

HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL**Report**

Committee	River Hamble Harbour Board
Date:	26 June 2013
Title:	Warsash Slipway Improvements
Reference:	4982
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. At its meeting on 11 January 2013, the River Hamble Harbour Board asked the Marine Director to engage consultants to assess the feasibility and likely costs of the improvements to the Warsash Slipway, as proposed by the Management Committee working group chaired by Councillor Cartwright.
- 1.2. The chosen consultants, selected on the basis of price and quality, and approved by the Chairman of the Harbour Board, were ABP Mer.

2. Background

- 2.1. At its meeting on 11 January 2013, the River Hamble Harbour Board considered the report of a working group, chaired by Councillor Cartwright, which set out a number of proposed improvements to the Warsash slipway. The Harbour Board asked the Marine Director to engage consultants to assess the feasibility and likely costs of the proposals. After seeking bids to carry out this work, the chosen consultants were ABP Mer who separately engaged Opus International to address the costings. Their combined report is at Appendix 1. Note that the conclusions are in two parts (ABP Mer and Opus) and that the comments below address both sets of conclusions.

3. Comments

- 3.1 The consultants have recommended that the removal of the north-east corner of the concrete pad of the maintenance piles should not be carried out, because the construction of the pad is unknown and the demolition costs may be un-economic. The consultants' report concludes that the use

of infill material to raise the level of the surrounding slipway to that of the concrete pad is possible, using granular material laid over a base layer of geomembrane, with geogrids inserted to hold the granular material in place. The Harbour Master is concerned that this process may have an adverse effect on the gradient of the slipway (and hence its usability) in this area, so the profiling of any such works will require very careful consideration.

- 3.2 The consultants' report concludes that fitting additional depth gauges to the maintenance piles is both feasible and desirable.
- 3.3 The consultants' report concludes that the installation of gravel retaining boards at the downstream edge of the slipway is feasible but suggests that marker posts should be installed at intervals in order to aid navigation. The addition of further granular material to strengthen the current surface along the downstream edge is also supported, but using geogrids to hold the surface material in place.
- 3.4 The consultants' report concludes that the creation of a gravel beach at the top of the slipway will not reduce the amount of seaweed that reaches the Warsash frontage, but will move the strand line further to seaward and may move some of the seaweed to the area between the Fishermen's Jetty and the Harbour Office. The seaweed is unlikely to be moved from the proposed gravel beach by the action of wind and tide as it is expected to be caught on the granular material of the beach. Further, it concludes that the gravel is likely to become rutted by trailers and vehicles using the slipway. Thus, it is recommended that the creation of a gravel beach, if implemented, should utilise 'Grasscrete' blocks or similar to hold the gravel in place, extending from the road edge out as far as the landward edge of the concrete pad of the maintenance piles. This would inevitably increase the cost of the project.
- 3.5 The proposal to remove part of the inshore pontoon of the Fishermen's Jetty (to create a 'swashway' and replace it with a bridge or brow) is considered feasible and will greatly enhance the safe use of the Jetty by the fishermen. In light of the recent Port Marine Safety Code audit report (see Harbour Master's Report), it is intended to proceed with this part of the scheme (subject to obtaining the necessary consents), using a six metre brow which will eliminate the need to move the existing pile. This will be funded from the annual jetty maintenance payments contributed by the local fishermen.
- 3.6 Discussions with pontoon manufacturers have indicated that installing a handrail on one edge of the Fishermen's Jetty pontoon would have an adverse effect on pontoon flotation and stability and should not proceed. It is not considered practical to install a handrail on both sides (thus balancing the loading on the pontoons) because of the limits this would impose on access. There are already sufficient cleats at the downstream side of the seaward end of the pontoon, given that the downstream side of

the Jetty is not intended for the mooring of boats. Solar powered deck-level lights have recently been installed on the pontoon to increase night-time safety for the fishermen.

- 3.7 The report concludes that the proposal to shutter and infill the lower part of the slipway is likely to be complex and expensive, and is unlikely to be acceptable to Natural England and the Environment Agency.

4. Cost

- 4.1 Section 6 of the Opus International report sets out approximate cost estimates for the various elements of the scheme. Of these, by far the largest (£90,000) is for the creation of the gravel beach. Of the remaining items, the infill around the concrete pad is estimated at £5,000, the fixing of depth markers at £550 and the construction of the gravel retaining boards and associated infill along the downstream edge at just over £5,000. Thus, if the gravel beach and Jetty handrails are removed from the scheme, and the creation of the swashway and brow is already funded, the total cost of the remaining items would be just under £11,000.

5. Way forward

- 5.1 If the recommendations below are approved, it is proposed that the next step should be to engage the services of a marine civil engineering company to draw up detailed engineering drawings and specifications for each of the elements listed, so that refined costs can be ascertained via a competitive tendering process.

6 Recommendation

- 6.1 **It is recommended that the River Hamble Harbour Board:**
- a. Approves the infill around the concrete pad of the maintenance piles, to restore the levels (but taking care to retain a useable gradient on the slipway);**
 - b. Approves the construction of gravel retaining boards, complete with marker posts, and associated infill along the downstream edge of the slipway;**
 - c. Approves the fixing of additional depth markers on the maintenance piles;**
 - d. Endorses the installation of a six-metre brow to enhance safe access to the Fishermen's Jetty;**
 - e. Approves other re-surfacing work and the infilling of existing potholes and shallow puddles (where not already included in Recommendations (a) and (b) above);**

- f. Rejects the proposed gravel beach (on the grounds of cost versus limited efficacy), and;**
- g. Rejects the proposed installation of a handrail and additional cleats on the Fishermen's Jetty.**

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. The contents of this report do not include references to crime on the River.

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, apart from the impact of the construction process which are unquantifiable at this stage.
- 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.