

## Mooring Strategy Review Update

Report by Senior Waterways and Recreation Officer and Director of Operations

**Summary:** This report provides members with an update on the progress made on the review of the Mooring Strategy that is currently being undertaken. The report identifies a ten year Action plan for repiling the Broads Authority's existing piled moorings which is informed by the Authority's Asset Management Strategy and takes account of the comments made at the stakeholder mooring workshop held on the 22 July 2014. Members' comments on the proposed repiling strategy and the workshop prioritisation of the Authority's mooring sites are welcomed.

## 1 Background

- 1.1 The Broads Authority originally published a mooring strategy in 2006. The need for a strategy to guide the provision of Broads Authority free 24-hour moorings was identified as a priority in the best value review of navigation and supported through the public consultation for the Broads Plan 2004. The original strategy was developed with the guidance of a steering group formed of Broads Authority members and wider consultation was undertaken with a formal consultation group which included representatives from the Authority's partners and stakeholders.
- 1.2 The 2006 strategy was updated in 2009 to take account of progress made in the delivery of the strategy objectives. The overarching objective of the strategy was to "maintain as a minimum the present number of moorings available for visitor use". The strategy also set out high level aims regarding the desired minimum cruising time between moorings and the distribution of the various types of moorings provided by the Authority. A number of key principles for mooring provision were also identified which have informed the strategy and been used to guide site specific issues. Appendix 1 sets out these principles.
- 1.3 In 2013 the Authority adopted an Integrated Access Strategy (IAS) for the Broads. While recognising that standalone strategies such as the mooring strategy have delivered considerable improvements to access, the IAS seeks to make improvements to the connectivity and use of access facilities on both land and water by taking a more holistic approach to access provision. The IAS adopted four key objectives:
  - To improve links between land and water and to the water's edge
  - To improve access links to local facilities, settlements and visitor destination points

- To encourage sustainable travel choices
  - To provide appropriate information and interpretation on access to recreational opportunities.
- 1.4 Since the adoption of the mooring strategy in 2006 and the IAS in 2013 the Authority has increased the length of free moorings it provides from 5969m of frontage to 7730m. While this has delivered significant improvements in mooring provision for private boaters and hire craft alike, it must be acknowledged that this growth in visitor moorings has also increased the authority's asset management liabilities.
- 1.5 Recognising that there is likely to be continued pressure on public funding, particularly in respect of the national park grant received by the Authority from government, the Authority produced an asset management strategy in January 2014 for the future management and maintenance of all its assets. This identified that, in respect of moorings, it would be prudent to allocate an annual budget of £425,935 to cover the costs of future repiling and refurbishment of all existing moorings, of which £160,000 would be required for an annual operational budget for piling works
- 1.6 While the Authority is responsible for the structure of the piling at a number of the 24-hour moorings it provides, there are sites where the piled edge is not our responsibility because this is set out in the lease we have with a private landowner or because the piling is currently a flood defence asset maintained by the Environment Agency (EA). Members will be aware that the EA is currently seeking to pass on liability for the maintenance of piling it no longer requires for flood risk management purposes to the owners of the land it abuts or to remove it if the landowners or lessees are not prepared to take on liability for the piled structure. This has the potential to further increase the Authority's asset management liabilities.

## **2 Moorings Workshop**

- 2.1 In view of the likelihood of the Authority having to take on liability for the maintenance of additional lengths of piling simply in order to maintain the current level of mooring provision and the impact this could have on asset management costs, members agreed that a stakeholder workshop should be held to consider mooring provision generally.
- 2.2 A workshop was therefore held on 22 July involving Navigation Committee members, Broads Authority members and representatives from a number of stakeholder groups. The workshop considered all relevant issues relating to the provision and funding of moorings and placed the Authority's existing moorings into one of four categories: retain at all costs, retain if funding allows, could live without or cannot agree today. The workshop also considered whether costs could be reduced by potentially reducing the length of piling used for mooring purposes at individual sites or considering using alternative means of mooring provision such as dolphins or pontoons to reduce costs.

- 2.3 There was a high level of agreement reached at the workshop regarding the prioritisation of individual sites with only one site being placed in the “can’t agree today” category. Appendix 2 lists the sites considered and the workshop prioritisation given to them.

### **3 Future Asset Management Action Plan for Piled Sites**

- 3.1 The Asset Management Strategy originally identified that an annual budget of £160,000 should be allocated to cover the costs of repiling the Authority’s existing 24-hour moorings, which would necessitate an increase of £50,000 per year on 2014/15 budget levels. Officers have since reassessed the costs for repiling each of the Authority’s moorings based on the typical contractor costs and prices for steel and materials in 2013/14. Having taking account of the recommendations of the stakeholder working group regarding reducing the lengths of individual moorings or using dolphins or other methods of providing mooring facilities at specific sites, and the assurances provided by the Environment Agency in respect of a number of sites, it has been calculated that it would actually be possible to maintain the current number of moorings provided by the Authority if an annual budget of £150,000 was allocated to repiling costs up to the year 2070. This is therefore £40,000 greater than the original asset management budget.
- 3.2 However, given the significant fluctuations in steel prices over time, the continued uncertainty about how many additional sites the Authority may have to take on responsibility for, and the fact that 2070 is so far into the future it would not be advisable to assume that maintaining the status quo would be achievable based on an annual budget of £150,000 for the next 56 years.
- 3.3 Officers are therefore of the opinion that adopting a ten year action plan for the repiling of moorings would be the most sensible approach to take. Based on 2103/14 costs and taking account of suggestions made at the stakeholder workshop such as reducing the length of Hoveton Viaduct moorings, replacing demasting moorings with dolphins and not renewing the Authority’s lease for the Thorpe River Green moorings, it would be possible to maintain all the other 24-hour moorings provided by the Authority until 2025 if an annual budget of £150,000 was allocated for repiling costs. Appendix 3 sets out a possible ten year action plan which takes account of all sites that will need to be repiled up to 2025.
- 3.4 Clearly it would be advisable to review this plan on an annual basis to take account of changes in tender prices received by the Authority and significant fluctuations in the price of steel. Moreover, it should be recognised that an annual budget of £150,000 will only achieve the ten year plan if the EA continues to maintain its position regarding the maintenance of flood defence piling at a number of 24 hr moorings, which include Burgh Castle, Cantley, Hardley Cross and How Hill.

## **4 Provision of New Moorings**

- 4.1 Members should recognise that while the allocation of an annual budget of £150,000 will maintain the current number of Broads Authority free mooring sites (apart from Thorpe River Green) it gives no scope for taking on asset management responsibility for additional sites.
- 4.2 The IAS has prioritised a number of areas for providing additional visitor moorings and the Authority also has a stated aim of providing demasting moorings at all four quadrants of bridges spanning the navigation. If new moorings are to be developed it will therefore be necessary to take account of the additional costs required both to establish the sites and maintain them in the future. It should also be noted that the Broadland Flood Alleviation Project is continuing to have discussions with landowners regarding the transfer of liability or removal of piling no longer required for flood risk management purposes so there is likely to be less piling available for developing new moorings.
- 4.3 Further, there are also additional pressures on the funding of other assets linked to moorings such as boardwalks leading from moorings to other locations. For example the boardwalk leading from the mooring at Paddy's Lane to Barton Turf has not been prioritised for retention in the asset management strategy, given these pressures and also the feedback expressing a desire for more wild moorings sites. This boardwalk is also not a priority in the IAS. Due to reductions in funding there is no scope for continuing to maintain the structure from national park income as other facilities such as the boardwalk linking the moorings at Woodbastwick and Cockshoot Dyke to the Norfolk Wildlife Trust bird hide at Cockshoot score more highly against the IAS criteria. Therefore, if there is a desire to continue to provide these facilities, which provide a greater benefit for boaters than land based visitors, alternative sources of funding will have to be identified.

## **5 Conclusions**

- 5.1 The adoption of the ten year action plan set out at Appendix 3 to this report would cover the costs of replacing the piling at the Authority's existing moorings up to 2025 at an annual budget of £150,000. There is also a requirement for additional budget to cover the costs of maintaining and refurbishing sites to a safe condition and this would result in a total annual moorings maintenance and repair budget of £232,700. This budget requirement has been taken into account in developing the draft Financial Strategy for 2015/16-17/18 which is reported separately on this agenda.
- 5.2 If members feel that the Authority should consider developing more free visitor moorings further work will need to be carried out on the prioritisation of sites taking account of the Mooring Strategy and IAS criteria. Consideration could also be given to adopting the recommendations made at the stakeholder workshop regarding the sites categorised as "could live without" and seeking to replace them with alternative sites at more strategically important locations. Members' comments are invited on the contents of this report.

Background papers: Nil

Authors: Adrian Clarke, Trudi Wakelin  
Date of report: 12 October 2014

Broads Plan Objectives: NA5, TR2

Appendices: Appendix 1 Mooring Strategy Principles  
Appendix 2 Mooring Stakeholder workshop Prioritisation of sites  
Appendix 3 10 Year Repiling Action Plan

## Mooring Strategy Update

### Principles of 2006/9 Mooring Strategies

- Distribution of moorings – maximum 30 minutes cruising time between sites (“90 minutes for Country Park” moorings).
- Distribution of mooring types - Wild 21%, Rural 36%, Urban 4% Country Park 37%, Flagship 2%.
- Maintain free use of Broads Authority unmanned moorings.
- Protect and enhance existing sites/facilities including working in partnership regarding third party provision.
- Seek contributions/ establish charges for ancillary services e.g. water/ Ranger etc.
- Promote double alongside mooring at appropriate sites and review effectiveness of national schemes.
- Encourage sustainable development of boating and associated infrastructure to be consistent with Water Framework Directive (WFD) and planning policies.
- Ensure sites have no negative impact in environmentally sensitive localities.
- Encourage innovative mooring design to provide habitat opportunities and mitigate landscape impacts.
- Improve the dissemination of information to users, to include location of sites, facilities available and consider a Moorings Code to refer to behaviour.
- Mitigate user conflict through design and alternative provision, i.e. relocate angling to adjacent facilities.
- Strategy to be linked to Broads Flood Alleviation Project, Electric Charging Point strategy, angling strategy, slipway strategy and water related sport and recreation strategy (**now the Integrated Access Strategy**) to consider and encourage partnership development/ funding opportunities.
- Undertake Byelaw enforcement to discourage misuse.

## Mooring Strategy update

Moorings Workshop prioritisation of sites

Key
Leasehold responsible
Transfer of liability proposed
Freehold
Third party maintained

Option	Workshop consultation
1	Retain at all costs
2	Keep if budget allows
3	Could live without
4	Can't decide

Yare, Chet & Breydon						
No.	Mooring	option			Comments	Officer comments
		1	2	3		
38	Langley Dyke 1/2	x			Very well used. Maybe split the two sites, don't need both unless secured at good price.	Agree – prioritise upstream section, renew lease 2023
39	Brundall Church Marsh	x			Only access to Brundall	Renew lease 2021
42	Whitlingham Country Park	x			Important access to park, integrated access strategic priority; commercial access to Norwich & developments (e.g. Deal Ground); good for boats unable to get under Norwich bridges. (-) Recreation access, not required for navigation	No action needed in next 10 years
67	Bramerton Common	x			Well used, access to pub, etc.	Renegotiate lease 2016
11	Commissioners Cut	x			Important strategic facility, particularly if Thorpe goes	No action needed in next 10 years
23	Hardley Cross	x			Safety, navigation	EA responsibility

24	Berney Arms	x			Safety	EA responsibility
29	Polkeys Mill	x			Strategic location for navigation	EA responsibility, renegotiate lease 2014
72	Norwich Yacht Station	x			Access to Norwich; is there a need for manning? (-) other informal opportunities in city. Tourist info rather than navigation imperative, so why wholly funded from navigation budget?	Renegotiate management agreement 2025
73	Gt Yarmouth Yacht Station	x			Safety	Renegotiate management agreement 2014
74	Reedham Quay	x			Safety	Renegotiate lease 2014
75	Loddon Staithe	x			Access to Loddon/ Cantley, local economic benefit	Renegotiate management agreement
47	Langley Dyke 1/2	x				Subject to EA negotiation with landowner
49	Rockland St Mary Staithe		x		Local economic benefit, alternative available at short dyke but less attractive	Renegotiate lease 2014, terminate prior to 2050
60	Thorpe Green			x	Low use, alternatives available	Exit at end of lease 2017
65	Chedgrave Common		x		Keep if good condition - 2040	Renegotiate lease 2023
10	Postwick Wharf			x	No flood defence requirement; EA seems to use site more than BA; poss. to EA for angling?	Discuss future with EA
22	Cantley	x			Keep if EA responsible; if not then reconsider, given proximity of pub moorings	EA responsibility, renegotiate lease 2017 subject to no structural responsibility

		Waveney				
No.	Mooring	option			Comments	Officer comments
		1	2	3		
33	Beccles bypass bridge (Suffolk Bank)	x			Long stretch, demasting facility, footpath access to town	Repiled 2013



59	Dutch Tea Gardens	x				Newish moorings, always well used	Renegotiate lease 2027, subject to EA negotiation with landowner
4	Worlingham	x				Good angling access, popular	Included in 10 year Action Plan
5	Geldeston Lock	x				Head of river, access to pub, footpaths, low maintenance costs	No action needed in next 10 years
21	Burgh Castle	x				Critical for safe passage across Breydon to retain a mooring, but could be pontoons or at nearby location	Included in 10 year Action Plan EA responsibility, renegotiate lease 2015
27	St Olaves	x				Demasting, recently repiled	Repiled 2013 by EA
51	Somerleyton	x				Good local facilities, bridge demasting	Renegotiate lease 2021, awaiting EA position
62	North Cove		x			Small, near other moorings	No action needed in next 10 years
66	Aldeby Hall Staithe		x			Remote, no footpath access, mainly used for angling; 3 moorings in area, so could lose one 3 moorings together still only provide 7-8 spaces, all needed	Renegotiate lease 2017
28	Herringfleet	x				Low costs, near St Olaves	Repiled 2012 by EA, renegotiate lease 2021
33	Beccles bypass bridge (Norfolk Bank)			x		Only 2 spaces - Suffolk Bank has good provision (+) Provides layby/demasting at low bridge. Mooring strategy denotes demasting at all 4 quadrants of a bridge (+) Could use as shorter-stay moorings (-) Insufficient facilities in Upper Waveney	Resign as demasting only 2015

Lower Bure & Thurne						
No.	Mooring	option			Comments	Officer comments
		1	2	3		
30	Boundary Farm	x				Freehold in progress, included in 10 year Action Plan
31	Boundary Farm Extension	x				As above
32	Thurne Mouth	x			Critical due to loss of informal mooring and need for moorings for flagship Broads sailing events	As above
34	Deep Dyke	x				Renegotiate lease 2014, included in 10 year Action plan
55	Potter Heigham demasting	x				Included in 10 year Action plan – subject to EA position
56	Repps	x				As above
57	Martham	x			If good condition - 2040	As above
2	Potter Heigham Dinghy Park	x				Included in 10 year Action plan
6	Womack Dyke	x			Critical for integrated access and overflow for parish staithe	No action needed in next 10 years
7	Potter Heigham Bridge Green	x				As above
20	Potter Heigham Staithe	x				As above
	West Somerton	x			Good mooring and no BA responsibility for piling	EA responsibility
35	Deep Go Dyke		x		Could be retained on cheaper basis; need wild moorings	Renegotiate lease 2014, included in 10 year Action plan
36	Whiteslea		x		Could be retained on cheaper basis; need wild moorings	Renegotiate lease 2014, included in 10 year Action plan
12	Womack Island			x	Could live without or provide by posts/mudweight mooring	No action needed in next 10 years
16	Stokesby			x	Other moorings in area, small site, attractive real estate potential Currently in good long-life condition; last official mooring before Gt Yarmouth, so if removed other moorings/demasting facilities	Repiled 2013

					must be found on that stretch.	
37	Catfield Dyke			x	Owned by Poors Trust, can live without – others may take it on	Renegotiate lease 2016, terminate before 2030

Upper Bure and Ant						
No.	Mooring	option			Comments	Officer comments
		1	2	3		
40	Horning Parish Staithe	x				Renegotiate lease 2020
44	Ludham Bridge demasting	x				Subject to EA position, Action Plan recommends replace with dolphins
48	St Benet's Abbey	x				No action in next 10 years
52	Cockshoot	x				Renegotiate lease 2014, included in 10 year Action plan
58	Neatishead	x				No action in next 10 years
61	Gay's Staithe	x				As above
64	Barton Turf	x				As above
68	Paddys Lane	x				Renegotiate lease 2014, mooring only – exit boardwalk
69	Wroxham Broad d/s	x				Renegotiate lease 2014
70	Wroxham Broad u/s	x				As above
71	Coltishall Common	x				No action in next 10 years
1	Ranworth Staithe/Dinghy Dyke	x				Dinghy dyke included in 10 year Action Plan
8	Sutton Staithe 1/2	x				Renegotiate lease 2014
9	Wayford Bridge	x				No action in next 10 years
14	Hoveton St John	x				As above
26	How Hill	x				EA responsibility
41	Belaugh		x			Renegotiate lease 2014
50	Horning Marshes	x				Renegotiate lease subject to EA position
53	Hoveton Viaduct		x		Could reduce length of mooring, as not heavily used; expensive to maintain	Renegotiate lease 2014, repile half only included in Action Plan

				(-) Could put pressure on Wroxham and Hoveton	
54	Woodbastwick		x	Pretty busy but others exist	Renegotiate lease 2016, included in 10 year Action plan
63	Perci's Island		x		Renegotiate lease 2016
3	Dilham		x	End of navigation, good for exploring NW&D Canal, important wild mooring. Could be managed by third party.	Included in 10 year Action Plan
13	Irstead Staithe			Disagreement over site. Only site left at workshop as category 4. However strong arguments made for retention at it is a staithe, so should keep.	No action in next 10 years

**Annualised Re-Piling Costs - All Contractor**

Estimated budget expenditure to cover the cost of employing Contractors for re-piling, with costs based on typical 2013 prices.

Takes into account notes from stakeholder workshop (eg reducing lengths, use of dolphins etc)

Mooring	Length	Life end	lease end	Contractor (all inc.)	Programme Year	Workshop priority	proposed Action Plan	Cumulative cost	Budget: £150,000		
									£ 150,000		
									Annual Budget	Cumulative Budget	Variance 1
<i>Turntide Jetty</i>	102	2015	F/H	£ 265,000	2015	1	repile 2015	£ 265,000	£ 280,000	£ 280,000	£ 15,000
Cockshoot Dyke	149	2015	Oct-14	£ 149,000	2016	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 414,000	£ 150,000	£ 430,000	£ 16,000
Hoveton Viaduct	319	2015	Sep-19	£ 159,500	2017	2	reduce to half	£ 573,500	£ 150,000	£ 580,000	£ 6,500
Burgh Castle	139	2015	holding	£ -	2018	1	at EA cost	£ 573,500	£ 150,000	£ 730,000	£ 156,500
Deep Dyke	193	2018	Oct-14	£ 193,000	2019	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 766,500	£ 150,000	£ 880,000	£ 113,500
Ludham Bridge demasting	20	2019	Licence	£ 10,000	2020	1	replace with dolphins	£ 776,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,030,000	£ 253,500
Ranworth Staithe Dinghy Dyke	50	2019	F/H	£ 20,000	2020	1	timber piling	£ 796,500		£ 1,030,000	£ 233,500
Woodbastwick	93	2019	Jul-16	£ 93,000	2020	2	re-pile trench sheets	£ 889,500		£ 1,030,000	£ 140,500
<i>Ludham Fieldbase basin</i>	80	2020	F/H	£ 40,000	2021	1	re-pile timber sheets	£ 929,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,180,000	£ 250,500
Potter Heigham Dinghy Park	60	2020	F/H	£ 30,000	2021	1	replace with dolphins	£ 959,500		£ 1,180,000	£ 220,500
Deep Go Dyke	112	2022	Oct-14	£ 112,000	2021	2	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,071,500		£ 1,180,000	£ 108,500
Potter Heigham Demasting	15	2022	2085	£ 15,000	2022	1	check EA position	£ 1,086,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,330,000	£ 243,500
Cantley	131	2023	Mar-17	£ -	2022	1	EA cost	£ 1,086,500		£ 1,330,000	£ 243,500
White Slea	25	2022	Oct-14	£ 25,000	2022	2	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,111,500		£ 1,330,000	£ 218,500
Dilham Staithe	50	2023	F/H	£ 50,000	2022	2	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,161,500		£ 1,330,000	£ 168,500
Worlingham Staithe	30	2025	F/H	£ 30,000	2023	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,191,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,480,000	£ 288,500
Boundary Farm (Extension), Oby	150	2025	F/H?	£ 150,000	2023	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,341,500		£ 1,480,000	£ 138,500
Boundary Farm, Oby	150	2025	F/H	£ 150,000	2024	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,491,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,630,000	£ 138,500
Thurne Mouth	118	2025	F/H	£ 118,000	2025	1	re-pile trench sheets	£ 1,609,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,780,000	£ 170,500
Repps bank	145	2025	EA	£ 145,000	2025		check EA position	£ 1,754,500		£ 1,780,000	£ 25,500
Martham	144	2025	EA	£ 144,000	2026		check EA position	£ 1,898,500	£ 150,000	£ 1,930,000	£ 31,500