

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Report**

Committee	River Hamble Harbour Board
Date:	28 September 2012
Title:	Marine Director's Current Issues
Reference:	4256
Report From:	Director of Culture, Communities and Business Services

Contact name: David Evans

Tel: 01489 576387

Email: david.evans@hants.gov.uk

1. Summary

- 1.1. This report deals with a single issue, namely the results of the recent consultation on the Warsash Slipway proposals which form part of the Asset Enhancement project.

2. Background

- 2.1. At the Management Committee meeting held on Friday 29 June 2012, members confirmed that the options set out in a report prepared by Marina Projects Ltd should be subject to a wider consultation.
- 2.2. Subsequently, the Marine Director provided Management Committee members with a copy of the report and associated drawings so that they could conduct the consultation with those whom they represent on the Committee. In addition, the Marine Director agreed to consult personally with representatives of Warsash Sailing Club, local fishermen, Warsash Marine and C-Power, and the landlord of the Rising Sun public house.

3. Responses

- 3.1. Verbatim responses are at Appendix 1. There has been no written response from the local fishermen, the Rising Sun public house, Warsash Marine or C-Power.

4. Recommendation

- 4.1 It is recommended that the River Hamble Harbour Board considers its preferred way forward.**

CORPORATE OR LEGAL INFORMATION:

Links to the Corporate Strategy

Hampshire safer and more secure for all:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Maximising well-being:	yes
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	
Enhancing our quality of place:	no
Corporate Improvement plan link number (if appropriate):	

Section 100 D - Local Government Act 1972 - background documents

The following documents discuss facts or matters on which this report, or an important part of it, is based and have been relied upon to a material extent in the preparation of this report. (NB: the list excludes published works and any documents which disclose exempt or confidential information as defined in the Act.)

Document

Location

None

IMPACT ASSESSMENTS:

1. Equalities Impact Assessment:

- 1.1. A full Equalities Impact Assessment for the River Hamble Harbour Authority's compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code has been carried out and this report does not raise any issues not previously covered by that Assessment.

2. Impact on Crime and Disorder:

- 2.1. Nil

3. Climate Change:

- a) How does what is being proposed impact on our carbon footprint / energy consumption? The contents of this report have no impact on carbon footprint or energy consumption although, if any of the proposed options is approved for further consideration, carbon footprint and energy consumption issues will be addressed.
- b) How does what is being proposed consider the need to adapt to climate change, and be resilient to its longer term impacts? Not applicable to this report at this stage, but if any of the proposed options is approved for further consideration, the impact of potential sea level rise will be addressed.

Appendix 1

Consultation responses (in date order)

On 17 July, Mr Alexander wrote:

Dear David,

Mindful of the upcoming Harbour Authority Board Meeting this week I thought you should have a copy of some of my thoughts on the subject of the proposed much steeper hard than at present.

Please see the attached Launching Ramp Gradients - Warsash Hard.doc

I have also done estimates that show a normal powerful family saloon (Ford Mondeo 2.5 litre) would be unable to develop sufficient traction to pull a 2,000 Kg boat plus trailer up a 1 in 10 ramp because the wheels will slip if either the ramp or the car tyres are wet.

I shall be able to say more when we meet for the anticipated Warsash Sailing Club consultation.

*Regards,
Don Alexander.*

His email covered the following document:

Launching Ramp Gradients – Proposed Warsash Slipway

14 July 2012 Don Alexander

The author of the report "Warsash Slipway Access to water - Slipway options analysis" uses as his main argument that the present gradient of the Warsash Hard is not steep enough and thus does not comply with the "Current design standards state 1:7 to 1:9 largely dictated by site limitations."

He proposes a design that will provide a 1 in 10 slope, albeit on a wooden surface.

Further he only considers launching from road trailers towed behind cars or other relatively heavy vehicles.

However many more craft are launched and recovered by people on foot using launching trolleys and it is essential that the safety of these sailors is not compromised by the slope being too steep to maintain a secure foothold whilst pulling their boat out of the water and up the wooden slipway.

There is no doubt that slopes as steep as the above 'recommendations' are needed for slipways. As such they are used by lifeboat launching ramps and other large vessel launching facilities. They are indeed SLIP ways with gradients such that vessels will slide down the slope on their own bottoms unaided.

Launching:-

Looking at the data on friction between dissimilar materials⁽¹⁾, one notes that a wooden boat sliding down a wet wooden slipway has a coefficient of only 0.072⁽²⁾. Similarly its metal keelband against oak has a coefficient of 0.075⁽³⁾.

Thus, by simple calculation and with the rubbing surfaces being wet or greasy, a gradient as little as 1 in 14 for wood against wood or 1 in 13 for metal against wood is all that is needed for the boat to slide down the ramp unaided.

One notes that the author intends to have a steeper slope of 1 in 10 on his ramp. As this is steeper than either of the above gradients boats will slide down the ramp whether on a trailer or not – and with ever increasing speed.

Additionally, once the ropes retaining the boat to its trailer are released, it will slide back off the trailer under its own weight – so we are in for some lively times.

Recovery:-

The above reasoning only considers launching, however recovery implies a sure foothold whilst recovering the boat. This is a much more hazardous exercise as now it is no longer just necessary to prevent the boat from sliding uncontrollably into the water one now needs to pull the boat onto its launching trolley and then to drag it up the ramp. Thus people will be both having to overcome the rolling resistance of the loaded trailer whilst, at the same time, lifting the boat as the trailer rises up the slope.

Any slip and the boat and trolley/trailer will descend uncontrollably back into the water, mowing down anyone who happened to be in the way or launching or recovering their own boat.

Weed:-

Unless kept scrupulously clean one must also take account of the presence of seaweed approximately halving the slope angles at which things slide and at which people fall over into the tide.

Don Alexander

14 July 2012.

Ref 1:- http://www.roymech.co.uk/Useful_Tables/Tribology/co_of_frict.htm

Ref 2:- Ref 1 report - Oak - Oak (cross grain) Wet or Greasy 0.072

Ref 3:- Ref 1 report - Cast Iron - Oak Wet or Greasy - 0.075

On 17 July 2012, Mr Foot wrote:

Dear Mr Evans,

I have read your consultants proposals for work to the slipway first with alarm, then incredulity.

There are three points only which ring true;

- 1. The slope is very slight and this does involve pushing (and pulling) trailers a long way in shallow water at high tide*
- 2. There are some, but not many, potholes and it would be helpful if these were filled in*

3. *The collection of seaweed and marine detritus needs to be cleared more often*

The first point is not insurmountable and is more than compensated for by the benefits of a large area at low tide

The second point is something which no one would object to you doing

The third point is entirely the consequence of past actions of the council and should be done by the council any way.

None of these features necessitate any of the proposed options.

Writing as both a laser sailer, a Rib owner, and as an SB3 sailer they all seem unhelpful.

Firstly I cannot imagine any laser sailer would, or even could, launch a laser with either daggerboard or rudder down. (neither of which draw a metre). It is quite usual practice to sail away from any slipway with both only partially down until in deeper water.

With regard to launching an SB3 or a Rib it is important to have sufficient space to turn a vehicle and trailer in order to reverse to the water's edge. The proposed options all appear to reduce the ability to do this.

I for one would not feel confident about the durability or strength of a wooden structure, and the option to dig away the sound gravel to a level lower than the adjacent mud will surely result in the mud moving to the lower level of the slipway; not exactly an improvement.

The last part of your consultants proposals to construct what is little more than a glorified beer garden for the pub is surely acting way beyond the limits of your authority. Not only will these cause immeasurable nuisance to the adjoining club but involves land which is not in your ownership and the use of the public purse for the benefit of a single commercial operation whilst actively harming the legitimate interests of a club who in all probability represent a substantial proportion of those people most likely to use the slipway, and the mooring piles.

My conclusion to these proposals is very different to your consultants', namely

- Fill in the pot holes*
- Remove the sea weed regularly*
- Leave the rest alone*

Yours sincerely

Jonathan Foot

On 20 July 2012, Mr Burgess wrote:

Dear Sirs,

I understand that you are inviting public comments on the future of Warsash Slipway.

My comment is that something should be done now to ensure that it is actually used solely as a slipway, and not as currently for car parking for customers in the Rising Sun, as well as commercial fishermen.

All too often there are refrigerated white vans parked on or across the top apron or further down, for long periods, seemingly immune from the bye-laws that govern the rest of the community.

From previous discussions I understand that there is a "grey" area between the highway which is regulated by Fareham, and the lower section which is supposed to be regulated by yourselves, which is currently being exploited by these people.

May I suggest that before you spend any additional funds on slipway consultations improvements ;-

1) You put in a request to Hampshire CC to enact a new bye-law to allow you to apply a fixed penalty notice to vehicles parked for more than 30 minutes on "your" part of the slipway.

2) Actively enforce this, which would either solve the problem, or provide an additional revenue stream for the Council.

3) Arrange with Fareham/ Hampshire roads to define your relevant boundaries, and request that they paint a few more feet of double yellow lines along their boundary to indicate where their authority is enforced.

These measures would at least have the benefit of restoring the slipway for its designated purpose.

Regards,

David Burgess.

On 23 July 2012, Mr Shepherd wrote:

Dear Sir,

I am a member of Warsash Sailing Club, and am also involved with a local Sea Scout group that use the slipway. I have reviewed the document "Warsash Slipway – Access to water", and have some serious issues with it.

My biggest concern is that the document appears to be trying to answer a question that is not properly defined. There is no evidence that the River Hamble Harbour Authority has surveyed the usage of the slip, what the actual problems are, how busy it gets & what people actually want from it. Without this the authors appear to be guessing what the real requirements are.

As regards the document itself I note that there are 2 ½ pages dedicated to “Environmental Designations, Licences & Consents Review”, but no consideration of whether the proposed changes constitute a hazard to navigation.

I’m not convinced by the arguments to spend a lot of money redeveloping this facility. It could easily become a white elephant if not done in a professional manner, and this report is certainly not that. I’d prefer you to maintain what we have, and maybe start a proper consultation with users as to what sensible improvements could be made.

I have the following comments to make on the detail of the document:

Introduction

Was the commission really to provide 3 options? Why the constraint? I hope you mean you looked a variety of options & present the best 3? Paragraph 4 suggests that this was the case.

As far as I am aware there’s only 1 “dinghy club” on this side of the river.

I agree about the build up of flotsam & jetsam. This used to be removed – maybe the Harbour master’s funds should be spent on this work? Is there any connection between this build-up & fairly recent addition of the fisherman’s jetty?

2.4 Tidal Access & Useable Window

The wording here gives the impression that you want vehicles to drive into the sea to speed up launching. I presume that’s not what you meant, as it’s a wonderful way of corroding braking systems, wheel bearings, exhausts, etc.

2.5 User Groups & Vessel Types

I used to launch sailing dinghies here regularly, and apart from the mud at very low water & the build up of seaweed I was quite happy with it.

The report mentions the sailing club using the slipway, but there’s no indication of any consultation with the club about how it’s used. My observation is that the large flat area can be very useful to allow sails to be hoisted, rudders fitted, etc prior to launching, especially with large fleets.

4 Development Options

All the options presented involve moving the piles. The authors seem to regard them as more of a nuisance than a facility, and so have tucked them out of the way with no further consideration. There’s no discussion of working around them, and the report does not include the layout drawing of their current location for comparison. Having viewed the site I conclude that the piles are positioned for safe access, and lay directly across the tidal flow. The new location would halve the available width of water, with boats trying to use the South side particularly

constrained by the sailing club jetty. I don't see how this is acceptable, or why the report fails to mention it.

There's a lack of clarity in the plans about the sailing club immediately adjacent to the slip. It's a sailing club, not a yacht club, and the access road & dinghy pound are not marked. A substantial part of the slip's users will be taking this route.

4.1 Option 1

Both options seem to involve spending a lot of money to achieve a small improvement. I have concerns that the buoys & their associated lines will be at best a nuisance & at worst a hazard just waiting to wrap around propellers.

4.2 Option 2

The timber ramp sound fine in principle, but there's no examples given of where this system has been used, what the life expectancy is & what type of vehicles are using it. The report talks about Transits on the hard – it's frequently used by small Lorries & large 4x4s. I envisage a substantial annual maintenance bill to keep such a structure in good order – has this been costed? One broken plank could knock the whole thing out until repairs are made.

The report mentions seaweed build-up as a problem for the current layout, but doesn't explain where it's going to end up for this scheme. I envisage large volumes of it trapped & rotting under the structure.

The budget is substantial for this option, but I'm not convinced by this report that it's anywhere near enough for a robust structure.

4.3 Option 3

My comments are as for option 2, but more-so. I'm not sure that the ownership of the 'development' area is clear. Its' proximity to the WSC access road & gate should be mentioned.

Regards,

Michael Shepherd

On 24 July 2012, Mr Gage wrote:

*Warsash Slipway
"Access to water proposals" response.*

Introduction.

This response to the proposals is from a long term river user and berth holder. I am a member of Warsash Sailing Club and the Royal Southern Yacht Club and an International Race Official.

I am opposed to these proposals, and consider any further work in preparing for them to be a waste of public money.

River and Road Congestion

There is a cap on the number of boats that are allowed to be moored in the river. This cap was imposed to limit the congestion in the river mouth at peak periods. These proposals seem to be intended to increase the number of power boats and PWCs that may be launched from the Warsash Hard. This will increase the congestion in the river and the congestion in Shore Road, as trailers are towed up the hill. The route for an empty trailer to the few trailer parking spaces in the car park has a very difficult turn. At peak periods the car parks are already full.

Loss of Amenity

The proposals cut a trench into the existing hard, so that at low water vehicles will no longer be able to have access to the fishing pontoon to the north, or the scrubbing piles to the south.

Spoil Removal

555 cubic metres are to be removed in option 1 and 300 in the other options. This could be removed by barge, but mooring would have to be found for the barge during loading operations, and this would necessarily have an impact on both the Warsash Sailing Club jetty and the fishing pontoon. In engineering terms it would be simpler to remove the soil by road. Given the nature of Shore Road the size of the removal lorries would have to be restricted, and at least 50 lorry movements would be required. As the spoil would be saturated and additional allowance would have to be made for the amount of water that would also be removed.

Scrubbing Pile Relocation

It is hard to describe the proposal to relocate the scrubbing piles to the south as anything other than naïve. The close proximity of the Warsash Sailing Club Jetty and the strong cross currents would make berthing a boat alongside the downstream side of the piles a hazardous occupation. Removing a boat from the piles into the flooding tide is even more hazardous and requires sea room. Clearly risk analysis has not been rigorously performed.

Capital Dredge

The construction of this trench is a capital dredge in that it is removing part of the sea bed that has not previously been removed. There is no evidence of any

sampling or hydrographic studies that would show the impact of the dredging on other river users. The bulk of the sea bed is soft mud and there is a risk that removing the spoil would cause a loss of support to the Warsash Sailing Club jetty.

Maintenance Dredging

The hard is hard through continuous compaction, and is surrounded by soft mud. A trench in the hard would swiftly become encroached by this mud, and frequent maintenance dredging would be required.

Land Ownership

The Harbour Authority do not own the land to the south of the hard. Its ownership is claimed by Warsash Sailing Club, proposals to build on this land, and indeed to lease it out will be a legal minefield.

Flotsam

The build up of flotsam has increased since the building of the car park extensions and the fishing pontoon on the upstream side of the hard. The proposals are to extend the downstream wall, presumably to cause the flotsam to be deposited downstream of that. In effect this is to dump the flotsam onto Warsash Sailing Club. There are many who would consider this to be a "beggar my neighbour" approach, and makes the ultimate removal of the flotsam more difficult.

Conclusions

Clearly there are costs associated with the proposals, there are risks, there are losses of amenity, there is disturbance and there is increased congestion in the river and on land. There are a few benefits. Laser sailors will possibly be able to sail further inshore before having to jump out and wade, but then will have a steeper drag on their trolleys. Trailer sailors will not have to carry long tow ropes to tow their boats from the water.

For the few benefits the costs are disproportionate.

To go ahead with gaining all the consents necessary in the face of opposition the professional fees are clearly underestimated. Soil Sampling and analysis, hydraulic modelling, civil engineers fees and legal fees are not cheap.

I have to suggest that it would be imprudent to invest any further money in anything other than simple maintenance together with frequent removal of the flotsam.

Philip Gage

On 30 July 2012, Mr Spencer wrote:

Warsash Slipway Plan

Reading Michael Sterne's notice in the last Lobster's Log reminded me of his, and others, determination to oppose the imposition of Harbour Dues for dinghies, and the lengthy and costly process that followed, and their eventual acceptance, at a zero rate. It did however inspire me to read the full report prepared by the consultants engaged by the Harbour Authority to look at various options to improve launching facilities on the public slipway. Some of the elements within the options do not meet with my support, but they do provide a useful starting point to improve sailing facilities at Warsash.

I believe that one fact that is not mentioned within the report is that our Club slipway profile, leading from the pound at Shore House and into the river, is far more suitable for launching small boats than that on the public slipway. I also note that the options go beyond the requirement to improve launching, and include the scrubbing piles, and the immediate foreshore adjacent to Shore House, to which the Club have a claim of ownership.

In the Executive Committee's initial response to the options report, much is made of the risks involved, but no discussions of the development opportunities, that might be available if an approach of collaboration, rather than opposition was taken by our Executive Committee, acting in the interests of the membership. The development might help us with our proof of ownership of part of the foreshore; it might rid us of the unsightly and unhealthy fishing equipment dumped in front of Shore House; it might move the piles closer to our Club pontoon which would enable members to draw water and electricity (on repayment) for scrubbing their boats; it might provide our Club caterer with business options rather than the opportunity being given to the Rising Sun. This list is not exhaustive, but I know that collaboration, rather than opposition provides greater overall improvements. In short I invite members to join with me to encourage our Executive Committee to adopt an approach of collaboration rather than confrontation. This might just provide improved facilities to support sailing opportunities for all, by taking advantage of the opportunities rather than concentrating on the risks. In anticipation I also declare that I would be willing to join other members, within a working group, to explore further some of my perceived opportunities.

Jon Spencer

On 31 July 2012, Councillor Cartwright wrote (on behalf of Fareham Borough Council):

Dear David

Further to our telephone conversation regarding the proposals. I can confirm that I briefed the Warsash Residents Association at their last meeting on the options and told them that it was out for consultation, I received no comment back.

As I said at the last Management Meeting I liked options 2 and 3 and was happy that it would go out for consultation.

Best wishes

Cllr. Cartwright

On 9 August, Councillor Victoria Weston wrote (on behalf of Winchester City Council):

David

I support the schemes - if they provide more trailer storage and tackle the sea weed problem they would have achieved a great deal.

Scheme two and three are very attractive, but do they make accommodation for the fisherman uses. I can see issues between recreation and fishermen if we enhance the slip way to be used more for recreational use. There wall is removed from schemes two and three.

Naturally there will be an increasing car parking problem if this slip way becomes more attractive for recreational use for the village of Warsash.

I would like to see the inspection piles remain which they are as the river is very short of public piles.

Kind regards

Vicki

On 10 August 2012, Councillor Suzy Hamel wrote (on behalf of Eastleigh Borough Council):

Hi David

Thank you very much for my induction to the River Hamble Management Committee and tour of the River Hamble and for providing so much information - very useful and illuminating.

I have forwarded the slipway proposals to members of both Hamble Parish Council and BHH Local Area Committee Councillors. I have received no feedback at all either positive or negative!

I personally would agree that the interim work should be undertaken as suggested and IMO the proposal option 3, whilst the most expensive, offers the best solution for Warsash generally and would benefit residents, tourists and river users alike.

This option also offers an opportunity for re-gaining some of the initial investment through offering a lease on part of the decking area to the Rising Sun or perhaps other establishment.

I am away on holiday until Monday 20th August but will catch up with any correspondence upon my return.

*Best regards
Suzy Hamel*

On 10 August 2012, Mr Budgen wrote:

Mr. David Evans,
Marine Director & Harbour Master,
River Hamble Harbour Authority,
Harbour Office,
Shore Road,
Warsash SO31 9FR.

Dear Sir,

I would like to give my unqualified support to your proposals to improve the Warsash boat slip.

At present, the slip is virtually unusable, for many weeks during the year, due to a build-up of seaweed and rubbish. Any of your proposals would significantly improve the situation. It would also be good to have an increased slope at the top of the ramp to allow easier launching above two thirds high tide.

I do not mind which of your three proposals get approval, as anything you can do to improve the present very unsatisfactory situation would be a major asset to the many boat owners who use the facility, as well as to the village. Having piles of rotting seaweed on our foreshore, opposite the Rising Sun, must put off a lot of visitors.

I look forward to you being able to implement one of your proposals in the near future, and would thank you for all the hard work that has obviously gone into finding a solution to what is an awful problem.

Thanks again.

Yours faithfully,

John Budgen

On 11 August 2012, Mr Hughes wrote:

Dear Mr David Evans

You have asked for written comments regarding Marina Projects Survey report and have set a deadline for receipt of Monday 13 August 2012.

The following are my comments and objections to Marina Projects' recommendations which, if proceeded with, will attract opposition at the RHHMC, RHHB, and at the FBC Planning Approval stage. It is understood that there are also Prima Facie grounds for a legal challenge.

If you require further clarification of any of my objective points or disagree with any of my objections would you kindly respond accordingly to me by 25 August 2012.

You will note I have also included details of simple positive measures which could be taken by the Harbour Authorities to improve the facilities at this historic Warsash Hard site.

Best regards

Clifford Hughes

A Yachtsman's Independent Objection to Marina Projects' Survey Analysis for Historic Warsash Hard

Introduction

I have been a lifelong resident of Fareham/Warsash and since the mid 1950s I have used Warsash Hard for launching dinghies and have regularly used the inspection piles with various size yachts. I have held Tucker & Mundy and RAF club moorings for many years and have found the current Warsash Hard and the piles to be an excellent facility. My background is in Project Management and Engineering and I have experience in MoD survey work

*I have examined in detail Marina Project's 23 page analysis/recommendations and I am very concerned that adopting them would turn the lower half of the Hard into a **dredged out muddy trench**. It also lacks essential evidence, includes unsupported claims, and does not appreciate the practical needs of the people who use the Hard. Many serious issues identified as follows have either **not** been addressed properly or just simply been ignored.*

*It is patently obvious that MP's recommendations just **create new problems** for dinghy sailors and **hazards** for yachtsmen, and would **exacerbate car parking problems** ashore. Adding 1,800 sq.m. of decking would destroy Warsash's quiet natural water side environment. I hope the committee consider the issues to be major grounds for rejecting their proposals.*

1 Marina Projects Survey dated 14 May 2012

MP's snapshot analysis was carried out on a neap tide(Thursday 15 March 2012) and cannot in any way be considered a representative day when the public used the Hard.

2 Health & Safety

- i) No independent Health and Safety Risk Assessment has been carried out or mentioned.
- ii) No safety guard-rails or life buoys are shown on the decking built out into deep water and there is **risk of people/children drowning** if swept under decking with little chance of rescue.
- iv) Cars backing trailers on the slime covered decking slope could slip into 2m depth of water.
- v) Seaweed trapped at the foot of the cobble stones slope is funnelled in by the car park's south wall, the fisherman's jetty and the concrete groin This will all finish up under an 1,800sq.m expanse of decking. **Will FBC be able to or be willing to clear this morass** of rotting seaweed trapped under the decking?

3 New Concrete Pad and new Piles

- i) The proposed line of marker buoys (**MP's Para 4.1 & p.15**) would **restrict access for yachts** approaching the piles particularly at half ebb tide when the marker buoy's lines would float towards the piles and possibly around propellers. At half flood tide the buoys would drift the other way over the hard and restrict the available width of the Hard.
- ii) The new concrete pad CH94 (**MP's App.6 p.19**) is shown as horizontal whereas the current pad is sloped down 1.7m closely following the hard profile. Introducing a 1.7m high concrete step would **create a massive new underwater obstruction giving less depth/access**.
Yachts of 2m draft would only just be able to go against the piles at the very top spring tides.
- iii)MP's brief was to 'look at the pad which stands proud of the Hard (20cms on the Hard side) causing hazards to centreboards, rudders and props'. A replacement **concrete pad hazard** with a 1.7m high edge is very much worse.
- iv) Bottlenecks for launching boats only occur when the fishermen's van is parked across the Hard so why relocate the facility just a few feet further to the south in the mud flat for that?
- v) Adding keel blocks for motor boats **would halve the availability of piles** for yachts.
- vi) Why do Marina Projects want to reduce the number of piles from 5 to 4? (**p19**)

4 Environmental Concerns and Tidal Deviation Effects

- i) Potential changes to the river tidal flow have not been addressed by MP. The decking support structure **will slow the natural scouring** of water movement and fine silt will be deposited on all the lower part of the Hard if it is regraded to a level lower than the mud flats.
- ii) MP has no proposal to carry out a study of the likely behaviour of sediment or the effect on migratory fish during and after the dredging alongside an inter-tidal nature conservancy area.

iii) MP (para.3.2) have serious concerns that 'significant contaminant levels' may exist in the sediment around the inspection piles'. Contaminants would be disturbed by dredging.

5 Dredging 555 cu.m. from the Hard's surface to put it below the level of mud flats

i) MP's Regrading Graphs (p.16 & 18) shows the removal of 0.9m depth of the Hard's surface to take it 0.7m below the mud flats level. Mud would soon migrate into this deep trench at the foot of the proposed wooden slipway. Launching any craft into a 16m wide x 0.7m deep trench of newly deposited soft mud on the Hard would be near impossible.

ii) Hards are, by definition, firm ground above the surrounding mud or silt, NOT below.

iii) MP give no disposal cost for 555cu.m. of dredged material or where it would be deposited.

iv) Removal of this massive amount of Hard material does NOT come within scope of Southampton Harbour Exemption Order 2011 No 409 'works being maintained'.(MP's para.2).

v) After negotiating the heaps of seaweed at the top, it is now possible to walk down the Hard to the scrubbing piles dry shod. The new pad would be an island in a deep mud flat.

vi) MP state, without evidence, there would be 'better access window of time for launching'. This is not true and should be challenged. The foot of the proposed wooden slipway would dry at half tide on both MLWN and MLWS and there is only a maximum of 1 metre depth of water there at the three quarter tide point. Clearly MP did not conduct a tidal curve check.

vii) Drivers towing trailers onto the Hard do not back their vehicles into the salt water therefore they would still have to use a long tow-out rope over the lower Hard muddy section (para.2.4)

6 Consultation and Legality

i) There has been NO pre survey public consultation or Hard user research and there has been no public demand for change. Dialogue with sailors who use the Hard is paramount.

ii) Any Planning Approval Application put to FBC based on PM's survey recommendations will be robustly challenged by both Warsash residents and sailing people.

iii) There is a 'Prima Facie case' to legally challenge the destruction of Warsash's ancient Hard and plans to severely restrict/reduce the 60year old inspection piles facilities for yachts.

7 WSC Beach Head

i) MP wrongly mark WSC beachhead as a 'Potential Development Area'(Appx.6 p.19).

ii) The proposal does not show where the fishermen will dump their unsightly marine rubbish?

8 Traffic Congestion and Parking Problems (MP's page 12)

MP state it ‘..will attract more visitors and will bring more cars into the village’. The two car parks are regularly at saturation point now and parking would clog up Warsash roads.

9 An expanse of Decking (1,800 sq.m nearly the size of the lower car park)

i) It is *a misappropriation of public funds* for M.P. to suggest that Hamble River authorities should provide an eating and drinking area for the Rising Sun Inn’. (MP’s para.4.3)

ii) A huge decking area in front of WSC will inevitably *destroy the quiet natural environment* and river view enjoyed by both club members and local residents over the last century.

10 Decking Construction and Safety - A wooden slipway 16m (53 ft) wide??

MP’s *cost estimates cannot be reliable* if there are no construction details or safety data for decking needed to support many tons of vehicles, trailers and power boats that may be on it.

11 Unspecified Additional Costs

i) MP give *no estimates of costs for FBC’s* annual maintenance or regular pressure cleaning of decking and slipway. MP noted the big build up of seaweed on the current slipway and the HM office does not take responsibility for reporting this nuisance to FBC.

ii) MP’s estimated cost for Option 3 is shown as £349K which, if added to all unspecified costs for ‘professional fees, related charges, general items’, project management, environmental studies, dredging and contaminated spoil disposal etc *could easily exceed £0.5 Million.*

iii) *No costs are mentioned* for producing proper Planning Application, drawing up plans and obtaining consent from the seven authorities quoted in MP’s analysis (para.3 & 3.1).

12 In Conclusion

There is very little wrong with the current excellent, well compacted, mud free Hard facilities which a proper survey of the main users would confirm.

Squandering reserve funds on flawed recommendations does not fit with the Government’s declared policy of cutting expenditure of public money in these years of austerity

I hope the committee consider the issues to be major grounds for rejecting their proposals

Clifford Hughes

On 12 August 2012, Mr Oddie wrote:

Dear David

I am writing to you regarding the build-up of seaweed and rubbish on the Warsash slipway. I have used the slipway for twenty eight years but the present situation makes it virtually unusable. There is also an unpleasant smell which is not very good for the general environment, particularly in hot weather' and must deter visitors from using the local amenities.

It is hoped that the success of British sailors at the Olympics will encourage more people to participate in the sport. The slipway is one of the few suitable ones in the area because of its width but, as you know, it is not deep enough for use at high water. This I feel could be fairly easily improved by creating an increased slope at the top to allow easier launching at this state of the tide. In addition to this the slipway could be cleaned on a regular basis to avoid the build-up of seaweed and rubbish and to eliminate the smell.

I hope that a suitable solution can soon be found and implemented.

Yours sincerely

David Oddie

On 13 August 2012, Mr Selby wrote:

Proposals for the enhancement of Warsash Public Hard

I have sailed dinghies and keel boats from the River Hamble/Warsash for over 40 years, and regularly made use of the maintenance piles for over 30 years. The hard certainly needs a little TLC by way of some inexpensive maintenance, and much more regular removal of seaweed build up.

However it does not need expensive grandiose schemes such as those proposed, which are likely to just create their own problems.

Extending the dwarf wall, whilst it might reduce the seaweed at the top of the hard, will just push it down in front of neighbouring property, where it will no longer be the responsibility of Fareham Borough Council to remove it. Hence it will accumulate, rot, and create a health hazard with an unpleasant odour along the Warsash shoreline. Building a wooden structure to the South of the hard means it will then be trapped under the structure, where it can't be cleared anyway.

Moving the piles South will make it impossible for yachts to get onto the down river side of the piles without great risk of collision with the Warsash Sailing Club Pier, as it is quite tricky even now because of the strong cross tides and prevailing winds, and making the concrete plinth horizontal with a deep lip at the leading edge will be dangerous for keel boats, attempting to get on the plinth, and to individuals falling off the end at low water. It is unclear from the diagrams whether in fact draft at the piles and length of the plinth may also be reduced from that at

present, as the plan view and side elevation of MP188-P-100.3 seem to be to totally different scales.

I see little evidence that the hard actually needs widening and regrading, it copes quite well as it is with current demand, even on days of large Dinghy Open Meetings.

I am mindful that the finances for these proposed projects originate from the sale of the midstream mooring piles to the Crown Estates. Mooring piles financed by the mid stream yacht mooring holders over many years. Yet the main beneficiaries of the proposed projects are likely to be jet skis, day boat trailer sailors, motor boats, and possibly sailing dinghies, all of whom contribute nothing to the Harbour Authority income, because it is not cost effective to stand on the hard and collect dues, which rather negates the argument that the hard is extensively used. The yacht owners who effectively provided the finances will just get a less useable and a more risk prone set of piles. Not exactly cost effective.

I am somewhat surprised that consultants were engaged at considerable expense to put forward these projects without there first being discussions with users, neighbours, and land owners, to determine their reactions to any possible enhancements, and perhaps to listen to their wish list and experience.

I am even more surprised that those making the decisions will not be making a site visit. Many of the Councillors on the committee represent areas far away from Warsash, and with respect probably have little personal knowledge of Warsash Hard, so it is difficult to see how they can make an informed decision without first having the benefit of an explanatory site visit.

I find the estimated costs given very conservative, and they do not appear to take into account such things as licenses, land rental, environmental assessments, disposal of material, professional fees, and future replacement/maintenance.

Any significant changes (the wooden structure to the south would accommodate up to 50 trailers each bringing at least one car) will attract more users, where are they going to park the inevitable cars? It is not good enough to say this is not a Harbour Authority responsibility, such comments are irresponsible.

I could comment further on a number of other aspects of these proposals, but I think it is sufficient for now to score the present proposals B- and an inappropriate use of the Enhancement Reserves.

Yours faithfully

JHR Selby

On 14 August 2012, Mr Peter Middleton wrote (on behalf of the Association of Hamble River Yacht Clubs:

Dear Mr Evans

***River Hamble - Warsash Hard
Response to the Consultation***

The members of the Association of Hamble River Yacht Clubs have reviewed the proposals for changes to be made to the Warsash Hard and the documents attached to your email message of 10th July 2012.

The Association wishes to respond as follows:

In essence the view of the Association is that the Harbour Authority should make evidence based decisions on investment and that much more needs to be done before decisions are made in relation to Warsash.

Therefore

- *A fresh start should be made. The objectives must be agreed first.*

Comment: The 'Issues' were apparently identified by the Marine Director. The current consultation provides a partial opportunity to identify the objectives.

- *The Harbour Authority should consult widely on the Harbour users needs and then consider their views on the objectives for possible changes to the Warsash Hard and related areas.*

Comment: The report to the Management Committee failed to include details of the objectives for change and associated information. The oral report identified six issues, set out in the message, but it is unclear how these were established.

The Marine Director has confirmed that "The brief to Marina Projects was provided verbally at a detailed site meeting on 13 February" The response, from Marina Projects, included a recital of three issues that may be taken to be the Consultants' objectives. The recital contains no comparative objective background information or evidence.

The recital is as follows:

"I refer to our recent site visit and discussions regarding the current issues associated with the public slipway between the Warsash Sailing Club and the Rising Sun Public House. You raised three main issues in regard to the existing facility which for clarity I note below:

General surface condition consisting of some deep potholes, soft mud areas, large rock deposits at the MLWS mark and a general lack of demarcation of underwater hazards such as the edging of the inspection piles.

The collection of flotsam and jetsam at the head of the slipway, which has worsened since the development of the waterfront decking area and in particular the wooden groin along the edge of the public car park. This issue making access and egress from the slipway difficult and in some instances making it virtually impassable.

The gradient of the existing slipway, which other than at times of high or low water, makes for difficult launch and recovery.”

- *The Harbour Authority should agree a formal brief and terms of employment, with costs, for the employment of an agreed design Consultant.*

Comment

The employment of Marina Projects to undertake the investigation to date appears not to have been approved by the Board and to have been done on the basis of oral instructions. This type of arrangement leads easily to misunderstandings. It is unclear how the Firm was chosen.

- *In support of the statements in the Strategic Vision, especially in para in 4.5- ‘Respond to future demand’ and para 5 ‘Engagement and consensus building’- the area to be considered for change and investment should be south from the footpath to the Harbour Master’s Office to the jetty of the Warsash Sailing Club. The consideration of this area must, as provided for in the Strategic Vision, be undertaken with the full involvement of and consultation with those likely to be affected.*

Comment: Consideration should be given to the realignment of the Fishermen’s Jetty to connect possibly with the northern end of the Car Park. The current location has created an unused and somewhat sterile lagoon to the west of the Car Park. The existing pedestrian access to the jetty is incongruously over the War Memorial and by way of a poorly designed and constructed gateway and ladder, which on recent inspection was padlocked shut. An unregulated/unplanned use is made of the jetty for purposes not connected with fishing or the landing of fish catches and a review of the area provides an opportunity to make provision for a wider regulated use. Nothing should be done which may prejudice the further development of the area. What is needed is an overall plan.

- *Consideration should be to the provision, afloat, for tenders, in place of the toast rack storage previously proposed for the pontoons adjoining the Harbour Master’s Office.*

Comment: There is a demand for afloat berthing evidenced by the need for the ballot annually for the allocation of the limited spaces adjoining the HM’s office.

- *A review should be undertaken of the capacity of the commercial boat yards and marinas to provide facilities for the launch of vessels larger than centre board sailing dinghies. An assessment should be made of the demand for improved facilities for the launch and recovery of vessels.*

Comment: The Options reported to Committee gave the impression that, there is a demand for use of the Hard by larger vessels and associated towing vehicles

and that following completion of works that there would be an increase in use. It may be more appropriate for this demand, if it exists, to be satisfied by the commercial undertakings, where provision may include car and trailer parking, and staff, winches and similar to assist with the recovery of vessels. Larger vessels, especially RIBS and similar can easily, once launched travel by water to the Hard, if necessary.

- *Action should be taken to identify a suitable site for maintenance piles or a wall to be used for the maintenance of yachts and other vessels which would lie in line with the tidal flow.*

Comment: The levels within the lagoon may allow this to be achieved without dredging. The maintenance piles at the Royal Southern Yacht Club are an example of what could be done (albeit across tidal flow) or an installation along the harbour wall, similar to that to be found in Dartmouth. Such an installation could provide not only a benefit for River users but an object of interest for shore side visitors.

- *Action should be taken to determine the ownership of all land that may be affected and the powers available to the Harbour Authority to make changes.*

Comment: To proceed without a reliable understanding of the ability to make even minor changes is a potentially wasteful use of resources.

- *An assessment should be made of the effect of change on the demand for parking space and the consequential effects on the capacity of the existing car and trailer parks to accommodate change.*

Comment: Any increase in use will have an impact on local residents especially if the launching of larger vessels from the Hard becomes practical.

The Appendix B Impact Assessments stated that there is no impact on carbon footprint or energy consumption. If, as the result of investment there is an increase in use how is this statement true?

- *Action should be taken to determine the current responsibilities for the maintenance of the surface of the Hard and for the clearance of seaweed and flotsam.*

Comment; It is understood these maintenance works are currently not the responsibility of the Harbour Authority. To what extent will those responsible for maintenance contribute to wards the cost of change?

- *Action should be taken to determine the cost of the options and the responsibilities for and the cost of maintenance arising from any changes made.*

Comment: The report by Marina Projects, at para 5, included a number of reservations/assumptions related to costs. There is reference to a cost benefit

but no details were included. Experience of consideration of the proposals for the extension of the Hamble jetty shows that initial cost estimates can be unreliable. It is important that accurate unqualified estimates are prepared at an early stage. The report on the use of the Asset Enhancement Fund to the Board meeting on 16th July 2010 reported that the combined Management Committee and Harbour Board sub group agreed that projects should avoid on going revenue costs.

- *Determine the potential income to be generated by change and the means for its collection.*

Comment: An assessment and analysis should be made of the amount of fees and dues generated by users of the Hard. An estimate should be prepared of the changes in income arising from change together with an identification of the means to be used to ensure full collection and the costs of so doing.

- *The funding Partners anticipated in the reports in 2010 (the leverage) in partnership with the funds in the Asset Enhancement Fund should be established.*

Comment: The Asset Enhancement Scheme was introduced as a means of attracting additional funding. A full report should be prepared of the sources of additional funding to support any change.

It would be helpful to receive copies of all the Consultation responses received by you. I should be grateful if you would arrange please for them to be sent to me as soon as available.

Yours sincerely

Peter S. Middleton

Secretary of the Association of Hamble River Yacht Clubs

On 14 August 2012, Mr Mike Glanville wrote (on behalf of the British Marine Federation):

David,

Thank you for your email. Please see below comments from me and the BMF South chair. We have distributed the proposals to the rest of the south committee however there has been few comments on the matter.

- *Although the proposed schemes seem complex and costly it will enhance the Warsash side of the river and resolve many of the maintenance and Health and Safety issues with the existing slipway and piles.*

- *Being on the Warsash side one has to question if there is plans for a corresponding project of a similar size and public benefit on the Hamble side of the water. Although the funds are coming from the Asset Enhancement Reserve the project needs to be of benefit to everyone and this has the potential to directly benefit the Warsash Sailing Club, who have a number of members who I assume are exempt from paying harbour dues. This said, I take your comments from our conversation that Warsash are not in favour of the idea.*
- *Although a patch repair in some areas would assist the current installation, there is no long term benefit to this with ongoing maintenance costing the council year on year. One of these proposals would ensure the longevity of the slipway for future users and harbour dues payers.*
- *Having never used the slip I cannot comment on the pitch and angle although note the suggestions made by Marina Projects and would assume that they have based their calculations and therefore proposals on current thinking in slipway design.*
- *If the committee vote in favour of one of these schemes, I assume the works would be widely tendered?*
- *Having discussed use of the Reserve Funds at many meetings; I fear that there are going to be very few proposals (that use enough of the built up reserves) if any that will meet the needs of the wide range of river users and harbour dues payers. As you know and I have said many times, in my view the only way to resolve the surplus is to use it to reduce Harbour dues over say 2 - 3 years. I take the comments regarding some users having left and new ones not being entitled but this is a relatively clean and open way to deal with the issue, leaving sufficient funds for smaller projects that provide less contention for the various parties along the river.*
- *I see that Marina Projects have made a recommendation for some remedial works at a cost of £3k to improve the slipway and remove potholes etc. I would have thought that this was sensible in the short term if there are areas that are potholed etc; out of interest, is maintenance of the slipways an insurance risk for the harbour in the event of an injury or damage to property?*

As always if you have any questions or wish to discuss further then please give me a call.

Thanks and regards

Mike

Michael Glanville

On 14 August 2012, the Honorary Secretary of Warsash Sailing Club wrote:

Warsash Hard Proposals

Response to the Consultation by Warsash Sailing Club

Introduction

Warsash Sailing Club welcomes this opportunity to comment on the proposals for the development of the Warsash Hard and wishes to express its gratitude to the Harbour Authority Management Committee for making the opportunity available. While its response to many of the proposals is somewhat critical, the Club nevertheless believes that there is scope for dialogue and for wider discussions between all interested parties

including the fishermen and the new owners of Stone Pier Yard to arrive at conclusions beneficial to all.

A. The Harbour Master's Questions

When circulating the consultants' report, the harbour master asked for responses to a number of issues. For ease of reading, the issues are reproduced here, with the club's replies.

1. Sea weed build up at the top of the "slipway"

We believe that the origin of the problem is the reduction in scour by the building of a solid wall to support the broad walk on the western boundary of the car park. Two possible solutions would be to replace the solid wall by piled support allowing a free scour or to create an artificial shoreline beyond the wall, smoothing the natural flow of the river. We should be happy to discuss the matter with the harbour officers. However, we would observe that a cheaper solution would be regular removal of the weed.

2. The muddy area downstream of the "slipway"

We are not sure why this is considered a problem but would recommend a hydrographic study before any works are undertaken.

3. Potholes and uneven surfaces on the "slipway"

We believe that the potholes should be filled in. As to the uneven surfaces, we would observe that the surface is compacted gravel, not easy to smooth. The uneven surface would not seem to be a major problem for those launching boats. The cost may be disproportionate to the benefit.

4. The concrete base of the maintenance piles which stands dangerously proud of the surrounding "slipway" surface

The outer edge of the concrete pad, i.e. the western edge, projected above the base level of the mud, measures 17 cm (6 ½"). Bearing in mind the pad already has a slope, as measured, of 1 metre in 16 metres, the inshore end of the pad is 1.9 metres higher than the outer end. Any boat intending to come on to these piles will surely ensure that there is at least (6") 0.15m clearance between the top of the concrete and its keel as, otherwise it would never get far enough on to reach the piles. This small 0.17 metre step is of no consequence and is only likely to cause harm to the most incautious sailor. However the outer edge of the concrete pad, i.e. the western edge, projected above the base level of the mud. It measured 17 cm (6 ½"). However, if there is thought to be a problem, it would be relatively simple to provide ramps to the edges. The outermost pile of the existing five is beyond the end of the concrete

pad so one often inadvertently steps off this step into deeper water - infuriating (and dangerous) depending on how tall your boots are! We recommend a longer pad encompassing the last pile and 2 metres beyond. It would be advantageous to replace the current rectangular piles (with corners that can damage boats) in the same position by piles with a circular cross section and to place a depth gauge on each pile. The proposal to move the piles downstream would pose far greater dangers. These are summarised in paragraph B 8 below.

5. The gradient of the “slipway”

The primary use of the slipway is for launching dinghies. The gradient should be considered in the light of that use. We do not think that the improvement in usefulness, if any, would justify the large amount of spoil removal and its attendant difficulties entailed in the consultants’ proposals. Stone Pier Yard staff use the hard for launching when they have insufficient water. Has the yard been consulted? Fishermen use the hard to load catches brought up to their jetty. Their interests must also be taken into account.

6. The mud and rocks at the low tide end of the “slipway”

We would support the removal of the rocks. We have some doubt that any removal of the mud would be permanent. However, the slipway ends long before MLWS. This means that launching and recovery is very difficult at these times as it is over the mud and rocks and it would be advantageous for the hard to extend beyond MLWS to approx depth of 0.7 metre at MLWS. The consultants ignore this point as they only consider the needs of larger vessels that would not launch at his state of the tide.

B. The Consultants’ “Slipway Options Analysis”

1. Preliminary

a. We find the process and indeed the genesis of these proposals surprising. The Warsash Hard has existed for centuries and long predates the establishment of the harbour. The consultants were briefed orally and it was left to them to interpret their brief, which they confirmed in a letter to the harbour master. In this process a fundamental misunderstanding arose in that the “hard” became a “slipway”. The hard has always had as its primary purpose the launching of small boats. A slipway is used for large vessels that require the assistance of gravity for their launch and mechanical means of recovery. The consultants have made a fundamental error in interpreting their brief. The consultants’ letter to the harbour master dated 24 February 2012 lists the three main issues he raised. There is no suggestion in those issues that the hard should be converted from its main use for small boats to a facility for the launching of large vessels.

b. On the western bank of the river, proposals for enhancement were discussed at an early stage before any detailed plans were formulated. We do not understand why this procedure was not followed on the eastern bank.

c. There are numerous slipways suitable for larger vessels in marinas and boatyards both above and below Bursledon Bridge, generally charged at modest rates. People wanting to launch these vessels will tow them to the river; their geographical location will not be a problem We have strong reservations about the propriety of the harbour authority offering a free facility in competition.

d. The consultants have undertaken no proper analysis of traffic on the hard. They surveyed it during a weekday at neap tides

e. There is no hydrographic analysis and no consideration of the extent to which the proposals would be vitiated by silting

- f. No basis is given for the estimates for the various options.*
- g. There is no analysis of winners and losers by the proposals*
- h. There is no discussion of the possible effects on neighbours, particularly the Warsash Sailing Club.*
- i. There is no indication of any discussion with the planning authority.*
- j. Members of the club have searched on the internet for examples of such wooden ramps in general use but have been unable to find any and hence have no indication of their success or lack of it in general use.*
- k. There is no estimate of the cost of maintenance, although the consultants, for example, recommend regular power washing of the wooden structure.*

2. Need for the proposals

There is no evidence presented to show that the hard needs widening, or that it cannot cope with demand in its present form. The evidence could have been the amounts collected in Harbour Dues from the Hard, but then the rate of collection is poor and in any case the harbour office does not record these separately. Most of the dues collected from boats that do not moor in the river are from dry-sailed boats. It is a reasonable surmise that the income from boats launched at the hard (and hence the number of visiting, larger boats) is small. The major use for the hard is to launch sailing dinghies. The club has a launching pontoon for dinghies at its Lobster Quay site but it is unsuitable for some types of performance dinghies with wings. Dinghies stored in the club's Shore House pound also use the hard as do dinghies (which can be substantial in number) brought for regular open events and stored temporarily in the Strawberry Field. Marina Projects, as their name implies and as the list of projects on their website demonstrates, have been almost exclusively concerned with designs for larger craft. They have made no analysis of the use of the hard, and possibly because of their professional experience, the consultants have made an unjustified assumption that their role is to suggest how to make the hard suitable for a tiny minority of users (who have alternatives) against the interests of the great majority of users who have no such alternative.

3. Risk Assessments

There are no risk assessments and there is no consideration of the extent to which the proposals may constitute a danger to navigation. We believe that the proposals will create unacceptable risks to vehicles through excessive loading of the structure and excessive danger of vehicles sliding into the water. The attached appendices give more detail

4. Car Parking in the Area

Car parking is already difficult. Additional boats being launched will cause parking problems and problems with trailers

5. River Congestion

There is a limit on the number of boats permitted to moor in the river. Additional larger boats being launched will cause further congestion problems.

6. Loss of Amenity

The proposals lower significantly the upper part of the existing hard, so that at low water vehicles will no longer be able to have access to the fishing pontoon to the north, or the scrubbing piles to the south.

7. Seaweed and Flotsam

There has been no examination of the factors leading to a buildup of seaweed and flotsam on the hard. If the main cause is from weed and flotsam being blown into an area of still water, extending the wall will not cure the problem. If it does work, the effect will be to divert the problem to the club. Weed and flotsam on the foreshore will be much more difficult to clear. If options two or three are chosen, the effect might be that the weed would rot under the bridge to the WSC jetty where it would develop a stench.

8. Spoil Removal

Reducing the profile and lowering the mid section of the current slipway (i.e. removal of up to 555m³ of sediment) will allow mud south of the hard to cover the new lower surface eventually becoming a muddier composition much like the low water mark top layer. 555 cubic metres are to be removed in option 1 and 300 in the other options. This could be removed by barge, but mooring would have to be found for the barge during loading operations, and this would necessarily have an impact on both the Warsash Sailing Club jetty and the fishing pontoon. In engineering terms it would be simpler to remove the soil by road. Given the nature of Shore Road the size of the removal lorries would have to be restricted. At least 50 lorry movements would be required. As the spoil would be saturated an additional allowance would have to be made for the amount of water. The County Council's "Guiding Principles for the Hamble Estuary Partnership" include minimizing capital dredging.

9. Moving the Scrubbing Piles Southward and Other Changes to the Piles

The close proximity of the Warsash Sailing Club (WSC) jetty and the strong cross currents would make berthing a boat alongside the downstream side of the piles dangerous. As proposed the piles will move 13.5 metres towards the Club's walkway leaving only 14.5 metres clearance in which to safely manoeuvre a boat of up to 4.6 metres beam and secure both bow and stern simultaneously to these very sharp edged posts. Leaving the piles on the ebb is even more hazardous and requires sea room. Boats are at their least manoeuvrable when they have least way on. There is a considerable risk of collision with the WSC jetty. Clearly there has been no risk assessment. The proposal would seem to be directly contrary to the ALARP principle (risks should be as low as reasonably possible). It appears, though this is not specified in the text, that the piles are to be moved into deeper water. This will reduce significantly their usefulness. Concrete blocks as proposed would present a hazard to keel boats. Only one side of the piles could then be used, the side without the blocks. Making the concrete plinth horizontal generates a dangerous lip, and reduces the available draft. As shown on the drawings, the piles have no connection to the shore, which will be a major inconvenience for users. One member of the club has submitted a paper setting out advantages to club members in moving the piles nearer the club jetty. In the club's view these advantages are outweighed by the extra risks. In any case, there would be no advantage to the majority of users of the piles, who are not members of the club. Unfortunately this is not true for the pad proposed in the Report which stands 0.8 metre proud of the surrounding mud and has no slope either. There are only 4 piles in the new proposals as against five at present. The total distance spanned by all 4 piles as planned is only 10.5m (34'). Most boats would thus span all four piles at once.

10. Capital Dredge

The removal of this spoil is a capital dredge in that it is removing part of the sea bed that has not previously been removed. There is no evidence of any sampling or hydrographic studies that would show the impact of the dredging on other river users. The bulk of the sea bed is soft mud and there is a risk that removing the spoil would cause a loss of support to the Warsash Sailing Club jetty. No tidal/erosion modelling study has been commissioned.

11. Maintenance Dredging

The hard is hard through continuous compaction, and is surrounded by soft mud. Mud would swiftly encroach on a lowered surface; frequent maintenance dredging would be required.

12. Land Ownership

WSC has submitted a claim to the Land Registry claiming rightful ownership of the foreshore adjacent to the hard. Other than the club, there is no known owner. The Harbour Authority cannot build on land it does not own. Moreover, there would be no access to the proposed facility except over land in Club ownership. Were the claim successful, the Club intends to place a bench on the land to the benefit of walkers and passers-by. The roadway between the Club premises and the proposed site for option three is private in the ownership of the Club. There is no right of way for vehicles to any construction site south of the hard.

13. Flotsam

Before the building of the Fishermen's jetty and the car park boardwalk, the hard was scoured by the tide and there was much less deposit of weed. Building a wall to block the flood tide may not solve the problem if the main build-up is in fact weed that is blown into the dead space by the prevailing wind. If the wall is a success, the result would be to divert the weed under the WSC bridge to its jetty from where it would be difficult to remove and where it would rot, creating an intolerably smelly nuisance.

14. Loads on the Proposed Wooden Ramp

See Appendix two.

15. Buoys

The proposed buoys marking the edge of the slipway will be a hazard, particularly to boats mooring at the scrubbing piles. It would be inevitable, given their closeness to the piles, that boats will foul them. If the buoys did foul boats' propellers, apart from damage to the stern gear, there would be a significant risk of damage through collision with the fishermen's jetty or boats alongside the jetty.

16. Launching

The consultants refer to the need for a 1m depth to launch a Laser dinghy with the dagger board down. Dinghies are not, however launched with the dagger board down. The increase in the slope will seriously incommode the recovery of dinghies. Owners of larger boats that require a steeper slope have, as said in the introduction, the option of launching, on payment of a small charge, at a boatyard or marina with a suitable slipway. The consultants refer to "current design standards" of 1:7 to 1:9. However, those are design standards for larger boats. Such boats can launch elsewhere on the river. The design standards specify concrete ramps. Wood has a lower coefficient of friction and there is greater danger of vehicles used for launching slipping into the water, particularly if the ramp is weedy or slimy. The ramp will have to be kept scrupulously clean. Vans and small trucks are used for launching, sometimes more than one at a time. A very robust construction will be required (see Appendix

two). Similarly the trailer park, which will have to accept vehicles hauling trailers into the park, will have to stand the weight. The attached paper by Don Alexander (Appendix one) explains in more detail the problems of a wooden ramp.

17. Public Sector Equality Duty

The two protected characteristics for consideration here are age and disability. A fit young man or woman would find it difficult to haul a dinghy up a slope of the gradient proposed. Older sailors and sailors with a disability would find it impossible. The Harbour Authority may not undertake actions which disadvantage people with protected characteristics.

18. Considerable Expense of Option Two for Marginal Improvement

Appendix 5 of the consultants' report shows that the lower end of the proposed wooden ramp terminates at the existing surface of the hard at just below mean high water neaps. As the report shows, there would be no improvement at mean high water neaps by comparison with option 1A.

19. Option Three

Option three at a further additional cost of £29,000 provides for the construction of a large area of decking, equivalent in area to the existing car park, from the existing slipway to the bridge to the Club's pontoon. This must substantially increase the risk of vandalism. The services to the pontoon would be easily accessible. The consultants intend this area as a trailer park only but car parking could not be prevented as access must be provided for trailers. Even a layman may doubt that this decking could be constructed for £29,000 (see Appendix two). It would traverse the foreshore, not in the ownership of the council and claimed by the Club. The proposal raises the "possibility" that "an area of the new decking to be leased to the nearby public house for the provision of outside seating/eating." Apart from the disturbance to the Club's quiet enjoyment of its premises, the option would involve carrying food and drink diagonally across the road and would conflict at times with dinghies being hauled along the right of way from the Shore House pound to the slipway and back. There is, as previously explained, no right of way for vehicles to access the construction site. To justify such a proposal, the Harbour Authority would have to recover enough in rental to yield a profit after taking into account capital and maintenance costs. No calculations have been provided.

Appendix One

Launching Ramp Gradients

A Note by Don Alexander

The author of the report "Warsash Slipway Access to water - Slipway options analysis" uses as his main argument that the present gradient of the Warsash Hard is not steep enough and thus does not comply with the "Current design standards state 1:7 to 1:9 largely dictated by site limitations." He proposes a design that will provide a 1 in 10 slope, albeit on a wooden surface. Further he only considers launching from road trailers towed behind cars or other relatively heavy vehicles. However many more craft are launched and recovered by people on foot using launching trolleys and it is essential that the safety of these sailors is not compromised by the slope being too steep to maintain a secure foothold whilst pulling their boat out of the water and up the wooden slipway.

There is no doubt that slopes as steep as the above 'recommendations' are needed for slipways. As such they are used by lifeboat launching ramps and other

large vessel launching facilities. They are indeed SLIP ways with gradients such that vessels will slide down the slope on their own bottoms unaided.

Launching:-

Looking at the data on friction between dissimilar materials(1), one notes that a wooden boat sliding down a wet wooden slipway has a coefficient of only 0.072(2). Similarly its metal keelband against oak has a coefficient of 0.075(3). Thus, by simple calculation and with the rubbing surfaces being wet or greasy, a gradient as little as 1 in 14 for wood against wood or 1 in 13 for metal against wood is all that is needed for the boat to slide down the ramp unaided. One notes that the author intends to have a steeper slope of 1 in 10 on his ramp. As this is steeper than either of the above gradients boats will slide down the ramp whether on a trailer or not – and with ever increasing speed. Additionally, once the ropes retaining the boat to its trailer are released, it will slide back off the trailer under its own weight – so we are in for some lively times.

Recovery:-

The above reasoning only considers launching; however recovery implies a sure foothold whilst recovering the boat. This is a much more hazardous exercise as now it is no longer just necessary to prevent the boat from sliding uncontrollably into the water one now needs to pull the boat onto its launching trolley and then to drag it up the ramp. Thus people will be both having to overcome the rolling resistance of the loaded trailer whilst, at the same time, lifting the boat as the trailer rises up the slope. Any slip and the boat and trolley/trailer will descend uncontrollably back into the water, mowing down anyone who happened to be in the way or launching or recovering their own boat.

Weed:-

Unless kept scrupulously clean one must also take account of the presence of seaweed approximately halving the slope angles at which things slide and at which people fall over into the tide.

Ref 1- http://www.roymech.co.uk/Useful_Tables/Tribology/co_of_fric.htm

Ref 2:- Ref 1 report - Oak - Oak (cross grain) Wet or Greasy 0.072

Ref 3:- Ref 1 report - Cast Iron - Oak Wet or Greasy - 0.075

7

Appendix Two

Load Requirements of the Slipway

A Note by Clifford Hughes

Currently the Hard, being a compacted, sound, mud free aggregate surface, accepts fishermen's transit vans (up to 1.5T.TARE + 1.7T.Payload) and low loaders (with gross weight of 7Tons). To be equivalent and using the normal safety factor of two and half times the weight of the vehicle, the decking built over the Hard would have to be designed to take up to 18Tons for each vehicle.

Presumably, as public bridges have to be safety inspected every two years, this would also apply to the decking. Marina Projects should refer to Standards for Highways and Bridges DMRB 1992 for guidance. I have not found one example of a wooden bridge or decking constructed by a UK Local Authority which would take this sort of weight; the design would have to be reinforced concrete and steel girders.

As Marina Projects has not given any construction details for their decking, they obviously have not taken into account vehicle weights or safety loading and public safety. They also do not provide any examples similar to their proposed decking

scheme (and carrying this weight) installed at any of their sites or at any marinas. The current hard does not have, or need, a weight restriction and there should be no additional constriction to public river access and usage of the Hard erecting new weight restrictions signs.

The fishermen may have a view on this 'restriction of trade' aspect if they knew that their use of the Hard were restricted/curtailed thus making it necessary for them to drag their catch all the way up the jetty from their pontoons to their vans on the public road rather than load them directly at the lower part of the consolidated hard as they do now. UK law frowns on restraint of trade of any kind. Ref. Board of Trade & Industries regs.