

Mr M Keeling

Fairport House, Lands End Road, Bursledon,
Southampton, SO31 8DN

Response to public comments for proposed construction
works F/26/101731

Compiled by Dr P Tosswell, Lymington Technical Services Ltd

Contents

1	Introduction	3
2	Anthony Hweett-Hicks	3
3	Amanda Richards	4
4	John Dyke.....	5
5	Roger Marsh	6
6	Angela Wills	8
7	Amanda Bowman.....	8
8	Marvin Wills.....	9
9	Glenna Horne	9
10	Mr Stephen Phillips.....	10
11	Paul Spooner	11
12	Mrs Melanie Smith.....	12
13	Jocelyn Davison-Mills	13
14	Brian Neve.....	13
15	Mrs Margaret Gordon.....	13
16	Mr Robert Dawson.....	14
17	Jim Williams	16
18	Robin Sims	19
19	Mr Jeffery Mannion	19
20	Dr David Gorrod	20
21	Photos	21

1 Introduction

This document is our response to the various public objections to the proposed works.

There are a multitude of objections all with a similar comment. For clarity, each of eth objections is addressed in the following sections.

2 Anthony Hweett-Hicks

I object to this planning application on the grounds of safety to the current users of this part of the river due to the reduction in width of the channel to an unsafe distance. Causing congestion to all users and the foreseeable possibility of a serious accident. I am a long-term user of the river and have been concerned by the increase by recreational users wild life and erosion.

This objection is not clear on detail and states that the channel is reduced to an unsafe distance.

This is factually incorrect. Careful examination of eth application drawing clearly identifies that the proposed works do NOT reduce the channel width less than existing distances. The location chosen has been specifically identified such that there is no significant navigation alterations. This is fully supported by the photos of actual use at the end of this document.

3 Amanda Richards

As a regular user of the River Hamble for rowing and paddleboarding, I am concerned that the proposed fixed jetty, access brow, and floating pontoon would introduce a permanent obstruction in an already busy and sensitive section of the river.

I object on the following grounds:

1. Navigation safety and channel narrowing

The proposed pontoon would significantly reduce the width of an important secondary channel used by small and unpowered craft. This would create a hazardous pinch point, increasing the risk of collisions and potentially forcing users into the busier main channel.

This is factually incorrect, the application drawing clearly demonstrates that a 'pinch point' is not created. There are a number of much narrower gaps further upstream.

The submitted drawings appear to measure the spacing between structures rather than the actual navigable width when vessels are moored, which in practice would be considerably reduced.

This has been done intentionally as we have no way of identifying what vessels may be moored on the existing moorings. The point here being that the adding moored vessels would result in the same differences between available berthed vessels.

This is of particular concern for Bursledon Gigs (20–22 feet wide when rowing), which may struggle to pass safely.

The photos at the end of this document suggests that this is not the case.

2. Impact on recreational users

The River Hamble is widely used by rowers, paddleboarders, kayakers, and sailors. This development would obstruct a key route and make passage to the Upper Hamble more difficult, particularly for unpowered craft.

It risks prioritising private moorings over shared public use of the river.

This is factually incorrect, using the upstream section of this part of the river is more restrictive.

3. Impact on rowing and events

Rowing activity, including the use of traditional boats and events such as the Hamble River Raid, could be adversely affected. Reduced navigable space and increased hazards may compromise safe participation and the continuation of future events.

The location of the proposed works has been specifically chosen so as to avoid any such impact, as supported by the photos at the end of this document.

4. Impact on Public Hard access

The proposal may restrict access from the Public Hard at Lands End Road, which is an important public access point to the river.

There is absolutely no link to any possible impact on the existing slipway.

5. Visual impact

The pontoon and associated structures would detract from the open character and visual amenity of this part of the River Hamble.

Based on the existing moorings, many of which now have pontoons, the proposed works are negligible.

6. Location

New pontoons should be sited within existing boatyards, rather than in open shared waterways where navigable space is already constrained.

This is not factually correct, many of the river moorings are being installed with pontoons.

4 John Dyke

I wish to object to the application on behalf of the Hamble River Raid. The raid is one of the largest rowing and paddling races on the south coast, and has been running for nearly 20 years. It sees around 60 rowing boats with around 200 competitors race from Hamble Quay to the Jolly Sailor pub and back. The proposed pontoon blocks the upriver course, leaving insufficient room for large rowing boats, some up to 20 feet wide across their oars to race up to the Jolly Sailor pub, and if permitted could spell the end of this popular community event, a shorter or alternative course not having the same attraction for those who return year on year. As such we strongly object to the new pontoon, and would highlight it could result in the loss of a significant community event. I also recall that a similar application was turned down some years ago.

This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

The earlier application the complainant refers to was much further into the river and the objections to that proposal have been carefully addressed in the current application.

5 Roger Marsh

I object to this application on the grounds of safety and the enjoyment of the river by the wider public. The addition of a fixed jetty, access brow and pontoon will create a significant obstruction in the river for a large number of users.

I am a member of the Hamble River Rowing Club - 80 members strong and growing. We are based at the Jolly Sailor pub, just up-river of the applicant, and mainly row Bursledon Gigs - a smaller cousin to the more famous Cornish Gigs, designed specifically for river use, and that each take four rowers and a cox. We normally have at least four rowing sessions a week, and run throughout the year, rowing either down to Warsash or Hamble, or up river to enjoy the Hamble River Valley.

The proposed jetty will significantly encroach on the channel used by both rowing boats and other river users such as canoeists, kayakers, wild swimmers and the increasing number of stand-up-paddle boarders. This channel is regarded as safer than the main boating channel to the north, keeping more vulnerable users clear of the majority of powered craft.

This jetty will create a choke point in this channel which will force users to pass very closely to one another. Although the plan shows a gap of 32m, this is pontoon to pontoon. Once you allow for boats moored to these pontoons, the actual gap is approx. 18m. In total, a Bursledon Gig is approx. 7m wide (oar to oar). If you allow 2m either side for safety margin / coxing errors, there is no room for two craft to pass safely at the choke point, which actually would extend either side by some 20-30m. This also does not take into account the other river users, including inexperienced users and young children on SUPs.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

The boat the objector has shown on his drawing as berthed on the new pontoon is deliberately excessive and far larger than safe mooring would permit.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

Also, and unlike the slipways that are adjacent to the property, the fixed jetty will always be an obstruction - even at high tide. Although SUPS and the more confident gig cox could pass over the lower end of the slips, they will have to divert to get around the jetty and pontoon.

The channel is also a key feature of the races that take place on the River, most notably the Hamble River Raid and the Bursledon Regatta. The increased traffic during the races, including the participation of the much broader beamed Cornish Gigs and similar craft, will make this area very challenging to navigate.

I note that my concerns echo those of the Hamble Harbour Authority who objected to an identical proposal the last time it was applied for in 2019 (Case Ref. F/19/85908). As such, I would suggest that should permission be granted, it should be noted that any resulting incidents, including harm to individuals or property, will have been totally foreseeable.

The previous application was NOT identical and it is misleading to suggest so.

If it would help members of the Planning Team and/or Councillors understand the challenges that this proposal would make for users of the River, I'm sure the Rowing Club would be happy to take you out on the water - we're very sociable, and it's a great low-impact way to stay fit - whatever your age.

Photos at the end of this document show typical vessel use.

A plan has also been provided which is shown on the document section.



This 'drawing' is deliberately misleading with an inappropriate vessel shown moored.

6 Angela Wills

I strongly object to this proposal on the following grounds

The plans show a distance of 32 metres from the site of the new pontoon to the existing mooring pontoons opposite. This does not allow for the width of moored vessels. There are always vessels moored opposite. This particular channel is the one that all small river craft are advised to use, keeping them out of the main channel, reducing the risk of incidents and accidents. This channel is therefore used by a large number of smaller crafts from paddle boarders, canoes and rowing gigs. It is already difficult to navigate on occasion when you have various craft going in opposite directions.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

This particular channel is used during the River hamble raid event, which is held annually. This event attracts larger gigs which are even wider.

There is currently a pier and pontoon to the south of this proposed one on this site.

This is not a relevant objection

The area that this will be built on is a salt water marsh and a designated SSSI, which needs to be protected.

The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

I believe the applicant has applied on a previous occasion and the plans were refused.

The earlier application the complainant refers to was much further into the river and the objections to that proposal have been carefully addressed in the current application.

The River Hamble is beautiful and surely needs to be protected from future developments.

A rather wide covering objection, not relevant nor appropriate.

7 Amanda Bowman

Good afternoon. I've recently joined the Hamble River Rowing Club and we use this stretch of river to row and moor the gigs on the pontoon of the Jolly Sailor. Having spoken to other members with far better knowledge on boat widths, tidal implications and experience of this stretch of water, I believe the pontoon plans in this application will significantly impede the passage of gigs and other water traffic and will create a dangerous pinch point. I therefore object to this application on safety grounds.

This is not supported by facts and no 'dangerous pinch point' will be created.

8 Marvin Wills

With reference to planning application F/26/101731 I wish to object for the following reasons .

- 1. This channel is often congested with an array of various watercraft from Bursledon gigs with a beam of 6.2 mts when under way to paddle boards and small powered craft .A pontoon with a hammer head in this location will seriously affect the enjoyment of many others using the river .*

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

- 2.The applicant already has a jetty to the south of this proposed construction .*

Not relevant

- 3.Small craft are actively encouraged to use this channel to keep the main swashway clear for larger craft either using the marina or navigating northwards under the bridges.*

No specific objection

- 4.A construction in this position would further damage the salt marshes which have a SSSI designation.*

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

- 5.The jetty would jeopardise the Hamble River Raid which is an event enjoyed by many local river users*

Not correct, our earlier responses demonstrate this.

9 Glenna Horne

I am writing to object to this proposal as it will seriously affect other river users. I am a member of Hamble River Rowing Club. We regularly use this stretch of water to and from the Jolly Sailor. Since Covid, this stretch of River has become more popular and is used by kayaks, paddle boarders, other small craft accessing the pub and swimmers as well as our gigs which are 20' oar tip to oar tip. The width of the channel has been given at high tide, but it is narrower most of the time. Dinghies launch from Land's End. Boats moored at this pontoon and others moored on the Premier moorings will narrow it further. I fear that this congestion and possible obstruction to visibility of swimmers and low craft increase the risk of an accident. There are notices at the entrance to the main channel instructing paddle boarders, kayaks and smaller craft to stay out of the main channel. I feel strongly that this application is detrimental to the enjoyment and safety of the river users

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

10 Mr Stephen Phillips

I have lived in Bursledon for 30yrs and am a regular boating user on the Hamble River. I am deeply concerned regarding the unsafe narrowing of the choke point caused by the proposed 10m jetty access walkway and 11m wide floating 'hammerhead' pontoon. The applicant's diagram mistakenly calculated shows a 32m wide choke width of water from the 'hammerhead pontoon' edge and the River Hamble midstream mooring floating walkway shown in green, which omits to account the beam widths of sailing/motor boats moored alongside either, or the safe passing distance needed for moving boats to pass. During the Hamble River Raid and on other busier occasions this choke point, caused by light traffic correctly avoiding the busy main River Hamble channel, needs to take into account the following:

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

- 1. Motor boat/s moored alongside the proposed new 'hammerhead' pontoon (eg Jeanneau Leader 36' beam 3.62m);*

Factually incorrect, the depth is not sufficient for such a vessel.

2. Sailing Yacht(s) moored alongside the mid-channel pontoon (eg Westerly 37' beam 3.8m);

Existing permitted berthing.

3. Plus, during May's Hamble River Raid - typically:

a. 2 x Hamble Gigs, each 4.5m width with oars rowing (9m + 3m for safe avoidance distance between the gigs);

b. A plethora of surf boarders/canoeists often inexperienced;

I submit that this application be rejected on safety at sea grounds as its construction would exacerbate an already narrow river choke point, with potential loss of life risk.

The proposed location do not cause a pinch point. Loss of life is an excessive inappropriate comment.

Additionally, the applicant already has a walkway and floating pontoon accessed directly from his property, so why does he need a second?

Not that this is a relevant objection, the jetty is not serviceable.

11 Paul Spooner

As a regular user of the River Hamble for recreational use, I object to this application on the basis that it will seriously inhibit the space available on the safe channel (SUPS and ROWCRAFT) as designated by the Harbour Master. This channel is the preferred route for paddle boarders / canoeists and other rowing craft.

The dimensions quoted on this application do not include vessels moored to the inshore side of the existing mid-river pontoons and the proposed new pontoon at the end of the jetty. When taking these into account, it will reduce the navigable width to around 18m.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

I row in Bursledon Gigs which with ours are 9m wide, with the large amount of paddle boards and kyaks, this stretch will become dangerously congested. When you take into account the fact that the majority of boarders and kyakers are not fully aware of maritime rules and etiquette, this significantly increases the risk of collision.

Alongside the navigation issues is the fact that adjacent mud flats are a SSI and the jetty will affect water flow over these mud flats.

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

Also, on the downstream side of this peninsula, there is an existing jetty and I would query whether this is already linked to this residence?

Not that this is a relevant objection, the jetty is not serviceable.

12 Mrs Melanie Smith

As a resident of Old Bursledon for over 30 years and a regular user of the River Hamble , I would like to object most strongly to this application.

The inner channel of the river is already narrow enough at Lands End, with rowers, paddle boarders and kayakers all jockeying for space.

A jetty at this point would further exacerbate an already challenging situation. The gig rowing would be affected and wonderful events such as the Hamble River Raid and The Regatta, which traditionally involve bigger Cornish gigs, as well as Bursledon gigs, would also be threatened.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

As well as the detrimental effect on leisure users of the river, this application would also harm wildlife. There is a swan currently nesting in the exact spot of the planned jetty. Egrets, cormorants and many different species of geese all gather on this land.

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

This property already has one jetty, which, as far as I can see, has never been used. It has recently added two new boat / summer houses.

Not that this is a relevant objection, the jetty is not serviceable.

I feel strongly that to further constrict this part of the river would force paddle boarders/kayakers/rowers etc. in to the main channel, which would be dangerous, in my view.

This is an unsupported comment referring to dangerous activity.

13 Jocelyn Davison-Mills

Will necessitate all craft using main channel which, particularly on low tides, will be dangerous as main channel is busy and used by larger craft.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

It will restrict the safe use of the river for many to the benefit of one property which already has the access of a pontoon onto the river.

Not that this is a relevant objection, the jetty is not serviceable.

14 Brian Neve

The jetty will be a hazard to many of the users of the river as it is where the passage is narrow and the outgoing tide can be very strong and it's function could be mostly fulfilled by a simple slipway on the same property or the rental of an existing pontoon or jetty in the very nearby marinas

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

There is no likely hazard generated.

15 Mrs Margaret Gordon

I am concerned that the proposed jetty and pontoon will impact both wildlife and small boat users.

The jetty and pontoon will increase human activity, which is already described as high and having an impact on wildlife. The site is adjacent to an SSSI and any increased human activity will disrupt the feeding and breeding of birds and other wildlife, especially the swans and other waders who nest on the mudflats nearby. The assessment that wildlife will not be affected by

the construction, because human activity is already high in the area, does not mean that human activity should be further increased.

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

The inshore channel is used all the time by paddleboarders, kayakers, dinghy sailors and rowing boats to avoid the busy main channel. Any constriction in the inshore channel will affect the ability to conduct the annual rowing races and make it more difficult for the Hamble River Rowing Club boats to safely navigate when the channel is busy with SUPs. The inshore channel is a sheltered area in which new rowers and coxes can currently be trained, especially when there are strong winds.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

16 Mr Robert Dawson

I write in objection to the above planning application. The proposals are in direct conflict with the Eastleigh Borough Council Local Plan 2016-2036 and should be refused. Key areas of the local plan that it breaches are:

- *Protection of the landscape.*
- *Protections of SSSIs.*
- *Protection of Sites of Importance for Nature Conservation.*
- *River Corridors.*
- *Jetties, pontoons, landing stages, etc.*
- *Criteria for development in a Conservation Area.*
- *Old Bursledon – protection.*

This is a re-hash of a previously submitted application (F/19/85908) which was withdrawn by the applicant after significant local outcry. For many of the same reasons, I object again. I am a member of a local sailing club, and the Hamble River Rowing Club. I keep a small boat on the Hamble, and frequently launch from Lands End slip, just upriver of the planned development. The proposed pontoon and jetty would have a significant impact on river users and residents. In particular;

- *It is not within the built-up areas of the river frontage, but in a nature site (see below)*
- *It will impede the movement of craft on the River (especially small craft directed to use the subsidiary channels by the Harbour Master)*

Not factually correct, the passage distances are not affected.

- *It will impede areas where there is currently public access being only 60 m from one of the remaining Public Harbours.*

Unclear objection.

As a rowing club, we provide cheap and easy river access to a broad and diverse range of society, enabling access to the water for groups who otherwise would be disadvantaged. In particular we train complete beginners with no previous skills to row, and enable them to enjoy the river. The stretch of water where this development is planned is right in the remaining sheltered area by our club which we use regularly for training, and for races such as Hamble regatta. This jetty would block access, diverting boats into an already busy channel. Should this be allowed to go ahead, it would cause huge damage to local rowing clubs, river users and residents and must be rejected firmly.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

It should also be highlighted the plans show no boat on the proposed pontoon. The distances given are deceptive – when you add the beam of two vessels (one on a mid-river mooring, one on the proposed pontoon), and account for the swing of boats on the mid-river moorings which can move laterally several metres with wind and current, it would leave an unacceptably small space to squeeze through rowing boats (which with oars can be over seven or eight metres wide), several novices on paddle boards, all potentially fighting wind and tide.

This has been done intentionally as we have no way of identifying what vessels may be moored on the existing moorings. The point here being that the adding moored vessels would result in the same differences between available berthed vessels.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

The site is in an important and prominent location on the bend of the River Hamble. It is subject to numerous designations:

- *European Nature Conservation Site;*
- *Solent Maritime Special Area of Conservation (SAC);*
- *Solent and Southampton Water Ramsar (wetlands of international importance);*
- *Solent and Southampton Water Special Protection Area (SPA);*
- *Lincegrove & Hackett's Marshes Site of Special Scientific Interest (SSSI).*

- *Old Bursledon Conservation Area;*
- *A River Corridor;*
- *A Local Gap; and*
- *Within the Countryside*

The site is of great ecological, visual and historic importance and development proposals need to consider all these aspects with great care. This application fails to do so in each instance.

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

17 Jim Williams

Objection to Planning Application F/26/101731

Proposed new pontoon – River Hamble, Fairport House, Lands End Road, Bursledon

Dear Sir/Madam,

I wish to object to planning application F/26/101731 for the proposed new pontoon on the River Hamble. I write, as the Founder of Hamble River Rowing Club and on it's behalf.

My principal concern is the effect of the proposed pontoon on the safe use and navigation of this part of the River Hamble, particularly by the Hamble River Rowing Club, whose members regularly use this stretch of river for rowing. This part of the river is, also, used by large numbers of Paddleboarders and Kayakers to enable them to stay out of the Main Channel where it is very busy with vessels entering and leaving Swanwick Marina.

Safety and navigable width of the river

The proposed pontoon would extend into the river and consequently reduce the width of water available for navigation. When a boat will be on this pontoon and one on the nearest of the pile moorings in the river the usable gap will, I believe, be reduced to less than 20 metres. Rowing boats used on the River can be 8 metres wide, with oars out. Thus 2 boats could not pass through this gap without the risk of collision or scraping the sides of moored craft.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

Further up the River, closer to the Jolly Sailor there are similar narrow gaps and great care has to be taken. This new pontoon reduces the width of the part of the River where novices are taught to row, reducing safety.

The reduction in available water space could make it more difficult for rowing crews to manoeuvre safely, particularly when:

Outgoing boats meet returning boats;

When boats are racing in this stretch of water;

Wind conditions make it more difficult to control a rowing boat; or

Rowing boats are trying to navigate through slow moving, and inexperienced, paddleboarders and kayakers:

Rowing boats are relatively low-powered and have limited ability to manoeuvre quickly to avoid other vessels. The loss of even a relatively modest amount of navigable water may therefore have a disproportionate effect on their safety.

Impact on Hamble River Rowing Club and on Rowing events in the River

The Hamble River Rowing Club is an established local sporting organisation and its members make regular use of the River Hamble for rowing. It was established in 2011 and has 80 local members. It's 7 Bursledon Gigs, moored at the Jolly Sailor, are used by up to 30 rowers at Club meetings on Tuesdays and Sunday, and by individual crews at other times in the week. It, also, hosts occasional visits by other Rowing Clubs who use the fllet of almost 40 Bursledon Gigs spread between the Hamble and Chichester.

In particular there is an annual Rowing Race, The Hamble River Raid, attracting 60+ craft and raising money for charity. The Race does go up this channel and already has a rule to ensure safe passage. The proposed pontoon will make this passage more difficult and less safe.

The proposed development should therefore be assessed not simply in terms of the physical size of the pontoon, but in terms of its practical effect on an established use of the river for recreational use by many Eastleigh residents.

I am concerned that the application does not adequately demonstrate that the remaining navigable channel will provide sufficient safe manoeuvring space for rowing boats and other river users.

Cumulative effect

The River Hamble is a relatively confined waterway which already contains numerous pontoons, jetties, moorings and vessels.

The Council should therefore consider the cumulative effect of this proposal rather than considering the new pontoon in isolation. Each additional structure reduces the amount of unobstructed water available to river users and can increase the potential for conflicts between different types of vessel. There is a need for an adequate navigation and safety assessment.

Before determining this application, I respectfully ask the Council to ensure that the applicant has demonstrated that the proposal will not create an unacceptable risk to the safety of navigation.

The assessment should consider, in particular:

The actual reduction in navigable width caused by the proposed pontoon, including the width of boats on this pontoon and the piles in the River. Most rowing takes place when the tide is close to High Water so rowing boats do go through the water that will be obstructed by the jetty, let alone by the pontoon and a moored boat.

The remaining width available to rowing boats and other vessels.

The effect of tidal flows at different states of tide.

The ability of rowing boats to pass safely in both directions.

The ability of rowing crews to turn and manoeuvre safely.

The interaction between rowing boats other vessels, in particular Paddleboarders and Kayakers.

The cumulative effect of existing pontoons, moorings and other obstructions in this section of the river.

The particular circumstances of organised rowing activity by the Hamble River Rowing Club which benefits the health of Members.

I also believe that the views of the Hamble River Rowing Club and the relevant river/navigation authorities should be given proper consideration before the application is determined.

Consultation should, also, include the Hambel based SUP club and the two businesses which hire out SUPs and Kayaks at Swanwick Marina and Mercury Matina.

Conclusion

I therefore respectfully request that planning permission be refused, unless the Council can be satisfied, on the basis of adequate evidence, that the proposed pontoon would not materially prejudice the safe navigation and use of this part of the River Hamble.

The River is a shared resource used by a wide range of vessels and recreational users. The interests of existing river users, including the Hamble River Rowing Club, should be properly protected when considering the introduction of another structure into an already constrained waterway.

I ask that this objection be taken into account when application F/26/101731 is determined.

18 Robin Sims

I have the pontoon opposite this planned construction V12. I objected last time this was proposed.

This development is on a special site with nesting birds. It has been steadily encroached on over the last years and gradually getting destroyed. This pontoon will need raised access across the site causing further damage.

Not correct. The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

Small craft users, paddle boards and canoes are encouraged to use this section of the river and not the main channel where they are a danger to themselves and obstruct larger vessels. Reducing the available channel is hindering that.

This view had remained unspoilt. Helped by saltwater marsh being too difficult to walk over. Over the last few years the some of the ground has been raised the salt water marsh lost. With this pontoon and the access the remainder will be in danger

19 Mr Jeffery Mannion

The new proposal for a Jetty is creating the same problem as the previous proposal in that it is restricting the inner channel. This channel is busier than ever with small craft users being directed away from the main channel which is very necessary with the increased use of paddle boards on the river. This area has always been busy but is especially so now. I would also point

out that over decades the adjacent spit is a nesting site for swans. A structure of this size is an unnecessary obstruction.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

If you consider the next gap at Lands End House, this is only 26m with vessels moored. As you travel further up this channel the gap lessens to 10m at the upstream end. Therefore, it is incorrect to suggest that the proposed works have any navigable effect.

The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

20 Dr David Gorrod

The proposed jetty is far longer than any of the other jetties on this shore. It is beside a SSSI and would have an adverse visual effect from the public area at Lands End Hard.

The proposal fully considers the SSSI and the works are fully compliant.

In addition it would cause a problem for small craft (rowers, paddleboards etc.) as we often keep close to this bank in an ebb tide. Having to negotiate this structure would force us out into the strong current.

This is factually incorrect. This objection is not supported by the facts. The proposed works retains a channel width of 29 metres (94 feet) between the pontoon (with a typical rib alongside), and the river mooring with a typical vessel moored.

21 Photos