart Datum (CD) to provide deeper water throughout the boatyard, with further dredging to 1.0m below CD in the vicinity of the quay where boat lifting is undertaken, The total capital dredge volume is estimated around 4180 to 5760m<sup>3</sup> depending on the dredge tolerance (up to 0.3m).*

*Overall, the effect of the proposed development on the marine environment is considered small and will be retained very local to Deacons Boatyard with most effects within the area of the facility itself. A small displacement of the deep channel flows immediately down estuary of the boatyard (beyond the extent of the training wall) may occur over the long-term, however, this will not adversely affect the overall integrity or functioning of the river. Furthermore, the proposed works are unlikely to adversely affect the sediment behaviour outside the footprint of the boatyard and the changes to the hydrodynamics will not affect navigation within the estuary.*

The revised layout has the same dredging proposals and the pontoon layout changes are insignificant in terms of the hydrodynamics (because the changes are all in the deeper undredged areas).

## 7 ECOLOGY

This is a well-developed section of the river and this explains why it is excluded from the protected areas. However it contains some inter tidal habitat that has the potential to act as a food source for SPA birds. Local observations indicate that birds prefer the quieter areas just downstream (within the SPA). The proposed mitigation will make a large area available to waterfowl if they choose to visit.

The dredge and pontoon layout has been designed specifically to minimise any impact on the important areas. The proposed method of dredging will also minimise any effect of smothering from suspended material.

Another feature of importance is that of eelgrass (*Zostera Marina*). Inspections of the site and the general locality show no evidence of this.

## 8 NAVIGATION

The proposed marina footprint has been designed such that it does not exceed the current footprint in navigation terms. It might be argued that connection of the two outer pontoon lines will be closing a small channel. However, this is not a 'secondary navigation channel' by any definition of the term. The use of the current gap for through navigation is unsafe due to the moored vessels and the strong tides in this locale. This area is only used to access the berths.

### 8.1 Issues raised as part of the MMO applications

The MMO licences relate to the Coast Protection Act 1949 and the Food and Environmental protection Act 1985 (as amended).

As part of this licensing process Public Notices were placed requesting representations on *navigational grounds*. This resulted in a number of representations.

As the revised layout effectively addresses the majority of the concerns raised (as evidenced by the lack of objections to the local authority planning application) full details are not included within this document, summary information is provided below (full details can be provided upon request).

#### *8.1.1 Secondary channels and the HYS appeal*

The definition of Secondary Channels is unclear but is best described as an alternative navigable channel. In large harbours these are more commonly referred to as 'small boat channels' and used by leisure craft to keep them out of the way of large commercial vessels. A good local example is in the entrance to Portsmouth Harbour.

In the entrance of the River Hamble a midstream mooring pontoon (B moorings) with large depths on both sides is marked by Red/Green/Red and light indicating that the preferred channel is to starboard (east of the pontoon). The upstream end of this pontoon has a Red mark indicating that the main channel is to the east. Although not specified as such the channel to the west of the B moorings is effectively an alternative navigation channel (otherwise the marker would be all red).

The key point being that for a secondary channel to exist there must be safe navigation at the entrance, during passage and at the exit. In the example described above this is clearly the case.

Examination of the UKHO charts for the Hamble shows no other areas that could be reasonably described as a secondary channel.

It is true that there are areas within the river where parallel sets of moorings exist with gaps between them. These gaps are obviously essential for moored vessels to leave and return to their moorings. In some areas there is access for small craft (i.e. powered or paddled but not under sail) to pass down these gaps.

Good examples are listed below:

1. Between A moorings and Hamble Point hammerheads

2. Between F and G moorings downstream of Mercury Yacht Harbour
3. Between U and V moorings off Bursledon Point.

In all the above good entrance and exits are possible. It might be argued that there are actually many more possible routes but in reality the nature of the moorings (often double berthed) and use by moored vessels precludes these routes for craft under safe navigation.

Whilst it is true at Deacons that there are two areas where small vessels could transit through the existing marina it is obvious that this could only be by small craft in full control. This would limit it to canoes and small dinghies and not vessels under sail. The western area is particularly narrow and small craft navigating this close to larger vessels would be not taking due care (the organisations objecting to the previously consented layout stated that this particular channel was not of concern). The outer area is slightly wider and does afford some respite from vessels in the main channel. However, once in this area the craft are in conflict with larger vessels manoeuvring to and from their berths. This is again an unsafe practice.

It should also be pointed out that such access is not possible through any of the nearby sites (Elephant, Cabin, RK Marine, Riverside or Eastlands).

The proposed revised marina layout retains a significant section of the outer channel. One objector at the recent EBC meeting felt that the whole length of the channel should remain on the grounds that if a vessel was in trouble on the ebb tide then it might collide with the moored vessels on the new jetty. The fact is that this is no different to what can happen with the existing layout, in fact with the existing layout the exit gap is narrower and requires 90° turns to be made – not something that is easy for a vessel ‘in trouble’. The planning committee considered his suggestion but took the view that the new proposal is, on balance, acceptable.

In terms of small craft using the channel for through navigation the diary log of channel usage submitted as part of the previous application is still relevant in that it demonstrates negligible use. A discussion with the local Canoe Club has resulted in an assurance of support for the revised layout. As such the previously included log of small craft has been omitted from this application. However, the log is being maintained in case it is requested.

The significant differences between the HYS Appeal and the previous application remain valid. However the layout changes now mean that we no longer consider detailed discussions are necessary and they have been removed from the document. They remain available if required.

#### *8.1.2 Public Slipway immediately upstream of Deacons.*

The proposals will have no effect on the stability of use of this slipway. Access to and from the slipway will remain as at present.

#### *8.1.3 Vessel numbers*

Various individuals have tried to count the vessel numbers from aerial photographs. This can be misleading as some vessels will be ashore, some elsewhere etc. The main concern from objectors is an increase in boat numbers. For the record it is stated that the reconfiguration will NOT increase the vessel numbers beyond that at present.

#### 8.1.4 Marine Management Organisation

The Marine Management Organisation considered all objections and responses and undertook expert advice.

*Expert advice was obtained from Cefas, Marine Management Organisation (Poole Office), Natural England, Environment Agency, English Heritage, Maritime and Coastguard Agency, Crown Estate, Eastleigh Borough Council, River Hamble Harbour Authority, Royal Yachting Association and Trinity House.*

This advice included navigational, environmental and other matters. None of these bodies expressed an objection. The conditions referred to relate to timing, method of working, colregs etc and are detailed in the licence.

Having considered the objections, responses and expert advice the MMO has concluded:

*Taking into account all of the above, the MMO considers that the proposed works and their operation will not cause or be likely to result in obstruction or danger to navigation, or have any significant effect on designated sites of environmental significance.*

#### 8.2 Potential impacts on navigation during construction

The pontoons will be transported to site by road and the only possible impacts during construction will be from the marine plant.

Marine piling and dredging plant work in this river on an annual basis and river users are well versed in the operations. All of the dredging work is within the current marina footprint so apart from the barges leaving and entering there will be no impact. Similarly the piling work is all within the existing footprint however the piling barge may need to be in a position off the hammerheads for some piling. The size of the vessel is such that this will not impede any vessel capable of navigating upstream of the site (i.e. under the A27 Bridge).

All vessels will display the correct lights and shapes and maintain a listening watch on VHF in accordance with a LNTM

#### 8.3 Potential navigation impacts during operation

The designed layout follows the existing footprint and there will be no detrimental effects on navigation interests as a result of the development.

#### 8.4 Navigation-related mitigation

The upstream and downstream sections will be fitted with 2 vertical red solar powered navigation lights or as otherwise required by Trinity House.

In order to ensure suitable visibility it has already been agreed with the River Hamble Harbour Authority that no large vessel will be permitted to berth on the outside of a hammerhead (i.e. no single large vessel taking up more than half the length of a hammerhead).

## **9 POSSIBLE IMPACTS ON INTERNATIONALLY DESIGNATED SITES**

The impacts of the proposed marina development will be local in extent and negligible in terms of significance. The calculations of area and volume changes arising from the development are insignificant in relation to the estuary as a whole.

It can therefore be concluded that the proposed marina re-build will not have any adverse direct or indirect effect on any of the features of the SAC.

### 9.1 Water quality

#### *9.1.1 Potential impacts on water quality due to dredging*

Water quality, particularly dissolved oxygen (DO) and suspended sediment (SS) can be affected by dredging operations.

Backhoe dredging plant produces the minimum disturbance of sediment and would be the type of plant employed.

This is standard practice for dredging in this river and accepted by the EA and NE as good practice.

#### *9.1.2 Potential impacts on water quality arising from marina operations*

The current management measures will continue to ensure that no significant adverse environmental effects result. Due reference will be made to the Yacht Harbour Association Code of Practice for the Construction and Operation of Marinas and Yacht Harbours and the 'Environmental Code of Practice' published by the British Marine Federation, the Royal Yachting Association and the Environment Agency.

### 9.2 Possible Impacts of Development

There will be no indirect loss of important habitat (e.g. due to changes in erosion, accretion, suspended sediment concentrations, sediment transport or tidal regime). The proposed mitigation provides a positive impact.

### 9.3 Possible impacts on birds

Potential impacts on birds can only occur during the construction phase as the works are effectively a replacement of that existing.

#### *9.3.1 Disturbance to birds during construction*

Concerns about the potential impacts of the works on migrating salmonids mean that it is unlikely to be possible to phase the marine construction works to avoid the bird over-wintering period. Similar work on the River Hamble traditionally takes place between 15<sup>th</sup> September and 31<sup>st</sup> March (inc).

The main concern is for the over-wintering birds between August and March. Typically wading birds feed from around 3 hours after high water to 3 hours before high water. It is anticipated that the dredging works will occur first followed by the piling works. Piling will hence occur in areas distant to

the intertidal areas. At the margins the piling is only likely to occur over high water periods thereby minimising any impact.

The distance to the nearest part of the European site (some 500m) means that birds using the SPA will be well beyond the maximum 'escape distance' at which birds are disturbed by visible human activity (typically 200-300m) during the construction period. There will not, therefore, be any direct adverse effect on the integrity of the European site.

The nearest point of the European site is also sufficiently far from the construction site to ensure that noise reaching it from the works is not significant given the context of the existing background noise currently generated by existing use of the estuary and adjacent areas, etc. No direct adverse effect on the integrity of the European site due to construction noise is therefore anticipated.

Existing lighting levels on the estuary, combined with the distance between the works and the protected sites, mean that no adverse effect on the European site due to lighting (during construction or operation) is anticipated.

### *9.3.2 Mitigation proposals during construction*

In order to minimise impacts on potentially sensitive species of noise emanating from the construction process for the marina and shore-based infrastructure, the following mitigation measures are therefore proposed wherever practicable:

Non-percussive (eg. vibro) piling will be used wherever practical. In cases where vibro methods are insufficient to achieve required penetrations then percussive piling will be employed using 'soft-start' methods. In areas near to the shoreline piling will only be carried out over the high water periods or other times when the intertidal habitat is inaccessible to waterfowl.

The piling operation consists of lifting the pile into position (pitching) and then driving it into the sea bed. Each pile takes approx. 20mins to drive. The piling operation is not continuous (unlike sheet piling) and a small number of piles would be driven each day (typically 4-6). This is because after driving the pile the barge has to re-position. Piling operations will only occur during daylight hours (typically 0800-1800 maximum) to further reduce impact. If percussive techniques are necessary it has been agreed with the Environmental Health Department of the Local Authority that this shall only occur between 1000-1600.

With the proposed mitigation in place it is considered unlikely that there will be any adverse effect on either SPA interest features or on other bird species using the site.

### *9.3.3 Disturbance to birds during operation*

During operation there will be no change to the current situation so there will be no significant adverse effects due to operational noise are thus anticipated on either SPA interest features or other bird species using the site.

### *9.3.4 Mitigation proposals during operation*

All operational lighting will be directional and low impact.

No adverse effects due to lighting are therefore anticipated either on the SPA bird species or on other species using the site.

#### 9.4 Migrating salmonids

##### *9.4.1 Existing environment*

There are two main potential issues with respect to migratory salmonids in the vicinity of the proposed marina development:

- re-suspension of sediment during construction (eg. dredging)
- noise during construction and operation

##### *9.4.2 Re-suspension of sediments*

In respect of re-suspended sediments the quantity of sediment suspended will be limited due to the use of a backhoe dredger. This is generally accepted to be best practice and regularly appears as a condition in CPA/FEPA licences.

The technique of 'over-spilling' when loading hoppers will not be permitted.

The resuspension of sediment due to dredging is therefore unlikely to have any significant implications for migratory salmon. With the earlier stated timing period this is accepted practice by both the EA and NE for this estuary.

##### *9.4.3 Noise impacts*

During construction there will be a variety of potential sources of noise including piling and dredging.

Non-percussive (eg. vibro) piling will be used wherever practical. In cases where vibro methods are insufficient to achieve required penetrations then percussive piling will be employed using 'soft-start' methods. In order to provide maximum areas for avoidance the piling will be conducted over the high water periods.

It is generally accepted that noise impacts on migratory fish in estuaries can be a concern when piling and dredging. It is for this reason that piling and dredging in this estuary are carried out between 15<sup>th</sup> September and 31<sup>st</sup> March.

This often conflicts with the over-wintering wildfowl season but the generally accepted practice is to minimise the impact on fish and use low noise (i.e. vibro-piling) plant to lessen any impact on birds.

As the proposal is a rebuild of the existing operation there will be no change in the operational noise impacts.

## **10 ARCHAEOLOGY**

The history of the site is that it has been an operational boatyard since 1922. All of the proposed works are within the existing footprint.

The proposed dredge will just remove material that has deposited in the last 20 years or so.

There is no recorded information regarding wrecks at this location. Unless information is available it is accepted standard practice to condition the marine works such that if any artefact should be encountered then work stops until the County Archaeologist has inspected the find. In any event, disposal of such material at sea would not be permitted by the licence. In accordance with good practice a watching brief will be maintained by the dredging crew for any items that may appear.

## **11 LOCAL COMMUNITY AND OTHER USERS**

### 11.1 Potential impacts on the local community

The proposed rebuild of the marina is such that there will be no change in terms of the local community.

### 11.2 Potential traffic impacts

#### *11.2.1 Potential traffic impacts during construction*

The industrial nature of the site and the mix of current uses are such that traffic associated with the proposed rebuild is unlikely to make more than a marginal difference to either the characteristics or the magnitude of existing traffic flows. The impact of construction traffic is therefore expected to be negligible.

#### *11.2.2 Potential traffic impacts during operation*

There will be no change to the current levels of traffic movements.

### 11.3 Potential noise impacts

#### *11.3.1 Existing noise climate*

As indicated above, the proposed works are a rebuild of the existing marina. Due to this environment and the nearby road bridge it has not been considered necessary to take noise measurements.


With the current site use and to the best of the applicant's knowledge, no complaints about noisy activities have been received.

### 11.3.2 Potential noise impacts during construction

With regard to the construction stage, the main potential source of noise is likely to be piling. It is therefore worth noting at this point that the use of vibro- (rather than percussive) piling is likely to be used in order to avoid adverse effects on the behaviour of migrating salmonids.

The piling operation consists of lifting the pile into position (pitching) and then driving it into the sea bed. Each pile takes approx. 20mins to drive. The piling operation is not continuous (unlike sheet piling) and a small number of piles would be driven each day (typically 4-6). This is because after driving the pile the barge has to re-position.

Noise levels for some recent piling at Portland were undertaken for Natural England. The noise levels 100m from the pile were as follows – background 55dB, vibro-piling operation 63dB, percussive hammer 77dB. This demonstrates that the use of vibro-piling and hence limited percussive piling is a significant reduction in noise impact. The graph below shows data from a typical piling hammer.



All piling works will be undertaken during daylight hours to minimise any noise impact.

In the event that substrate conditions require the use of percussive piling, this activity will be restricted to 1000-1600. As a result, and taking into account the existing nature of the site, it is not considered that any limited percussive piling activity would cause a significant adverse impact on either users of the site or the residential properties in the area.

The secondary potential noise impact is that from the dredging operation. Dredging plant is diesel engine driven with substantial silencing systems to prevent any hearing impact on operatives. The crew do not wear any form of ear protection as the noise levels do not warrant it. The same is true for the split hopper barges.

The nearest housing accommodation is some 200m away from the operational dredger with an operational railway line between. Whilst the loading operation only lasts a couple of hours all operational plant will be checked to ensure that their silencers are fully operational to minimise noise impact. It is unlikely that the dredge operation will be audible above normal road traffic.

Maintenance dredging occurs annually in this estuary and noise issues from the dredging plant are very rare.

#### *11.3.3 Potential noise impacts during operation*

This is an existing marina and the proposed rebuild will not result in any additional noise impacts.

#### *11.3.4 Mitigation measures for noise*

As no potentially significant noise impacts affecting the local community or site users were identified, no mitigation measures are necessary

## **12 VISUAL IMPACT**

### 12.1 Description

The proposed rebuild overlays the existing marina and there will be no visible difference from either land or sea.

The potential impact of lighting will be avoided by limiting the amount and by the design of fittings to ensure minimal vertical light spillage. In particular, lighting will be directional and low impact to avoid illumination of the inter-tidal mudflats.

### 13 SUMMARY

The Assessment identified a number of potential impacts, which require mitigation. The table below summarises these potential impacts. Overall, these indicate that there will be no adverse effect on the integrity of the SPA/SAC sites.

Potential impact	Pre-mitigation impact significance	Mitigation requirements or enhancement opportunities	Significance of residual impact	Direct or indirect adverse effect on integrity of European site?
Tidal prism or flow characteristics	Negligible		Negligible	<b>NO</b>
Sediment regime	Negligible		Negligible	<b>NO</b>
Designated sites (coastal processes)	Negligible		Negligible	<b>NO</b>
Direct loss of designated habitats	None		None	<b>NO</b>
Indirect loss of designated habitats	None		None	<b>NO</b>
Loss of intertidal bird feeding/loafing	Minor	Net gain by exposing covered mudflats	Positive	<b>NO</b>
Bird disturbance during construction	Possible impact	- Non-percussive piling wherever practicable	Minor	<b>NO</b>
Migrating salmonids (sediment resuspension)	Minor	- Backhoe dredger used to minimise suspension - No over-spilling of hoppers	Minor	N/A
Migrating salmonids (construction noise)	Possible impact	- Non-percussive piling wherever practicable - Seasonal constraints on working practices	Negligible	N/A
Archaeology and heritage	Negligible	- Watching brief during construction	Negligible	N/A
Traffic	Negligible		Negligible	N/A

Noise (construction)	Negligible		Negligible	N/A
Noise (operation)	No change		None	N/A
Navigation (construction)	None	- Notices to Mariners	None	N/A
Navigation (operation)	Negligible	- Navigation lights	Negligible	N/A
Local Economy	Positive		Positive	N/A

## 14 METHOD STATEMENT

This summary method statement is intended to provide information on the key aspects of the work.

In order to minimise the disturbance from plant the works will commence with dredging at the northern end of the site and proceed southwards. A spud-legged backhoe dredger loading into self-propelled split hopper barges will be used as this generates the least noise and minimises sediment disturbance.

The dredging operation consists of loading a hopper (typically 2.5 hours) which then travels to the disposal site. In line with all other dredging operations in this estuary the works are tidally constrained (i.e. can't work at low water) so some night time operation is anticipated.

As the dredging proceeds the marina construction will commence with tubular steel piles being driven into the sea bed using vibro techniques where practicable. Typically, a small number of key location piles will be driven and the marina pontoons floated into position. The remaining piles will then be driven through the pile guides. This is a standard technique that minimises any need to extract and re-drive piles.

The piling operation consists of lifting the pile into position (pitching) and then driving it into the sea bed. Each pile takes approx. 20mins to drive. The piling operation is not continuous (unlike sheet piling) and a small number of piles would be driven each day (typically 4-6). This is because after driving the pile the barge has to re-position.

Piling operations will only occur during daylight hours (typically 0800-1800 maximum) to further reduce impact. If percussive techniques are necessary it has been agreed with the Environmental Health Department of the Local Authority that this shall only occur between 1000-1600.

The combined dredge and construction is expected to be completed within 2 months.

