

Consultee	Comments	Summary
John Holmes	(1) the slope of the seawall at that point has become very dangerous to children with no restraining fence at the top, (2) the lack of water available to the inner moored boats on this particular arm of the pontoon, and (3) the damage to boats at this point from children throwing stones into the mud.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Access area safety fencing • Inside line needs more water • Improve security of boats
Mike Caddick	Is it possible to consider the possibility of dredging around this area to enable access at all states of the tide? Any dredging in the future would probably affect the way the pontoons are secured. I would also ask if it is a sensible idea to consider very narrow fingers to be placed between every two berths with mooring cleats to save having to use a pick up buoy?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredge to improve access • Consider employing fingers
Nigel Mortimer AONB Estuaries Officer	I don't see any ecological issues with this project - piles would be marginally better than chains but less beneficial than in deeper waters and longer and more sustainable life but they do have a landscape issue. I have discussed this with Robin some time ago and that we felt that piles would be in keeping in this busy part of the Harbour, especially considering the backdrop of yacht masts from some angles. Possibly a darker 'hat' on top of the piles would help them blend in more.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piles preferable to chains
Mr Crampin	In general, the system works really well. To my mind the only things that could be improved, are, better tidal access by means of a little mild dredging, better numbering of berths, requiring boats to be similarly numbered, and better quality stern buoys.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredge to improve access • Better berth numbers • Numbering boats to berth • Better quality stern buoys
Mr Dwyer	Group the boat sizes better to minimise damage by careless/incompetent owners & enforce the size limits. Do not use replacement as an excuse for putting up charges which have risen significantly above inflation in recent years. Demand is not the only consideration in setting charges.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Group Boats by size • Do not increase prices
Mr Marles	The curtailment of the 2.3m width berths should not have been made and should be re-introduced. You are somewhat splitting hairs by reducing it to 2.2m. A large number of the boats on the pontoons are possibly of 2.3m beam and I am curious to learn where they are going to go in the next year. You do not have enough foreshore or swinging moorings to accommodate them. Just before you decided in your wisdom to stop the larger berths I agreed to purchase a larger dory of 2.2m beam to give more comfort to my family. For two years I have had to rent a mooring at great expense to accommodate the new boat, whilst on your waiting list for a mooring, whereas it would have been of the correct size to have stayed on the pontoon. I still have my pontoon berth as I need the old boat to get out to the new one. Something that is unnecessary and a complete waste of money.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Provide larger berth width
Mr Boddington	One of the drawbacks is the lack of deep water at Batson Pontoon. If finance were to become available, would piles be an obstacle to dredging? Could a small area be made available for vessels to berth whilst waiting for water?	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredge to improve access • Waiting berth

Mr Higginbottom	1) I support the new layout. However, I would prefer the central area to be accessed closer to the seaward end.2) The pontoon should be secured by piles which should not be painted. A natural wood finish would be more pleasing to look at.3) Chains should secure the sterns of boats. I have found fingers, which I assume will be considerably narrower than the pontoons, in other locations to be unsafe in a swell.4) The mix of 2m and 2.2m berths is reasonable.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Support layout move entrance ● Piles but unpainted ● Favor Stern Chains ● Mix of berth sizes
Mr Hobbs	Views are personal but would like to have moorings to take vessels up to 18' in length and with a broader beam. Would also like to have power and water available. Finally, water at all states of the tide would be the ultimate.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Larger berth sizes ● Power available ● Washdown facilities ● Dredge to improve access
This represents the official response from Kingsbridge Estuary Boat Club.	Construction and boat provision. - The proposed galvanised steel frame and supporting plastic flotation seems a robust and durable solution for the construction. It is assumed that the 'earthwood' decking would incorporate a non-slip surface at least equivalent to that on the current pontoons. It is considered that Harbour Management are best placed to decide the size, width and general configuration in order to fulfil the need to accommodate the appropriate craft. Finger berths would be useful but the extra costs involved may not justify this. The opportunity to rearrange the pontoon layout which would help towards addressing the ongoing Salcombe Whitestrand dinghy mooring problems seems very sensible. The opportunity to rearrange the pontoon layout which would help towards addressing the ongoing Salcombe Whitestrand dinghy mooring problems seems very sensible. Harbour Management together with the Conservation Officer is also best placed to decide on the most appropriate and cost effective method of securing the pontoons.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Deck to be non-slip ● Support galvanised steel ● Layout to aid tender berthing ● No objection to Piles
KEBC Continued	Additionally, our members would welcome a facility that would enable mooring alongside whilst visiting Salcombe.If any of the old pontoons are able to be salvaged, please consider a section adjacent to the Kingsbidge slipway. This would be of great benefit when launching and recovering boats.In summary I have had a positive feedback from our members to your proposals for your ongoing upgrade of this and other harbour facilities.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Visiting berths in Salcombe ● Kingsbridge facilities TBC ● General support for improvements

<p>Mrs Roger C-Martyn</p>	<p>I am a berth holder.1) All effort should be made to increase the tidal access at all times. The current configuration means that those with an inside berth have to travel up stream into shallower water to leave the pontoon. This reduces the access by at least an hour each side of the tides. All berths should be able to leave their berth, by travelling immediately in the direction of deeper water.2) Fingers would be a great benefit. Over the years my boat has been marked, and damaged by the boats alongside which have not always had fenders. Also many boats do not use stern buoys, and the buoys themselves have moved over time which sometimes means that using you own buoy, pulls your boat out of position instead of securing it into position.3) slightly increased pontoon length, would be a small price to pay for slightly wider berths, as the alternative would be to allow for more tenders for boats which would have to be moved to swinging moorings, thereby increasing the need for moorings overall and decreasing the convenience of use.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dredge to improve access ● Direct access to sea ● Support for fingers ● Increase pontoon length ● Provide larger berth width <p><i>Comment: It is not the stern buoys moving, it is the entire pontoon system which is moving because it is secured on chains.</i></p>
<p>Mr R Gough</p>	<p>Whilst we whole heartedly welcome the improving developments seen throughout the Salcombe Estuary we are hugely concerned that the Batson re-development is going to prohibit access for my father-in-law onto our boat. We have experimented coming alongside the new pontoon next to the Batson slip and notice that, with the buoyancy of the flotation tanks, the entire height of the pontoon has been significantly raised. If this new pontoon system is the style which is to be built to replace the existing pontoons it will make it <u>impossible</u> for us to lower the bow of 'RoRo' to a height with which we can wheel my father-in-law on or off the boat. It may also prohibit the many other Batson boat owners who use the easy low level access of the existing pontoons for their children or elderly and disabled family members.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Disabled Access ● Freeboard of Pontoon
<p>Mr Bgibbons</p>	<p>Does not think there is anything wrong with the current pontoon, but is sure that in present financial climate money will not be spent unnecessarily. He is concerned about the building mound of mud between the lines of the pontoons reducing the time that berth holders can access the pontoons.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Dredge to improve access
<p>Mr Guest</p>	<p>Thanks for the letter of 12 December, as long as the sizes are not reduced I look forward to seeing the new pontoons in place at the beginning of the season. I have a 16ft Sea-skate "Emma" which has been down on these pontoons from the off.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ● Do not reduce berth size

Historic Environment Service Devon County Council	Thanks for your consultation on the replacement pontoons at Batson Creek. I have looked at the documents, assessed our Historic Environment Record (HER) records and discussed this site with one of my colleagues. The slipway adjacent to the pontoons (and potentially attached to the new pontoon) is recorded on the Devon HER as a US naval slipway (part of US naval base at Salcombe) during the Second World War. Also, near to the pontoons is the site of the wreck 'Empress'. I have attached the HER records for these, for your interest. However, any impact on these monuments will be minimal, and therefore, I have no further observations or recommendations about this application. However, it needs to be recognised that the HER does not provide a complete record of Devon's historic environment. We would therefore be grateful if it was made known that if any significant archaeological remains (pottery, human or animal skeletal remains, wrecks, etc) were discovered during groundworks they should be reported to this office.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to proposals
Mr Worster	Vessels suffer damage from stones thrown by children. The boat next to me is too long, preventing me getting in and out. Pontoons would be better further out from the land, which would improve access. Could berths be numbered and boats have a plaque with their berth number? Bird guano is a problem.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredge to improve access • Move pontoons out for access • Numbering boats to berth • Remove guano from pontoons
Mr Woolf	I have read your consultation document on the web and give you below my views: 1. I agree that there is a trend to boats with greater beam. For this reason your compromise proposal of an increase in length of pontton to accommodate boats with a larger beam is correct, even with an additional charge. 2. I agree with your proposal regarding construction. 3. I agree with the compromise solution of a mixture of fingers and stern chains with an extra charge for berths with fingers. 4. I have no views with regard to access to the pontoons. I hope you have two constructive public meetings.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with accommodating larger beam • Agree with construction proposal • Agree with mix of fingers and stern chains • No views on access

<p>Mr Lucocq</p>	<p>Firstly, thank you for explaining the project to me. I will comment on the headings in the consultation document in seriatim: Construction. I agree the middle road with earthwood decking is the most acceptable from a visual, environmental viewpoint. Size and Shape. I have no particular views on ashape except a very personal wish regarding our berth 69 which is outside and virtually at the end nearest the harbour. I would not wish to see a re-allocation of spaces, it has taken me decades to achieve this prime position!!As to size, it would be folly not to take this opportunity to increase the number of berths by extending the pontoon and slightly changing the orientation. I believe the pontoons were originally provided to accomodate dinghy and small dory types; to increase the berth width to 2.5m is to change the whole ethos of of Batson Pontoon. There will always be those who moan that thier preffered boat won't fit; well buy a boat that does! You set the rules. By definition - Batson Dinghy Pontoon - not Batson Marina. Given the length of the waiting for a berth every opportunity should be taken to increase berth numbers not pander to those who want a bigger boat. T</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with decking • Agree with increasing no. of berths • Keep width at 2m • Agree with fingers • Agree with piles • Proposed access will be congested • Dredging needed • Wouldn't want to lose prime berth
<p>Mr Godwin</p>	<p>I refer to your recent letter and the invitation to make comment on the Consultation regarding Batson Pontoon. Having read through the consultation paper, I would agree with the necessity of providing better tidal access to the pontoons and provision for wider beamed boats. As you are aware, boats nowadays are often beamier than earlier models. The current maximum beam of 2 metres is therefore becoming very restrictive on the type of boat that can be moored. Better and extended access to the pontoon will also help alleviate the ridiculous situation with regard to Whitestrand. I also believe that minimal dredging would help extend access to the pontoon. Turning to the size and shape of the pontoon, I believe the best suggestion is the one to increase the berth size by increasing the available length of the pontoon. I also believe the compromise solution of a mixture of fingers and stern chains would optimise the available budget and space. Turning to the securing of the pontoons, I believe the best and most long term economical answer would be the</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Dredge to improve access • Provide larger berth width • Agree with piles • Mixture of stern chains and fingers • Agree with new layout

Mr Curry	<p>Hello Harbour Office</p> <p>It does seem that the 'Piles' solution is the best option for Batson however I do query the following: -</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Piles would obstruct the flow of silt and as a consequence the area around the 'Piles' would silt up more quickly. 2. The 'Piles' would inhibit dredging manoverability hence dredging if undertaken would be over a longer duration and therefore more costly. I don't have any idea of the dredging costs involved so really don't know how often this would be necessary and whether the cost is a significant consideration. <p>Best regards</p> <p>Brian Curry</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Concern about future dredging
Mr Pearce	<p>Thank you for your letter of 12th December regarding the above consultation period. In support of the proposals I have just one comment to make. I am sure you will be mindful of and cater for modern boats that tend to be larger, as they have become substantially safer than their predecessors. Maybe 2.3m is too wide but 2.0m is not wide enough taking into account fenders.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support proposals • Support wider berths

<p>Ms. Jefferson</p>	<p>I regret that I will be away for your meetings on 28th and 29th January.</p> <p>As you have asked for views on the new Batson Pontoons I am happy to give my preferred option. That is to have finger moorings supported by pylons. I understand that this is the more expensive option, but would not need the ongoing maintenance of the present pontoons, and may even be the cheaper long term option. It would also be much better for the each boat to have a more defined space.</p> <p>I believe there is some opposition from environmentalists. Salcombe is and has always been a boating community, and there must be an established right to moor boats. As money has to be spent on these moorings surely we need to offer better conditions and take advantage of the better options now available.</p> <p>Signed: Daphne Jefferson</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Agree with fingers
<p>Mr Irwin</p>	<p>I have studied the document "Consultation on Batson Pontoons Replacement Project"</p> <p>In my opinion the proposal put forward is sensible ,modern and further improves the usability of the mooring arrangements. I particularly commend the introduction of a range of berth sizes to accommodate the different ranges of modern small boats. I would recommend the use of the "fingers" option as it would improve both the look of the boats and the safety of the users.</p> <p>On the question of securing the pontoons, piles seem much superior to chains.</p> <p>Done with care and due attention to detail the proposed upgrade to the Batson pontoons will become an admirable addition to the attractiveness of Salcombe Harbour and a credit to long term vision in the South Hams.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Agree with fingers • Agree with range of berth sizes
<p>Salcombe Town Council</p>	<p>Following our town council meeting I was asked to write advising that Town Council has no objection to the proposals as this area is seen as a harbour facility bordering an industrial zone. This was felt to be beneficial for the town and Batson improving environmental aspects of the area and potentially providing better disabled access and security.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to proposals • Support better disabled access • Support for piling

<p>Mr Matthews</p>	<p>1. Clearly some upgrade is needed but the layout that you have selected does not appear to be the most optimal in terms of access. Unless access is possible underneath the link from the shore to the new pontoons, there is a very long traverse to reach the spaces on the inside nearest to the shore/bridge. The gradual silting up of the area will mean that users will have to allow even more time to tie up before the tide disappears.</p> <p>2. Given the high demand for berths, why have we not taken the opportunity to INCREASE the number while moving to an alternate layout. The onshore and linkage costs will have to be met whether we have 245 or 345 berths. Surely there will be a good payback for adopting a layout that will allow an increase beyond 245 vessels. There are various ways in which this might be achieved.</p> <p>3. The whole area does need to be dredged in some way before the new pontoons are installed. The time available for access has gradually reduced over the years and action needs to be taken, particularly in the access channels. These have risen steadily over the past twenty years and impeded access.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Does not agree with layout • Support for increased berth numbers • Dredging needed
<p>Mr and Mrs Peck</p>	<p>Further to the Forum Moderator's e-mail please accept our apologies that we cannot attend the meeting. We think that the pile alternative to the existing bridge is probably the best long term solution but that consideration should be given to increasing the capacity for yacht tenders for those yachts with deep water moorings. The position at White Strand is very unsatisfactory for the holders of deep water moorings during the season as we know has been accepted and this could significantly assist if a longer pontoon could be worked in.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support piles • Tender berthing section to alleviate Whitestrand
<p>Mr Kew</p>	<p>On the thorny question of piles/chains, I am afraid that, despite the arguments, I still prefer chains. I should very much like to see a photoshop mockup of what the piles proposal would look like from the estuary banks at Batson,</p> <p>As regards access to the new pontoons, one issue really concerns me, the greatly increased traffic around the top of the slip, mixing pedestrians with amateur trailer drivers on a much greater scale. Trailer launched boats tend to be launched 'equipped', however, pontoon users carry a quite a bit of equipment to and from their boats, which they will need to lug through that area. I really believe that there is a major safety issue which is going to arise there.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer chains • Concerned about safety issues at top of slipway
<p>Mr Watling</p>	<p>1. Concerned at the likely conjection at the top of slipway with only one bridge. 2. Timber decking needs slightly open joints to prevent it staying wet and slippery.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Conjection concern • Decking needs to be non slip

<p>Ms Waters</p>	<p>Thank you for your excellent presentation last Thursday. I agree that piles are the best option. I am worried about the new layout. I think there could be alot of congestion on the inside. All those stern moorings let loose! And only one entrance for boats. I would prefer the width to be kept at 2 m.. The larger boats would surely put more strain on the pontoon. Extending usage time. An idea but how many would actually use it?</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Concern over congestion • Keep beam at 2m
<p>Mr and Mrs Blanch</p>	<p>To start, we echo the various comments made at the Salcombe presentation thanking the Board for explaining your thinking to us users and residents and for promising to listen to our comments. We hope that this constructive policy will spread! We have to admit to some degree of special interest in this project though we have tried not to let that lead us to a biased viewpoint. The aspects of your proposals which give us concern are:</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer chains • Concerns about congestion, both pedestrian and boat traffic
<p>Mr and Mrs Blanch</p>	<p>Securing of Pontoons: The financial case for piles as against chains is clear. However the Highways Department could make an equally strong case for concreting over all grass verges to local roads on the grounds that maintenance costs would then be vastly reduced, but that would not be acceptable to anyone - even, we imagine, to members of the Harbour Board! The Board surely has a moral if not a statutory duty to maintain the aesthetic appeal of the estuary in general and of the creeks in particular. Piles are ugly and rather brutal in appearance - with or without white tops. Chains are not. Chains in the particular location of Batson Creek are not thought by at least one very respected and knowlegable local expert to be ecologically damaging in the way that they would be in the main part of the estuary. This is an area which enjoys considerable environmental protection - what weighting does the Board give to aesthetics and what weighting to pure finance in making your evaluation? Our special interest is that the pontoons take centre stage in the view from our house, but our comments are made more as regular users of the estuary - both on boats and on walking around it.</p>	
<p>Mr and Mrs Blanch</p>	<p>Access Bridge and Pontoon Layout: We cannot believe that the Harbourmaster's study of pedestrian traffic on the existing two bridges (main pontoon and slipway pontoon) was carried out at one of the normally busy periods, on a normally busy holiday or regatta day, or on more than one occasion because his comments beggared belief. Certainly for much of each day there is not much traffic, especially on weekdays outside school holidays and at low water on any day. However, at busy holiday times when the tide is just bringing in sufficient water and many boats are loading up with cumbersome cargoes of petrol cans, life jackets, fishing tackle, picnics and excited small children, and small craft are being launched and made ready on the slip and its pontoon, both bridges are very well used if not acually crowded, and to try to load all that traffic on to one bridge seems to ask for problems and temper tantrums.</p>	

Mr and Mrs Blanch	And then you are suggesting adding to the traffic by offering temporary visitor berthing on the pontoons too! Cutting back to a single bridge would present another problem for many users which is that approximately two thirds of all users (and therefore of all traffic on the pontoons) would then be confined to one long run of pontoons. With the existing centre bridge, users are quickly separated off on to four branches - so users are directed out of each other's way rather than into it. In addition, the single bridge layout creates a mighty long walk, quite possibly for a well-laden mum shepherding small children, to the berths at the far end of the upstream part of the pontoon. What would be the Health & Safety implications of that?	
Mr and Mrs Blanch	Conclusion: So to sum up, we know that the existing pontoons have to be replaced now, which is a good thing, and we understand that you have to take the financial considerations very seriously. But please do not let them blind you to all other considerations. We urge you to take your obligations to the environment in a very special part of a very special area and the practicalities to the users of your proposals just as seriously. It is very easy to allow "just one more bit" of desecration in a beautiful place because money seems more important, but in the long run money is not. What has once been spoiled can never be recovered. And if what seems at first sight to offer a tidy and well organised new layout seems impractical to the users, they may well have a better understanding of the potential problems than the planners. Please think these particular aspects of your proposals out again.	
Mr Fulford - Smith	Your proposed layout indicates an approximate one third reduction in the width of the "lagoon", being the distance between the leg of the pontoon nearest the shore and the leg nearest midstream. This reduction would be fine for most of the time, but can you not imagine the chaos when several boats are rushing to get back through the narrow entrance and on to their berths within the pontoon's "lagoon" on a rapidly falling tide? And if the total layout would provide 245 berths you must be planning for over 100 berths inside that area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Concerned about layout • Place larger boats at Batson end • Agree with fingers, but not if extra cost to berthholders
Mr Goldsworthy	On your own figures the proposed new layout would not create very many new spaces. Its main rationale is again to save the cost of a bridge - and yet this is a bridge which already exists, even if it might need some small modification to suit the new pontoons. It all seems like a case of potential cost savings outweighing common sense.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Concerned about layout

Mr Cullen	Width of Berths: Again we confess to some special interest! We have enjoyed for nearly 25 years a superb berth giving us the maximum tidal access, and if you re-classify to a larger beam the midstream berths, as seems likely if you decide to provide wider berths, we are bound to lose it. But as a more objective viewpoint, before they buy a boat everyone must know - or certainly has no reason not to know - the restrictions on the size of boat that can be accommodated at Batson. And if the waiting list is something like 7 years, as you say, there should be no problem in letting all 2m spaces for many years to come.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Not worried about congestion • Agree with wider berths • Water/Electricity?
Robin Toogood AONB Manager	As far as the visual impacts are concerned, I noted that the pontoons are (when seen from some angles) set against the built backdrop of the quayside wall, car park and boat park, with all the paraphernalia associated with that area. They are not located in undeveloped countryside and are therefore less visually conspicuous than (say) the pontoons in The Bag. I do not therefore have strong views against pile fixing per se and I note your indication that careful choice of colour could help minimise the visual impact of piles. I recognise the potential benefit of being able to use the existing bridge to access the new pontoons rather than having to construct a new one. That said, I also noted that the pontoons are seen against countryside when viewed from the quayside and are located on the edge of Salombe's built up area.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No objection to piles • Pile colour should be muted • Agree with using existing bridge
Robin Toogood AONB Manager	When I visited, being out-of-season with no boats moored on the pontoons, they were fairly inconspicuous being low level and in muted colours. The inclusion of new security gates, "fingers", ladders, firefighting equipment etc, in addition to the piles, and the fact that the new pontoons appear to be sited further out into the channel*, would, taken together, make the proposed new structure appear more bulky and conspicuous than the existing ones, particularly out of season when no boats are moored. My preference therefore would be to avoid any further extension to the pontoons in an "up-river" direction, and either to dispense with the use of "fingers" or to detach and remove them out of season if that is practicable (may not be, I don't know). Any piles should be as short as safely possible and use muted colours. Any security gates should preferably be sited close to the quayside.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do not extend pontoons upstream • Security gate close to quayside to reduce visual impact.

<p>Mr Green</p>	<p>We have had a mooring on the pontoon since they were first installed. We worked up a few positions in the early years to our current position which we have held for well over 20 years. Our position is 64 our boat is not more than 2 meters wide and we are able to reach Dartmouth on a good Sea. We do not want a bigger boat nor do we want to lose our position on the pontoon. I would think we currently get about 45 minutes more water each side of the tide than moorings at the other end. With the new layout I would be tempted to take an outside mooring if it was offered to me as time on the tide is my priority. Obviously I don't really want to pay more and what's more the bigger Boston Whaler boats are normally owned by people who use them for one or two weeks of the year. It would be very irritating to be waiting for the tide on the new arrangement whilst big wide powerful boats that are not frequently used are afloat on the outer edge of the new pontoon.</p> <p>I understand that this is an opportunity for you to look at the best use of the pontoon as it could be re designed but I would like to see new pontoons on Piles in the same arrangement only 1.5meters future</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Keep 2m berth width • Move pontoon system 1.5m towards channel • Keep current layout • Agree with security gate • Concerned about congestion at top of slip
<p>Mr Caddick</p>	<p>Further to the recent public meeting regarding the above held at Cliff House I would like you to consider the following comments.</p> <p>After listening to your presentation I would confirm that the proposal to replace the existing pontoons and secure them using piles would be my preferred option. The layout suggested in the presentation would offer the best solution for access to the pontoons both from the land and the water. However the need for a greater degree of supervision at the top of the slipway during busy periods should be investigated. It is a dangerous area, especially when a lot of visitors are in Salcombe and whose only thoughts are for themselves and how quickly they can get onto the water!</p> <p>The view that the piles would be obtrusive for me doesn't present a problem, if you look at the eclectic mix of craft on and around the pontoon, with masts, engines boat covers etc. then a few piles wouldn't make any difference.</p> <p>I like the idea of restricted access to the pontoons and hope a suitable system can be devised. I also like the idea of a waiting area, especially since we cannot expect any dredging to take place, but think</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with piles • Agree with restricting access • Concerned about congestion at top of slip • Agree with new layout • Agree with waiting area • Lights on pontoon • Nav. lights at entrance

<p>Mr Hosking</p>	<p>Construction – Pontoons and Piles. I agree that the mid priced pontoon option utilising galvanised steel and plastic covered flotation appears the most appropriate. With regard to the securing of these pontoons I strongly believe that the only sensible option would be to use piles. Whereas all the points you gave regarding piles as opposed to chains are relevant, I would particularly support the points “Most secure with no lateral movement”, “Lower through life maintenance costs”, ”Preferred environmental option on fundus”, and the “Potential for an extension of the contract period” which could be desirable. With regard to the matter of overall visual impact which was discussed by certain people at the meeting, I personally have absolutely no objection to the appearance of piles in this location which is not the most attractive area of Salcombe. The area could easily be regarded as more commercial/industrial when considered in relation to the fish quay, car parks, unattractive dinghy storage, etc. Provision of new improved pontoons even with piles would certainly not look out of keeping, and overall, could only enhance the area.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with mid price option • Agree with piles • Worried about congestion • Lights on pontoon
<p>Mr Hodges</p>	<p>Thank you for your presentation last week re Batson pontoons. Although you have obviously spent considerable time on the presentation, you asked for views, so I have a few comments:-</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1) I have witnessed a large amount of silting around the pontoons over recent years and so if you are able to blow-dredge the site, it would certainly seem to be a good solution as far as capital/maintenance dredging is concerned. 2) A compromise of an increase in pontoon length to give a small proportion of larger berths is sensible. 3) I personally do not see the point of 'fingers' - the stern chains have done pretty well so far. 4) I believe the pontoon should be kept for resident boats rather than providing for visitors' tenders. 5) I believe black is the worst colour for pontoons, as they stick out like sore thumbs: suggest return to grey or similar soft colour (preferably not pink!) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with dredging • Agree with some larger berths • Stern chains not fingers • Against provision for visiting tenders • Prefer neutral colours

<p>Mr Shelmadine</p>	<p>Comment card</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mid range steel construction • Increase berth size • Mixture of fingers and stern chains • Prefer alongside berths • 56 2.2m berths with fingers • 6 2.5m alongside berths • Prefer piles • Concerned about loss of tidal time
<p>Mr Cohen</p>	<p>Just a brief note to thank the Harbour Board for offering genuine consultation at the above. It's the first time in my living memory that we've been afforded such courtesy in matters of 'planning', and long may that last.</p> <p>As mentioned at the meeting, I live in the world of 'Swallows and Amazons' which means my aspirations for Salcombe do not sit well with much that involves engineers building in sensitive areas of the environment. Of course I'm fortunate we have a space on the facility, but I'm equally aware that the overall territory belongs to everyone, including those who just enjoy walking in proximity, including Snapes.</p> <p>If told that the price for what I'd ideally like is to have no convenient facility at all – you'll have to tow your boat down when you wish to use it, I'd respect that although I realise the treasurer at SHDC would not be very happy!</p> <p>So I remain a bit of a nuisance and spoilsport to 'progress', and confirm my plea for chains as a continuing solution.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer chains • Thank you for allowing consultation

<p>Mr Brown</p>	<p>I consider the pile option should be adopted,with finger pontoons, by far the best long term solution, it would reduce maintenance costs and the boating season can be extended. The ability to moor alongside would greatly benefit older users. The depth of water should be such that access is possible at all states of the tide. There should be a security access gate for berth holders, using the pontoon bridge. Visitor moorings are a good idea to help reduce pressure on Whitestrand. Summary I believe a good marina style facility should be provided with all states of tide access. I think the Harbour Authority has an excellent opportunity of producing a modern, safe facility with good disabled facilities that will considerable reduce future maintenance costs. To try to reduce capital costs now would be a false economy.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Piles with fingers • Agree with alongside berths • Agree with dredging • Agree with security gate • Agree with visitor berths
<p>Mr Turner</p>	<p>Comment card</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Prefer piles • Agree with extending season • Deeper hulled boats allocated berths with more water • Presentation very good
<p>Mr Stratton</p>	<p>I agree that the pontoons need to be replaced and support the proposal for the mid price option, but having given considerable thought to the case presented by the Board, for their preferred option of a revised layout of pontoons, supported on steel piles driven into the sea bed, with shared access exclusively via the new slipway bridge, I find myself unconvinced by their arguments for the following reasons: The revised layout is ill conceived and does not allow easy and convenient access for all berth –holders alike. The current system with central access is the best compromise for convenience and is best for “traffic flow”. The proposed layout is more about utilising the new slipway bridge with obvious adverse consequences. The access to the lagoon creates a pinch point and is the only egress or ingress for probably some 100 craft. The proposed access at or in the vicinity of the top of the slipway is simply going to add to the already considerable congestion experienced in this area at busy times during the season.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Support mid price option • Keep current layout and berth size • Keep current access • Pile central section of pontoon • Other pontoons to be anchored by chain. • Agree with dredging

	<p>The environmental argument against chains and for piles must be flawed. The so called scouring effect of chains is more associated with swinging moorings or vessels at anchor, free to swing to the tide, the catenary of chain on the bottom being potentially dragged through 360 degrees. The securing chains for the existing pontoon system simply gradually emerge from the mud and in much the same manner return, this would result in minimum scouring as is evidenced by the amount of mud accumulated in this area. (If they were scouring they would be easy to find when doing maintenance!) Some limited scouring could be seen as beneficial. If there is any scouring effect from the chains it surely is, as nothing, when compared to the effects of the entire system of pontoons, along with 245 boats attached, grounding at successive low tides. From my own enquiries made with the Estuary Conservation Officer I was informed he had no environmental concerns associated with the securing chains in this area. Surely the environmental argument that matters is for the visual environment, which, sadly, will be jeopardised if the Board's proposals succeed. I think it is generally accepted by estuary users that caring for the environment costs money and that it. Keeping Salcombe unspoilt is important and accrues benefits for the resident and visitor alike and of course Dredging the area prior to pontoon renewal - for the majority, is seen as being essential. We now have</p>	
	<p>The Financial information given at the consultation was for a budget cost for Piles only, at £90,000 against a budget cost for chains only at £50,000. Additionally the cost of pontoons being the same for either method. The consultation document stated the capital cost difference of £40,000 was equalised after 5 years whereas in the report by the Harbour Master to the Board for the 22nd September meeting it was stated as " between 10 and 15 years." This longer period is somewhat supported by the Harbour Master's report to the Board for the 2nd June meeting, when he stated " maintenance could be markedly reduced saving the cost of approx 70 man hours and the cost of replacement chain, approx £3000 /year." Surely, these facts must be reviewed and the figures made public as I think the explanation of "typo" offered by the Harbour Master at the consultation to be unacceptable. I am concerned that the true savings associated with the chain option are being played down, for example no allowance has been made for the second - hand value of the chain we replace each year which is either sold to be used for moorings elsewhere or for i</p>	

	<p>I therefore propose the following alternative, which makes good business and environmental sense in a difficult economic climate.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Retain the current layout and berth size (most economical option, more likely to come in on budget) • Leave the access in the current position and re-utilise the current bridge • Secure the central section of pontoons on environmentally sensitive piles. This will provide secure central anchorage to the whole system • The spur pontoons off to be anchored by chain. • This will be cheaper than piling the whole system and the difference can be used to pay for- • The removal of mud by the new method (ensuring it is carried out as one contract when the maintained channel is done.) <p>There is still the possibility in the future of providing more pontoons to link back to the slipway pontoon bridge. This would provide additional berths and should be self-financing. We would then have an augmented system with two separate access points.</p> <p>This proposal I would suggest has something for every body.</p> <p>May I thank you for holding this consultation and may I suggest that the Board incorporate consultation</p>	
<p>SKEA</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Batson Pontoon replacement – public consultation • The consultation document along with the Harbour Master’s letter of the 22nd December 2008 inviting the views of the SKEA membership was brought to the attention of members present. • Chairman welcomed the public consultation and underlined the importance of members attendance on the dates appointed, or alternatively responding directly to the Harbour Board in writing • The consultation document was discussed in some depth in order to get a proper understanding of the Board’s proposals. • The following points emerged as being significant: • General acceptance that replacement was inevitable • Support for the mid range option with pontoons as per recent installations. • Support System – Piles emerged as the preferred option (9 for 3 against) but with the following qualifications: • That the piles should be as unobtrusive as possible with efforts made to blend them in to their surroundings. • It was noted that even with a piled system there still would be an annual maintenance requirement ongoing for the stern moorings, which remain on chain. • Unanimous support for keeping berth width at 2m and length at 5.5m. The provision of extra berths v • There was limited and qualified support for the proposed layout and a general concern about siting th • Some concern that there is to be no mud removed from the area before installation of new equipmen 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In favour of consultation • Support mid range option • Support piles(muted colours) • Keep beam at 2m and length at 5.5m • Agree with extra berths • Concern about congestion • Would like to see more layout options

Mr Spratling	Letter in file	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with alongside berths • No increase in price
Mr Jenkins	Letter in file	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Congratulations on presentation • Agree with larger beam • Prefer stern chains • Agree with new layout • Agree with piles

<p>Mr Marsden</p>	<p>Construction I agree with the best value for money proposal, steel frame, plastic floatation and recycled plastic decking Size and Shape Number and size of berths I agree with the compromise proposal "a small increase in pontoon length to accommodate a proportion of larger berths. There would need to be an additional charge for wider berths." Securing of Boats I agree with the compromise proposal "a mixture of fingers and stern chains optimized to the available budget and space. There would need to be an additional charge for berths with fingers." Tender Berthing. I believe it is essential that additional tender berthing is provided for Resident Mooring holders. Owing to the number of hire boats using the Whitestrand pontoon during peak seasons, and the inaccessibility to the inside for much of the tide, access to the town is severely limited. Either stop differentiating between visitors and residents at Normandy / Whitestrand, or provide additional resident only tender berthing at Batson. I notice that on the plan provided the additional tender berthing is described as "Tender berthing for visitors", not residents. Access to the Pontoons I agree with the proposal to use the existing Batson Slipway Pontoon Bridge and Proposed Layout. I agree with the proposed layout, provided additional tender berthing is for residents, Securing Pontoons. I agree with the proposal to use Piles for the reasons described in the consultation document. Most of the Pontoon Furniture I agree with the proposals, particularly the use of secure access gates. Other issues. More boat washing facilities should be provided above the slipway. At times a log jam of towing vehicles</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with mid-price option • Agree with mix of fingers and stern chains • Agree with resident tender berthing • Agree with proposed layout • Agree with piles • Agree with security gate • More washdown facilities and better drainage
<p>Mr and Mrs Parker</p>	<p>Please note that we both totally agree with your proposal for the replacement of the Batson pontoons. We trust that you will be giving further thought to managing pedestrian, car and boat traffic at the top of the slip in order to maximise safety and avoid congestion. Graham & Meredith Parker</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Agree with proposals • Concerned about congestion

Mr Pettman	I have always (since inception) had a category 4 berth at Batson which I should like to retain in case of change of boat. Anything which makes the pontoon less tide dependant would be a huge advantage.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Would like to see larger beam boats accommodated • Expressed concern over tidal access constraints and would support dredging
Mr Tucker	<p>1. Clearly, the piling system provides the most ecologically favourable solution, albeit there is a risk of creating a significant visual impact on Batson Creek. Whilst your contemplation of timber piles is to be applauded, if this result is not viable, can you please seek to mitigate the visibility of any steel piles by use of subdued/natural coatings and finishes (not white caps) should they be the favoured route.</p> <p>2. I note that consideration is being given to use the new access recently created adjacent to the top of the slipway as the main link to the pontoon. Whilst for 10 months of the year this might be an acceptable answer, during the period of Regattas and in particular July and August, I believe it to be a recipe for conflict and extreme difficulty. Recent developments, including the pontoon, have helped some of the issues with the slipway, which inevitably is overcrowded and confused and often tests ability and temper when yawls and dinghies are being launched alongside arriving and departing holiday makers, some less than familiar with the ways of the harbour. At least the present pontoon ac</p> <p>3. Finally, on a point of self interest, I am one of the original and now few remaining Category 4 berth h</p> <p>Thank you for affording all interested parties a thorough forum to reflect the various views, which hope</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a preference for piles • Prefer neutral colouring • Concerned about congestion in Boatpark and at the top of the slipway • Praise for consultation/presentation • Would like to see larger beam boats accommodated
Kingsbridge Town Council	<p>Thank you for your letter dated 22 Dec 08 and your recent presentation at Quay House.</p> <p>Members discussed the project at this week's council meeting and fully support the layout proposed within the consultation paper; it was further supported for the pontoons to be secured by piles.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Have a preference for piles • Expressed support for the proposed layout • Praise for consultation/presentation

<p>John Chalmers</p>	<p>In the presentation by Ian Gibson of the Harbour Board's proposals to replace the Batson pontoons there were a number of anomalies and omissions which should be cleared up. I would be pleased to hear how the Board intends to meet them and publicise the results. I have listed the items I have in mind below.</p> <p>The period during which the extra capital cost of the piles would be offset by the extra cost of chain moorings was unclear. I have heard that it was once said to be 15 years but is now thought to be 4 years. What factors have changed to produce this result?</p> <p>The height of the piles seems to be unclear. 0.5M above Highest Astronomical Tide is inadequate to cope with runs at high tide. At least 1.5M above HAT is needed.</p> <p>The claim that it is not possible to find maintenance workers for chain moorings at a time when thousands are being laid off every week is hard to believe.</p> <p>You need to demonstrate that the concentration of pedestrian traffic at peak times on the slip bridge and the pontoons caused by the revised design is not a problem.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Preference for chains ▪ Concern that piles are high enough to cope with HAT and tidal surges ▪ Concern over congestion at pontoon access
<p>John Chalmers continued</p>	<p>The narrow channel between the southern end of the pontoons and the line of moorings may cause problems as most of the boats using the pontoons will have to pass through it. This problem is exacerbated by the anti-clockwise rotation of the pontoons and a proposal that larger boats be berthed at this point.</p> <p>The visual impact of the piles in the creek was dismissed using a view about 2-300 feet above East Portsmouth from which the whole structure is insignificant. I was very pleased to hear you promise to produce a view of the pontoons secured by piles from the edge of the Batson boat park. I can assure you they are quite easy to produce and would be pleased to offer help if required.</p> <p>Finally I support the view that only boats of 2M beam or less should be allowed on the pontoons.</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> ▪ Concern over access to pontoons past existing moorings ▪ Concern over visual impact of piles ▪ Support for berth width to be limited to 2m