

LYMINGTON HARBOUR ADVISORY GROUP

MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON TUESDAY 18th OCTOBER 2016

At 1700 hrs at the Royal Lymington Yacht Club.

PRESENT:

Andrew Wilkes (Business Interests) Chairman
Rupert Wagstaff (Marinas), Vice Chairman
Peter Upcher (Recreational Users)
Michael White (Lymington & Pennington Town Council)
John Clarke (Lymington, Keyhaven and District Wildfowlers Association)
Bob Chapman (Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust)
Peter Ferguson (NFDC Coast Protection)

IN ATTENDANCE:

Ryan Willegers (Chief Executive and Harbour Master)
Geoff Holmes (Lymington Harbour Commissioners Chairman)
Richard Jenner (Lymington Harbour Commissioners Vice Chairman)
Matt Brown (RSPB)

1. Apologies for absence

David Illsey (NFNPA)
Derek Graham (Wightlink)
Rob Thompson (Commercial Boat Owners) Peter Lock (Lymington Rowers)

2. Minutes of previous meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 12th April 2016 were approved. As discussed in April, future meeting minutes will be approved using email prior to LHAG meetings. This will enable them to be approved and posted on the LHC web site in a timely manner.

3. LHAG - new members

Sandy James has retired from Wightlink. Derek Graham has been appointed as Wightlink's representative. He sent his apologies for this meeting.

Andrew Colenutt has left NFDC to take up a new post with the Maritime and Coastguard Agency. NFDC have nominated Peter Ferguson from their coastal protection team to replace him.

Barry Dunning has been appointed Town Mayor and will find it difficult to attend LHAG meetings. Cllr. Michael White is welcomed back to represent "Local People".

4. Matters Arising:

(a) Strategic Plan progress - Town Quay consultations

The eight week public consultation commenced on Monday 1st August and ended on Sunday 25th September 2016. Details of the individual feedback (personal information removed) and an interim analysis was circulated to LHAG Members. Overall feedback showed strong support for the scheme across all categories of stakeholder, with 85 (86%) of the 99 responses being in favour with just 6% of responses against the scheme. On receipt of LHAG's response, the Commissioners will take time to properly consider all of the feedback received before deciding whether any changes were required prior to developing a business case. On completion of the business case the Commissioners will make a decision on whether any changes are required and, if so, in what format the scheme should proceed.

- Letters from Graham Butler and the Berthon Boat Company Ltd had previously been distributed to members and these were discussed. Berthon Boat Company strongly objected to the proposal and raised a number of issues. R.Wag highlighted the concerns expressed by Berthon about access to their Boatyard.. R. Wil said that in developing the scheme the Commissioners had taken care to ensure the navigation fairway width between LHC moorings and the Berthon boatyard was preserved in line with present and historical use. R.Wil said LHC would respond directly to Berthon's letter once it had time to properly consider the points raised. LYH had made no comment on the revised proposal.
- AW said local businesses would prefer the mid-stream pontoon to be used for visitors' use rather than residential use. However most local businesses are in favour of the scheme and would like to support it.
- AW asked about plans to upgrade the Town Quay WC/shower facilities. R.Wil that he had asked NFDC, who own the facilities and are in the process of a phased replacement of their facilities, whether the Town Quay facility is in their renewal/refurbishment plan for the next three years. If so, LHC is likely to defer budgeted expenditure for planned refurbishment in FY 2017/18 but not firm decision has been taken yet.
- R.Wag asked if LHC were consulting with the Environment Agency about any proposed further changes they may seek to make to the floodgates in future in order to establish if this might impact on the scheme. R.Wil indicated that based on the feedback received at the end of the two year trial period, it is understood that the EA intend to maintain the present configuration going forward. R Wil indicated he would double check that this remains the case. Any future changes proposed would need to be the subject of further consultation with LHC, and as in the past, LHC would seek to ensure that any proposals would not adversely affect moorings whether in existing or new configurations. In response to a question from AW, R.Wil confirmed that it is LHC's intention to apply to NFDC for planning consent for the re-development. There is some doubt about whether or not structures in subtidal waters and not connected to the land require planning consent and indeed whether NFDC has power to consent this element. MMO (Marine Management Organisation) approval will be required for all works.
- The sailing clubs and rowing club and recreational sailors are in favour of the revised scheme.
- AW noted that concern had been expressed about boats attempting to moor in strong tidal streams. R Wil indicated that LHC had commissioned a specialist company and equipment to monitor tidal flows, including over the largest spring tides of 2016 co-inciding with a period of rain. R.Wil confirmed that flow rates through most of the new mooring configuration area will be under 1 knot for the vast majority of the time. As far as is practical most berths have been aligned to take account of current flows. This recent monitoring endorsed the findings of previous Environment Agency monitoring undertaken over a 549 day period (including two winters) in a location just below the railway bridge which showed that flow rates were under 0.6 of a knot for over 99% of that period. From time to time there will be exceptional floodwater conditions, however these are most likely to occur in winter when visitor numbers are low and the small number of moorings most exposed to current flows can be managed accordingly. This view was also shared by the independent risk assessment commissioned by LHC. RWil indicated that visiting boats have historically rafted out 4 (and previously 5) deep in an area affected by the strongest flows without any trend of incidents related to current flows. The Harbour Operations Manager, who has worked within the harbour for over

thirty years, confirms this view. However, R Wag said that Graham Butler strongly disagreed with these findings as outlined in his letter.

- R.Wil said that, where appropriate, he was answering concerns raised by people individually.
- The consensus of the meeting was that, although not all Stakeholders were in favour, a substantial majority were. LHAG would therefore support the scheme but ask LHC to address specific concerns wherever possible.
- On behalf of LHAG, AW thanked LHC for the extensive consultation process concerning the proposal and agreed to draft and circulate a letter to be sent to LHC on behalf of LHAG.

(b) Maintenance Grids and Antifouling

At the Commissioners July meeting it was agreed to review the use of maintenance piles/pressure washers for hull cleaning and antifouling operations. The purpose was to identify whether LHC could do more to minimise the risk of contaminants entering the water column. A review was undertaken and the associated report was considered Commissioners at their September meeting. The review concluded that the environmental impact of the existing use of the scrubbing grids is low. It also concluded that risks could be further mitigated by drawing attention to the relevant anti-pollution legislation, prohibiting the (already very low) use of pressure washers, and by publishing best practice guidance taken from The Green Blue (Boating Fact Sheet 10). These further controls to mitigate environmental risk have been implemented. Further details are available at <http://www.lymingtonharbour.co.uk/Antifouling-and-the-Marine-Environment>.

5. Harbour Commissioner Changes

Clifford Jakes (CJ) and Brian May (BM) will retire in the 31st October 2016 after serving for two three year terms each as Harbour Commissioner. At the September meeting, both were thanked for their valued service and presented with an engraved ships decanter. The vacancy created by CJ's retirement was filled by Bob Mitchel who had previously been co-opted to facilitate a 'handover' period for the role of Chairman of the Finance Committee. Interviews to fill the vacancy were held on the 8th September and 18th October 2016 (today). The interview panel consisting of Peter Upcher (LHAG), Cllr Michael White (Independent), Geoff Holmes (Chair LHC) and Richard Jenner (Chair – Personnel Committee LHC) will forward their recommendations to the Commissioners for consideration.

If arising from the interviews there are two strong candidates with the right mix of skills, there is an option to co-opt a second person to fulfil the vacancy that will arise in May 2017 when Geoff Holmes retires. This would save a further recruitment process being required early in the New Year. This was discussed and it was agreed that this would be a sensible approach. A recruiting process will still be required for vacancies occurring next October.

At the September Board meeting Richard Jenner was appointed as Vice Chairman to take effect from the 1st November 2016 on Clifford Jakes retirement.

6. LHC Staffing

In response to a shortage of personnel within the river (outside) operational team during the winter months, the Commissioners have approved converting one of the existing full time seasonal posts to a full time permanent position. In practice this extends a post that has been working for 8-9 months to a 12 month position. An appointment has been made.

7. Natural England

AW advised the meeting that, following an exchange of emails between LHC and NE, NE have offered to attend LHAG meeting to provide a briefing (if we wish) in connection with the proposal to create a new Special Protection Area to protect Tern foraging grounds.

8. Hampshire and Isle of Wight Wildlife Trust and RSPB Tern Project

BC reported a successful HIWWT Open Day which many people found informative and useful. The day included boat trips to Hurst Castle for members of the public.

Matt Brown (RSPB) told the meeting that he was hoping to erect "table-top" structures on the breakwaters with the objective of encouraging Roseate Terns to breed within the Special Protection Area (SPA). Roseate Terns are one of Britain's rarest birds and their severe long-lasting decline has put them on the RSPB's "Red List." JC expressed fears that foxes would swim to the breakwaters and eat the eggs. R.Wil said that he has sought the views of LHC engineering consultants, Black & Vetch on the effect of the proposed structures on the breakwaters.

An alternative habitat was discussed which was to encourage Roseate Terns to breed on the chenier beaches on the marsh edges. The chenier beaches could be artificially re-charged to promote a sustainable breeding ground. GH asked if NFDC would continue to monitor chenier beaches in the Lymington area as the data was a useful indicator of marsh erosion. PF said that, although the Hurst Spit area is their main priority, it was hoped to continue monitoring the Lymington area. Future surveys may be carried out using drones.

Another potential way of encouraging Roseate Tern to breed is to moor a number of floating rafts within creeks. Some form of fox deterrent/proofing would be required to protect the nests, eggs and chicks. R.Wil and BC thought this would be the best option from a practicality and cost perspective as pontoons could be pre-prepared and then simply towed/floated into position within the marsh or behind the breakwaters on suitable tides.

9. Dredging Programme

Dredging this winter is currently being carried out in the eastern margins of the main channel in the lower river. Thereafter it will move to the Fortuna Dock area and a small area within the Dan Bran pontoon.

10. Safety and Port Marine Safety Code

10.1 Port Marine Safety Code Compliance Audit - LHC appoint a qualified consultant (Independent Designated Person) to provide independent reassurance to the Board that LHC's Safety Management System (SMS) complies with the provisions of the Port Marine Safety Code. His annual audit was conducted in April and concluded that LHC's Safety Management System continued to comply with the requirements of the Code.

10.2 Safety Meeting (Incident Review) - Since the last LHAG meeting, LHC have held two safety review meetings. Part of their considerations includes a review of incidents in the river. Copies of the incident summary reports informing those meetings have been circulated to LHAG for information. There were currently two potential cases under consideration for prosecutions for speeding and other offences under the 2014 General Directions. The case files are currently with LHC's legal advisors for legal review prior to taking a final decision on whether to proceed.

In terms of ongoing safety management, LHC have been working with the RLymYC and Wightlink to try and address problems experienced by the W Class ferries when entering or leaving the river during Thursday evening keelboat racing. RLymYC had made some changes to their safety control measures including amending some race start times to create a bigger 'window' between race starts during expected ferry transit periods and this had improved the position. However there were still some issues that needed further consideration. A review meeting is planned for the 15th November.

11. Any other business

11.1 JC asked about a proposal to promote oyster breeding beneath existing floating structures (eg pontoons) in the Lymington River. A meeting had been held earlier in the year which R.Wil and R.Wag attended. It was not known if the proposal was likely to go any further.

11.2 A second Consultation about the pSPA (Tern Foraging Areas) is likely to be held at some time in the future.

11.3 PF noted that the sea wall adjacent to the RLymYC was damaged. It was built by the Environment Agency and it is believed ownership transferred to NFDC at some time in the 1980's.

11.4 GH advised that he and R.Wil would be attending a Habitat Replenishment Scheme conference in London in November.

12. 2017 Meetings

14th March and 26th September 2017 - to be confirmed.

Details of the individual feedback to the Town Quay consultation and the interim analysis are appended below.

Lymington Harbour Town Quay Proposals - Interim Consultation Feedback Analysis

| Responder Category | No. Responses | Supportive | Against | No For/Against View Expressed |
|--|---------------|------------|-----------|-------------------------------|
| Mooring Holder on Lymington River | 35 | 30 | 3 | 2 |
| On waiting List for a Mooring in Lymington River | 12 | 10 | 0 | 2 |
| Visiting Boat to Lymington River | 25 | 20 | 2 | 3 |
| Local Resident | 15 | 14 | 0 | 1 |
| Local Business or Organisation | 10 | 9 | 1 | 0 |
| Other | 2 | 2 | 0 | 0 |
| Total | 99 | 85 | 6 | 8 |
| Percentages (rounded) | | 86% | 6% | 8% |

11th Oct 2016

Town Quay Development Proposals - Consultation Feedback

| | Category | Proposal Supported ? Yes / No / Not Stated | Comment | Count | | |
|----|----------------|--|---|-------|---------|------------|
| | | | | For | Against | Not Stated |
| 1 | Other (Staff) | Yes | Looks great and I think it will be a great improvement to the area for the Harbour and the Town. | 1 | | |
| 2 | Visitor | Yes | Very supportive of the scheme - would increase our use of Lymington | 1 | | |
| 3 | Visitor | Yes | Excellent idea and I like the idea of pontoons at 45 degrees. We will visit more often if you build this. | 1 | | |
| 4 | Visitor | Yes | We like visiting town Quay. Always used to use the buoys but getting older, metal joints, poor breathing etc. means we now like the walk ashore quay. As my wife is now very ill her recovery will mean using the dinghy now impossible. We have also switched to power with attendant rafting problems so the proposals should suit us very well. We are only mid week visitors! | 1 | | |
| 5 | Visitor | Yes (Qualified). Supports extending walk ashore rafting berths BUT against finger berths | I'm a regular visitor from Poole, I'd say Lymington is my favourite in the Solent. Why ramp up the cost and price by adding the fingers to avoid rafting? Rafting is sociable and promotes good relations between visitors. Yarmouth spoiled themselves with the pontoon push. Do the U backbone by all means, but dump the fingers (at whatever angle) Retain the rafting. All that will add walkashore capacity at minimal cost to what is already popular. Don't change the character to something else. Don't overprice yourself like Yarmouth did, it lost its charm and raised its prices. | 1 | | |
| 6 | Visitor | Yes | In principal see no problems. I have been using the Town Quay for over 40 years as a visitor, by boats have always been small, my current boat is 27 feet. I am quite happy with a mid river berth. The layout does not make it clear if the mid river berths will be between bouys, between piles or alongside a pontoon As far as mid river capacity is concerned is the maximum number of existing berths based on two boats per pair of buoys/piles, and is proposed capacity based on the same arrangement. As present you washroom showers and toilet facilities although a big improvement on years ago are still not up the modern standards, compare yourself with Yarmouth. How will the proposal impact the berthing cost, currently your mid river moorings are similar the non walkashore at Yarmouth. A response would be much appreciated. | 1 | | |
| 7 | Visitor | Yes | I think your plans look excellent. I would definitely visit Lymington more often if this was in place. I think your facts on Yarmouth are very interesting and reflect my experience. Good luck. | 1 | | |
| 8 | Visitor | Yes | Great idea. It will improve facilities for all mariners and increase the revenue stream. As a visitor and New forest resident I hope it happens sooner rather than later. | 1 | | |
| 9 | Visitor | Yes | Proposal supported | 1 | | |
| 10 | Mooring Holder | Not stated | Hi I'm currently on I think K8-9 will this still be in place or are the moorings moving? What are the plans for where I am currently moored ? | | | 1 |
| 11 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I think this is an excellent scheme that can drive revenue for LHA to the benefit of all. | 1 | | |
| 12 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Happy to support the proposals | 1 | | |
| 13 | Mooring Holder | Yes | An excellent proposal , the town needs to thrive and this improvement can only help.This revision will help the finances of the "river" in general and should be welcomed | 1 | | |
| 14 | Mooring Holder | Not stated | How will the redevelopment be funded? I would prefer that the cost does not result in higher mooring fees for mooring holders. | | | 1 |
| 15 | Local Resident | Yes | The proposal is outstanding.I support it. | 1 | | |
| 16 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Excellent idea, plans look good and should be a great success. What about the toilet and shower facilities at the quay?? Public toilets are not acceptable if you are paying the market price for mooring. | 1 | | |
| 17 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I am a resident who has a berth on the Dan Bran complex. I have noted in the last two years how popular this has become with visiting boats, and therefore endorse the proposal for the Town Quay, which will be of huge benefit to all the local businesses . My only concern would be the lack of sufficient WC's showers rubbish disposal etc , and trust this has been considered ,an increase in pollution of any sort would be detrimental to an excellent scheme | 1 | | |
| 18 | Waiting List | Yes | I think the new proposals are first class and back them entirely. I am sailing in France at the moment, so don't have any chance of discussing them with others, but they do really tackle the current problem. Lymington needs harbourmaster walk ashore pontoons with power and water for visitors, provided at a cost significantly lower than the 2 commercial marinas. It should be approached as providing business for the town and winter facilities for locals. | 1 | | |
| 19 | Visitor | Yes | Strongly in favour of the proposal | 1 | | |
| 20 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Excellent proposal, we should not delay in implementing | 1 | | |
| 21 | Waiting List | Yes | I fully support the proposals, which will be a significant and valuable improvement to the Town Quay facilities | 1 | | |
| 22 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Excellent idea...well thought through proposals...good for Lymington and Town Quay | 1 | | |
| 23 | Local Resident | Yes | These proposals will provide much needed enlargement and improvement to town quay moorings. I hope they will prove to be the first step in a programme of general modernisation, badly needed in this part of our town. | 1 | | |
| 24 | Waiting List | Yes | Anything which improves the attractiveness of Lymington for visiting yachtsmen is to be supported. Many destinations offer not only walk ashore facilities but also showers etc Can this be included in the plans We also need more walk ashore facilities for Lymington residents | 1 | | |
| 25 | Waiting List | Yes | looks like the new proposal is a far better use of the facility | 1 | | |
| 26 | Mooring Holder | Yes | As a mooring holder I'm not familiar with visitors' fees at the Town Quay, but wondered whether there was a sufficient differentiation between fees for mid-river and alongside berths. So I looked on your website to find out, and couldn't find a list of charges. So two bits of feedback from me: (1) put charges on the website; (2) encourage people to go mid-river by going easy on their pockets. Other than that, the new plan looks good to me. | 1 | | |
| 27 | Mooring Holder | Yes | The scheme for the Town Quay looks sound and well reasoned and thought out. However I would hope that existing mooring holders will not be subjected to increased berthing fees to finance the project | 1 | | |
| 28 | Visitor | Yes | Having been a frequent visitor to the Town Quay for many years I would welcome an increase in walkashore berths especially bookable berths - I have actually stayed more frequently in the marinas of late to be sure of a berth and this would encourage me to use the Town Quay once again. | 1 | | |
| 29 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I'm fully in favour of the proposed plan as it appears to make more effective use of the river in the vicinity of the Town Quay | 1 | | |
| 30 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I support the proposal, which will greatly improve Lymingtons visitor facilities. | 1 | | |
| 31 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I think the proposals are a good idea and fully support the changes. | 1 | | |
| 32 | Visitor | Yes | I am pleased to see that some river moorings are being kept, I visit regularly often single handed in a long keel boat that doesn't go well astern and the flexibility of a river mooring is very welcome compared to rafting up on the existing town quay, not through lack of sociability but the practicalities of handling a long keeler. I would welcome being able to check ahead on line for vacancies or even book online: most people have smart phones with data even at sea! For example if the Dan Bran pontoon is free midweek when most rallies are at weekends? I greatly value Lymington as a place to visit: sheltered in bad weather, good shops and restaurants to good for provisioning and above all a convenient place to meet or exchange crew with the rail link, few other ports offer that, also relaxed atmosphere and welcoming staff, keep up the good work but keep a bit of space for those who do prefer a buoy! Unlike your neighbours in Yarmouth, Lymington has a reputation for always fitting you in whereas Yarmouth is often full on a summer Saturday and the buoys just add to that flexibility. | 1 | | |
| 33 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Increasing the walk ashore space for visiting boats makes sense in terms of expanding the attractiveness of the river. Yarmouth did it many moons ago as already cited. A question might need to be addressed whether current mooring holders on the river will see an increase to fees or whether this project will be based on a self-funding cycle? Local businesses and most of the town trade should benefit. Is there funding from town businesses and commercial sectors? | 1 | | |
| 34 | Visitor | Yes | Go for it, well over due. Will mean I will visit Lymington more often without the hassle of rowing ashore. I do presume electricity will be available on the walk ashore. | 1 | | |
| 35 | Local Resident | Yes | This proposal is to be welcomed and supported by all concerned | 1 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|------------|--|---|---|---|
| 36 | Mooring Holder | Yes | A good plan that makes sense | 1 | | |
| 37 | Mooring Holder | Yes | This looks like an excellent plan with better facilities for visitors. More walk ashore moorings are needed so I fully support this plan especially as a lower number of boats being rafted together is much better as well. | 1 | | |
| 38 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Fully support the new walk ashore | 1 | | |
| 39 | Waiting List | Yes | These proposals are good, but it's a pity there is no increase in resident moorings. However I understand the difficulties in achieving that objective and support the proposal. | 1 | | |
| 40 | Visitor | Yes | Looks excellent | 1 | | |
| 41 | Visitor | Yes | I like the Town Quay proposals | 1 | | |
| 42 | Mooring Holder | Yes | This proposal is an improvement on the previous one and meets the perceived needs of the boating population of today. It has long been noted that the visitor buoys have been unpopular, seen as a last option, and so the supply of walk ashore berths with power and water will bring the area into the modern day whilst giving the commercial users a safer turning area. Excellent proposal. | 1 | | |
| 43 | Visitor | Yes | Whilst I applaud the proposed re-development of the Town Quay mooring area, I don't fully understand why there is not an enterprising water taxi business delivering owners to and from their boats from wherever in the river during the sailing season. This seems to work well in Cowes and Yarmouth. | 1 | | |
| 44 | Waiting List | Yes | Its unfortunate that there is very limited (public) river frontage at the Town Quay, so therefore it is important that the most is made of what space there is. The proposed scheme looks like an excellent improvement and will enhance the quay area, and of course visitors are to be greatly encouraged. I note that there will be no increase in the number of resident moorings available, I would like to see local residents of more modest means with smaller craft who are seeking a berth also benefit from any improvements. | 1 | | |
| 45 | Visitor | Not Stated | I think there will be problems if yachts on the inner pontoons have to reverse out. It looks quite a tricky sternboard. If the tide is wrong or the wind is blowing hard it could lead to bumps and scrapes. I make this comment as a Yachtmaster Instructor who has taught many skippers and in this case would advise them not to accept one of these berths if laid out as proposed. | | | 1 |
| 46 | Visitor | Yes | I think this proposal looks really fabulous for visiting boats. I really like the idea of the berths being bookable in advance, Im a regular user of the Yarmouth bookable finger pontoons which work really well. In fact Ive never stayed overnight on Lymington town quay as it always looks crazy busy so Im never confident to find a spare place, plus the turning circle is so tight when the boats are rafted 4 out so mostly wouldnt even bother to look . I always end up staying in Berthon or the Yacht Haven. The location is super convenient for town so Im sure it will be popular. | 1 | | |
| 47 | Mooring Holder | Yes | The proposals look to be well thought out, and have my support. | 1 | | |
| 48 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I think it looks good for Lymington and well thought out. | 1 | | |
| 49 | Waiting List | Yes | I think these proposals are a great step fwd & take into account the need to help visitors to enjoy what we residents have all year round. They might even help me get a mooring. Bare in mind that today's boater will need a berth for more than the traditional "36 ft". (I need a 42 fter). Bu well done for proposing these changes. Basically a thumbs up from me. | 1 | | |
| 50 | Mooring Holder | No | Whilst congratulating the harbour commission on the consultation, I consider the new plan for town key visitor mooring to be another example of the destruction of the Lymington's unique character. Already the appalling 'Lymington Shores' development is an eyesore and I fear that the congestion during the summer of the new plan for the town key moorings will make that picturesque part of the town little more than a congested marina despoiling the view. I see the attractions of more cash for the Harbour Commission but I say let the visitors park downriver and use the sea legs to get into town! | | 1 | |
| 51 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I'm happy with the proposal as I'm under bridge! | 1 | | |
| 52 | Mooring Holder | Yes | The proposal to increase the facilities to bring business to the town are to be supported, the pontoon layout and re arrangement of the area look sensible and the risk assessment reasonable. The proposal requires substantial dredging, over laying the existing plan with the proposed plan shows a change in the channel through capital dredging. Will this require maintenance dredging and if so how frequently does the modelling predict this will be needed? Perhaps there is an EIA that answers these questions ? How will the dredging (capital and maintenance) be financed, will that be an overall cost to all other users or financed through berthing charges to the visitors ? | 1 | | |
| 53 | Visitor | No | As a visitor of very many years standing, my opinion is that one of the great charms of the Lymington River, is that one can lie afloat in the river remote from the unpleasantness of marina's, walk ashores etc. The inexorable reduction of visitors river moorings is already making the LR less & less hospitable. "If" the proposal means that visitors are denied the choice NOT to lie alongside then I am merely one of those who will turn their back on Lymington. Yarmouth's ill starred marina has lost them a host of regular & faithful visitors, & yet the Harbour Master says (July 2016) that is has not been a commercial success & that they need to re-attract yachts in the 30-35' range. You have a business to run, but I see jeopardy on your horizon, and I will not use a marinised facility anymore than I would drive to, say, the Lake District & stay in a National Car Park. Lymington has many empty shops etc, and I foresee many more in the future. | | 1 | |
| 54 | Local Resident | Yes | Both as a resident and as Chairman of Fishermans Quay Management Company Limited (we are 18 owner/residents) I am in support of the LHC's proposals. The quay, located in the centre of Lymington has long been an under developed asset and the proposals will help to regenerate the area by encouraging private investment. I would be grateful if you would keep me informed of the progress in implementing the proposals. | 1 | | |
| 55 | Visitor | No | I have berthed a yacht on Lymington Town Quay every summer for a week or so for the last 5 years. The atmosphere is quite unlike any other marina or harbour I have visited and this is a direct consequence of the "no frills, you're rafting" approach. It encourages good boat handlers and compatible visitors who are not after the highest level of luxury for their visit. The occasional running of a quiet diesel engine to recharge the batteries, after asking your neighbour if it's OK makes for a gentle backdrop, often drowned out by the ferry train or the ever-more aggressive sea-gulls. While the proposal has merits in that rafting will still be part of the character, the additional number of visitors will put a significant stretch on the limited shoreline facilities which have been due an upgrade for sometime. It was actually better in the good old days when The Ship Inn had a row of six showers available for visiting yachtsmen. A combined shower and wc may be a novelty for some but it just makes for a wet floor every time you sit down which is no joke. So, press on by all means, but I will miss the "band of brothers" feel that has pervaded the Town Quay for the last 20 years. The affluent will still seek finger berths in Berthons where they can admire themselves in the marbled wash-rooms. While you may increase the footfall into the town it will be at some cost to the character of the Town Quay and will likely require the attendance of a full-time berthing master as opposed to the current irregular visits by the ever-helpful Harbour Master's team. | | 1 | |
| 56 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Totally in agreement with what is proposed but why has Dan Bran enlargement not being proceeded with in conjunction with the above. Also is it not possible to re-organise and add to the moorings on the east side of the river below the ferry terminal and widen the navigable area near the main slipway which is very congested at weekends? Access to that slipway with trailer stowage continues to be a problem and needs greater control even at the risk of reducing numbers. In addition all too often boats are to be seen navigating down the wrong side of the river - would it be possible to erect signs to remind skippers to keep to the starboard side whenever possible (I know it should not be necessary but the rules are often ignored)? | 1 | | |
| 57 | Local Resident | Yes | This is an excellent plan to maintain the value of our town and neighbourhood and bring additional new business to our friends and neighbours. | 1 | | |
| 58 | Local Resident | Yes | I'd like to thank you for putting so much effort into this proposal and for seeking our feedback. I think the proposed scheme is very imaginative and makes much better use of the limited space we have in that area. | 1 | | |
| 59 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Vital for increased tourist trade on the Quay to help with footfall and increased revenue | 1 | | |
| 60 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Positive and vital to encourage people to Lymington for the business health of the town. This development will help greatly. | 1 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|----|--------------------------------|------------|---|---|--|---|
| 61 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Hi Paul from the Boathouse Cafe on Lymington quay. The new proposals look amazing !! This is exactly what Lymington needs and wants !! Yarmouth has been turned around by its walk ashore facility and now it's Lymington's turn. Keep up the good work guys | 1 | | |
| 62 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Excellent for local business | 1 | | |
| 63 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | I Have seen visitor numbers drop over the last 10 plus years whilst operating Puffin Cruises from the Town Quay, a walk ashore facility on the Quay is vital for continued prosperity for the town and trades alike | 1 | | |
| 64 | Waiting List | Yes | Great proposal, fully support | 1 | | |
| 65 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | It will be great for all the businesses on the Quay | 1 | | |
| 66 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Very positive about these proposals - excellent - much needed upgrade! Will add to the river and the town overall, bringing much needed visitors and money without cars. As resident at nearby Fisherman's Quay welcome this uplift and will support local business. Well done! | 1 | | |
| 67 | Local Resident | Yes | I support this proposal as it will bring more business to the town and allow more leisure craft to use the ponton rather than having to berth in an expensive marina | 1 | | |
| 68 | Local Resident | Yes | I am totally in favour and live close by in Fishermans Quay | 1 | | |
| 69 | Other (Holiday Home Owner) | Yes | Supportive of the proposal | 1 | | |
| 70 | Local Resident | Yes | We are residents at Fisherman's Quay and our flat overlooks the Town Quay, so we strongly support the proposals for improvement. We understand from Pat Mennie that Fishermans Quay has historically had direct access to the river via its own slipway which is no longer useable. We would strongly support provision of somewhere to launch small leisure craft (canoe or small sailing dinghy) and a pontoon where families can safely go on board and leave the boat temporarily perhaps overnight sometimes. This provision would greatly increase our family enjoyment of the wonderful opportunities for water activities in Lymington and help us educate our grandchildren into the pleasures of boating. PS Our son who used to sail in Lymington successfully completed the Sydney to Hobart race this year. | 1 | | |
| 71 | Local Resident | Yes | Great idea, long overdue, being yachtsman this will be much better when I bring my boat into the quay. | 1 | | |
| 72 | Local Resident | Yes | Very impressed with the proposals as a half owner of Oligo II currently on a river mooring. | 1 | | |
| 73 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Delighted to see a well presented case for major improvements based on factual analysis. Surely this provides a positive result for all concerned particularly local traders and visiting yachtsmen alike. I was originally skeptical about similar improvements when planned for Yarmouth Harbour but the results are overwhelmingly positive. I do hope the Lymington Town Quay scheme can proceed with minimal fuss and negativity. | 1 | | |
| 74 | Visitor | Not Stated | The plan shows the mid-river visitor/multi purpose moorings as being pontoons. Is it possible to keep these as fore/aft buoys to maintain some of the existing character of Lymington. Your statistics show 1/5 of your visitors to the town quay area do use the existing buoys, so why replace all the visitor buoys with more expensive to maintain mid river pontoons. I understand why you are proposing these changes and hope you will not end up just turning the town quay area in to just another expensive Solent marina, and lose the unique character of this affordable corner of the Solent. Neil and Shiv - Rival 32 Valerie | | | 1 |
| 75 | Local Resident | Not Stated | Whilst I believe the move to pontoon moorings for visitors is the right way forward; having recently moved here I was dismayed to find a long waiting list for residents moorings yet no plans to increase their availability ! You are therefore missing an ideal opportunity to improve both quantity and quality (ie via more pontoons) for resident boat owners - hardly likely to engender local support ?? | | | 1 |
| 76 | Local Resident | Yes | I fully support the proposed redevelopment which will surely enhance the experience for visiting boaters and trades within Lymington. | 1 | | |
| 77 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Very much in favour of the proposed Town Quay Plan. The increased facilities for yachtsmen will be beneficial to Lymington as a town. | 1 | | |
| 78 | Waiting List | Yes | The overall plan looks to be the way forward for Lymington, visiting yachts do want walk ashore berths and facilities now and this will keep Lymington high on the list of places to visit, I support this proposal. | 1 | | |
| 79 | Visitor | Yes | It sounds like a good idea to me, hopefully charges will not increase too much. Presumably you have a further plan to increase the shower facilities for the undoubted increase in numbers that will occur. I always enjoy visiting Lymington! | 1 | | |
| 80 | Local Resident | Yes | My wife and I attended the recent exhibition at LCC. Based on what we saw and were told we consider the changes beneficial not only to those wanting a walk ashore berth close to the town centre, but also the businesses who will benefit from the increased footfall. As a centre of sailing excellence Lymington has to remain competitive in what it can offer the sailing community whilst also catering for the needs of commercial fishing operations. We therefore support the proposals. | 1 | | |
| 81 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Following Yarmouth's experience these seem sensible proposals. | 1 | | |
| 82 | Waiting List | | It seems to me that the proposals are well thought out and will provide a significant enhancement to that part of the river moorings. I am very much in favour of it. | 1 | | |
| 83 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I welcome and support the new plan, and would be happy to bid for funding from the Coastal Communities Fund, as I once did for this scheme on behalf of LHC before, as part of a more major Coastal Regeneration Strategy for Lymington and environs. Feedback from the CCF suggests that a single issue project of this nature is more likely to succeed and there is ample funding next year, although decisions on this year's round has been delayed by a change of Minister. I would also pass on suggestions from those I have received whilst discussing the needs of fishermen in relation to the Solent Oyster Project and other regeneration initiatives with the National Park, as well as from fellow yachtsmen and members of the Town Team. 1) I had not considered it personally fellow sailor, a regular visitor from outside the area suggested to me, that, with the move of the Rowing Club to Lymington Shores site (if it is still going ahead) the slipway will be little used and perhaps could be filled in to create more usable space onshore, as the other slipway by LHC offices is far more practical. 2) Regarding LHC strategy to develop and sustainable & profitable fishing industry, several other harbours in the region have provided space for net and pot repair, ice machines, shellfish processing and handling of niche catches unique to the area. I was assisting in Dorset FLAG workshop where fishermen were such provisions were being developed in collaboration with harbour authorities. It would seem sensible to look at developing that on the East side of the river in the estate previously occupied by Green Marine, as you may have already considered it would be worth discussing the opportunities and facilities needed with Rob Clark CO of Southern IFCA, Seafish and CEFAS as to what businesses and catches they believe have greatest prospect of success. As the Solent Oyster Project has highlighted, shellfish cultivation is one very viable opportunity but there are several others worthy of consideration and commercial operators may have a view as to what the site might offer. 3) With walkashore moorings the case for a water taxi combined with a ferry service from the railway station to the LHC pontoon for rail visitors to the National Park wanting to reach the coastal path and nature reserves but subsidies might be available, similar to those provided for open top bus routes around the forest. However, hopefully the pick up facilities have allowed for the possibility, which might also include pickup from Elmers Court and drop off on Town Moorings as was once provided many years ago, and was part of the last CCF application. 4) I am sure you will have checked this out but one sailor commented to me that the length of the angled finger pontoons needs ideally to be sufficient to provide a cleat aft of midships on the longest boats. He had experience of similar systems in the US but the fingers were longer. | 1 | | |
| 84 | Visitor | Yes | Looks like a real improvement. However, if you wish to encourage visiting family yachtsmen you need to ensure visiting fees are affordable. Large yachts with multiple crews are far better able to afford fees than family yachts with only two crew! Excessive visiting fees are driving out these family run yachts. | 1 | | |
| 85 | Visitor | Yes | As regular visitors we strongly support the proposals made by the commission. Those proposals represent a huge step forward and we look forward to enjoying them as soon as possible. | 1 | | |
| 86 | Mooring Holder | Yes | Look better than previous plan for more of the users residents as well as visitors. | 1 | | |
| 87 | Local Resident | Yes | Excellent proposal to modernise the quayside. | 1 | | |

| | | | | | | |
|-------------------------------|--------------------------------|------------|---|---|---|---|
| 88 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | In my position as Rear Commodore Sailing I am providing feedback on behalf of the Royal Lynton Yacht Club. Having reviewed in detail your plans to redevelop the Town Quay Mooring area, the club is in full support of the proposals. We consider the proposals will add significantly to the attractiveness Town Quay providing more walk ashore moorings which are required to cater for the needs of visiting yachtsmen. The club sees no conflict in it's operation with the proposals and looks forward to welcoming more visitors to Lynton. | 1 | | |
| 89 | Waiting List | Not Stated | I am a local resident and currently have the use of a temporary sublet mooring. I would respond to the latest proposals from two viewpoints; as a local resident and as a sailor who is a current mooring user. Lynton is a vibrant and active community of both residents and visitors with an excellent location by the New Forest and Lynton River with access to the Solent. Visitors and holiday makers are a double edged sword bringing business and revenue into the area but putting pressure on local facilities and car parks. As a visiting sailor I look for three major things: a) a safe and well maintained mooring, b) good facilities (water, electric and good toilets and shower facilities, and c) access to a wide variety of local shops, bars and restaurants. Before moving into the area 18months ago I have sailed into Lynton and on each occasion moored in one of the two marinas never using the Lynton Commissioner's facilities. I think that the Commissioners need to be crystal clear about their priorities between residents, visitors, promoting Lynton, increasing local business revenue and maximising the Commissions income. I accept that none of these are binary and that the balance between all aspects are key. My point is; the two commercial marinas exist and are flourishing, so how do Commission services best complement these rather than compete with them. I think that the proposed layout of moorings within the Town Quay area are well considered and make good use of the available space. Redirecting the main channel is a very good idea so long as the new route is likely to persist and not require continued dredging. I question if the current shower and toilet facilities are consistent with current expected standards. The major loss appears to be the reduction of 97 multi-purpose moorings to 36. I fear that as a current local sublet mooring user I may lose my mooring. I would ask that the Commissioners undertake regular audits to ensure that resident moorings are in current use by authenticated residents. I am sure that members on the current waiting list would happily volunteer their services to undertake this activity. | | | 1 |
| 90 | Visitor | Yes | Overall the proposals will have my support; however I am concerned that the increased number of boats wanting to berth at Town Quay especially at busy weekends will significantly increase the risk of bump and shunts. The need to have harbour staff on the water to assist boats in mooring - just as is done in Yarmouth - would be advisable if not necessary | 1 | | |
| 91 | Local Business or Organisation | No | We have carefully read the newly proposed changes to the Town Quay area and I'd like to make the following observations: 1. The plan showing the Existing Mooring Layout misrepresents the current usage by showing yachts moored two abreast on the westernmost mooring buoys across from Shipyard House. 2. It would appear that this has been shown thus to justify 12m yachts mooring on the proposed walk ashore pontoon's fingers creating a closer relationship with the house and garden. This area should have a different mooring proposition. 3. Taking Berthon's prescribed mooring rights in way of Area 4 of the continuing correspondence with LHC/CE, and the intended use of a short stay pontoon opposite, it would appear that with one yacht moored on the short stay pontoon, a gap of only 82 feet (25m) (or if two abreast, 65 feet (20m)) would be insufficient for manoeuvring yachts on the commissioning pontoons on Berthon yard wall when guidelines suggest 98 feet (30m) and currently we have the use of 115 feet (35m) river width at this point, a loss of between 33 feet to 50 feet manoeuvring width depending on whether you have one or two abreast. Additionally, the buoy moorings are seldom occupied during the week so making manoeuvring large yachts and motor boats low risk. Manoeuvring space is critical to our shipyard operation, as we already have yachts from 70 feet to 100 feet regularly coming to this pontoon for work. LHC is already aware of Berthon plans to attract more of these large yachts for refit to our shipyard, to protect the jobs of 150 local people, and increase the skills base with our apprenticeship programme. 4. The same occurs in Claim area 3 with a proximity to moored 12m yachts on LHC fingers reducing to approx 82 feet (25m) from the existing 124 feet (38m), a loss of 42' of manoeuvring width. With the current moorings our larger vessels in Claim Area 3 can turn into the vacant mooring areas between the buoys and reverse back towards the Quay; this exit method would no longer be viable. 5. We appreciate that there is a larger turning area where part of the existing pontoon B is to be removed, but this triples the distance a 80 - 100 foot (25 - 30m) yacht has to reverse to line up for a forward easterly passage towards the Wightlink slipway; the reversing will also occur around a blind bend if yachts were moored temporarily on the short stay pontoon. 6. Reducing our manoeuvring width will reduce safety on the river, and increase our costs. 7. We therefore object most strongly to the extension of this new pontoon to overlap our property, which will effectively become a restraint on trade. It cannot be in the interest of the town that the Lynton Harbour Commissioners estops Berthon from trading legally. 8. There appears to be no information as to whether pontoon electricity and lighting will be provided; any lighting would need to be suitably subtle to create no light pollution into the Shipyard House premises. | | 1 | |
| | Cont ... | Cont ... | 9. Has thought been given to adding navigational lights to the posts at this end of the river? If so, will an increase to light pollution be the result? 10. What thoughts have the LHC given to car parking issues at Town Quay, particularly during the winter period when the Quay shops need visitors most? Inclement winter weather will prevent customers from walking down from town and if the car park is full of sub-let mooring yachts with owners using the long term car park, the local commercial businesses will suffer. 11. Furthermore, the nearest car park is at Berthon which remains easily accessible to encourage yachtsmen to enter our premises for legitimate yard, new boat sales and brokerage services. Is LHC proposing to police the increased search for car parking to prevent Berthon having to bare consequential costs of illegitimate car parking from LHC customers? 12. The existing commercial / passenger pontoon adjacent to Shipyard House garden wall (party wall with Lynton Town Council) was intentionally set back (via correspondence with your predecessor at LHC) to prevent loss of privacy; whilst the proposed new pontoon is slightly short of where the existing pontoon ends, the overhang of the moored boats on the last finger is +5m in comparison with existing. 13. There has been much discussion about the decline of the commercial fishermen in Lynton. Has LHC come up with a solution for this problem and will they make a commitment to maintain the designated pontoon even if it is empty? 14. Will the LHC make a definitive decision to restrict the short term mooring area to precisely that and not let it morph either side into annual or sublet moorings? 15. LHC is currently accepting sub-let for unoccupied moorings from outside the radius dictated by the Act. We know of one owner who has annually been given a sub-let for at least the last five years, and yet the owner is NOT local. This suggests that all the newly created sub-let berths are not in demand by locals, but will be filled up by non-locals. The need for new moorings is therefore totally false, as LHC's remit is to provide permanent moorings for locals. | | | |
| 92 | Mooring Holder | Yes | I have no objection to increasing the numbers of visitors walk on berths at the town key as shown in the plan . | 1 | | |
| MAIL or EMAIL FEEDBACK | | | | | | |
| 93 | Mooring Holder | Yes | See eMail of 13th Sept. In favour of proposal in general. Commented on access/egress arrangements for Puffin Ferries in spring ebb tide conditions. Commented on alignment of mid-river resident cingers to current flows. | 1 | | |
| 94 | Mooring Holder | No | See letter of 20th September 2016. Acknowledged visiting yachtsmen prefer walk ashore but believes already catered for by the private marinas. Commented on tidal flows in flood/ebb conditions. Believes proposed layout restricts access to Berthon Boatyard. Disagreed that events and more visitors at Town Quay would contribute the vibrancy and atmosphere of the area. Stated visitors bring very little benefit to local businesses. Concerned about use of walk ashore moorings for sublets and implications for parking for local residents, fishermen and businesses. Comments on dingy tender spaces. Happy with fishermen mooring arrangements. Requests information on business case. | | 1 | |
| 95 | Mooring Holder | No | See letter of 25th September from Secretary of Lynton Fishermens Association - Concern if use walk ashore for off peak sublet mooring this could have an impact on availability of long stay parking spaces at Town Quay. No other objection/concerns raised. | | 1 | |

| | | | | | | |
|---------------|--------------------------------|------------|--|-----------|----------|------------|
| 96 | Mooring Holder | Yes | See press comment (Lymington Times 6th August 2016) by A. Savage - (West Wight Charter Skippers) - Although did not ask for changes - Happy with arrangements. Note: It can be assumed that charter skippers may share concerns expressed on behalf of Commercial Fishermen (95) regarding limited parking. | 1 | | |
| 97 | Local Business or Organisation | Yes | Lymington Society - See press statement (Lymington Times Aug 6th) - Supportive. | 1 | | |
| 98 | Visitor | Not Stated | See letter of the 14th September 2016. Commented on need to upgrade shower/toilet facilities, pricing, security (gate) and berthing arrangements. | | | 1 |
| 99 | Waiting List | Not Stated | Pros: increased walk ashore berths for visitors; subsequent increase in harbour revenues; spend by visitors. Cons: Loss of mid river moorings; increased improved shower facilities required = cost. Personal aspect: As on waiting list for a mooring would have liked to see the underutilised visitor capacity released for resident use. Also acknowledged that when he was a visitor a few years ago his view would be the opposite and supportive of proposals to enhance visitor moorings. | | | 1 |
| | | | | For | Against | Not Stated |
| TOTALS | | | | 85 | 6 | 8 |

86 6 8