

COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 20TH JANUARY, 2017

SUBJECT :
BURRY PORT HARBOUR - FUTURE MAINTENANCE

To consider and comment on the following issues:

To support the future maintenance programme and consider the funding proposals for Burry Port Harbour

REASONS:

On the 13th July 2015, Executive Board Members supported the strategic need to maintain the Harbour and subsequently a notional figure of £400k was added to the Capital Programme.

The Head of Leisure subsequently sought assistance from the Environment Department to fully investigate the detail of the dredging work required along with a review of maintenance requirements for the grade II listed harbour walls. Atkins were commissioned to lead on the task, supported by [ADBP](#) dredging, harbour and coastal consultants.

This report provides a summary of identified issues, risks and costs along with a range of future maintenance options. The report considers options from 'do nothing', to a sustainable planned maintenance schedule which allows for a reasonable degree of certainty over ongoing costs. It is important to note that the 'do nothing' option does not apply to the harbour walls and therefore still carries risk and cost.

To be referred to the Executive Board/Council for decision: YES

Executive Board – 6th February, 2017

Executive Board Member Portfolio Holder:

Cllr. M. Gravell (Regeneration & Leisure Portfolio Holder)

Directorate:

Communities

Name of Head of Service:

Ian Jones

Report Author:

Ian Jones

Designation:

Head of Leisure and Sport

Tel Nos. 01267 228309

E Mail Addresses:

IJones@sirgar.gov.uk

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

COMMUNITY SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

DATE: 20TH JANUARY, 2017

SUBJECT:

BURRY PORT HARBOUR – FUTURE MAINTENANCE

1. Background

Managing the harbour is becoming increasingly difficult without a major dredge, with mooring fees having to be frozen, and the window of opportunity for berth holders to access and egress the harbour being reduced each year. This in turn reduces the harbour's appeal to boat owners and is resulting in a loss of potential income, as well as attracting adverse publicity. Approximately 6,000m³-10,000m³ of sand and silt enters the harbour every year, with around 80,000m³ of material (mainly silt) needing to be removed as part of the immediate capital dredge. The Harbour walls are also in a poor condition, meaning that East Dock is no longer used.

The income currently generated by the harbour covers most of its current revenue costs including the annual sand dredge of the approach channel. The Outer Harbour has a capacity for 330 berths, with 137 occupied and over half of the remaining 193 not serviceable due to the siltation problems. A further 104 berths in East Dock are out of commission due to the issues with the Harbour walls. 10 additional vessels are moored in West Dock where there are no pontoons. For every additional 50 boats mooring at an average of £750 pa (£125/m x 6m boat), this generates an extra £37.5K of income pa at current prices.

If the planned regeneration of the harbour area is undertaken, complete with 250+ new harbour side homes and many extra facilities, there is every chance the take-up of pontoon berths and thus income, will increase substantially in a well maintained harbour, making the facility more sustainable. With full occupation of East Dock and the outer Harbour, the facility could generate an additional £223k of income pa for the authority at current charging rates. Charging rates have been kept purposely low over recent years, due to the access / egress issue associated with the limited dredging regime.

2. Costs and funding

Dredging

REVENUE:

The annual sand dredging cost for the harbour channel and basin, undertaken in early Spring, is around £50k. It is recommended that this ongoing mechanical sand dredging budget needs be around £120k pa (dredging twice a year) – anticipated to be £20k less than shown on the attached main report due to tender documentation and project management plans already being in place.

Potential sources of revenue funding to meet these additional costs would include an increase in income of at least £40k, through additional mooring lettings (50 extra), and increased charges, thus leaving a revenue shortfall of around £30k pa. Discussions are also ongoing about the potential sale / use of the sand removed by the mechanical dredging contractor, which may in turn, significantly reduce or remove these costs.

CAPITAL:

The report also recommends a capital (silt) dredge of the inner harbour at a cost of £780k. £400k is included in the capital programme for 16/17, however, approximately £50K is already allocated for this initial feasibility work. This leaves a shortfall of circa £430k for the capital dredge works.

This shortfall would need to be funded from the corporate capital programme, where it should be noted that receipts from MCP land have previously been re-used within the MCP. Previous capital harbour works were funded from the general capital programme.

£190k of S106 receipts are also available locally, with the local member keen to see the money spent on a new playground at BPH, which would generate considerable additional parking income for the Harbour, as has been witnessed with a similar development at North Dock.

Harbour Walls

Costs for the Harbour wall repairs total £2.8m, over a 10 year phased programme, with £860k of capital required in the immediate term (years 1-2), £1.05m in years 3-5 and £0.89m in years 6-10

Officers will be exploring grant opportunities with agencies such as CADW, and another option could be using the internal development loan fund to 'borrow' additional capital.

3. Risks and other options

A full list of risks is included in the detailed report, not least the requirement to apply for a disposal license from NRW for the dredged material. Obtaining the necessary disposal license would mean that the main dredge of BPH would not be likely before the Autumn of 2017. Consents will also be required from CADW, amongst others, for works to the Harbour Walls.

A number of other disposal site options have also been considered and dismissed and are again listed within the detailed report.

The report also considers the 'do nothing option', which still incurs significant cost, not least in relation to the legal requirement to maintain the harbour walls, which remains the same.

The detailed report highlights the requirement for ongoing dredging of the silt material and outlines an option to undertake a process called Water Injected Dredging (WID) – as is successfully used at Swansea Marina. £330k would be required for the WID trial dredge, which could lead to subsequent scheduled, low level WID dredging regime every 2 years to keep on top of the silt dredging at a cost of £80k pa.

An alternative and preferred option to this would be to schedule in a capital silt dredge every 5 years or so at an anticipated cost of around £500k (less material than current, plus tender documents and survey work already in place by then). This could be funded from scheduled capital funding every 5 years, or possibly through increased mooring availability, take up and an increase in charges due to the improved facilities (would need to generate an additional £100k pa over the 5 year period).

Officers from the Leisure and Corporate Property Divisions continue to explore opportunities for partnership working that may assist with the future management of the Harbour.

4. Summary

Issue / Action	Current position	Proposed / Required	Funding solution
Annual Mechanical Sand dredging (Revenue)	£50k pa (dredge access channel once a year)	£120k pa (dredge twice a year)	£40k additional mooring income anticipated (occupation and increased fees). £30k Revenue growth required
Major Silt Dredge (Capital)	Long overdue, causing access / egress problems.	£780k to dredge 80,000m ³ of material	£400k in capital programme (£50k spent) - additional £430k to be identified from capital programme
Ongoing Silt Dredge (Rev / Capital)	No provision at present	£500k of capital every 5 years	£500k to be identified in capital programme every 5 years (2022/23 onwards)
Harbour walls - immediate repairs (Capital)	H&S issue	£860k required for H&S works	£860k to be identified from capital programme / MCP receipts
Harbour Walls - 5 year repair programme (Capital)	No planned programme for listed features	£1.94m to complete	£1.05m to be identified from capital programme / local receipts over years 3-5 (19/20-21/22) and £0.89m for years 6-10

5. Conclusions & Recommendations

The report aims to provide a detailed appraisal of issues at the harbour, offering a number of options around future maintenance. Costs and potential funding solutions are identified, along with associated risks. It is recommended that funding is included in the relevant revenue and capital budgets to sustain the harbour on an ongoing basis.

DETAILED REPORT ATTACHED?

Yes, along with map showing key features of harbour, and regeneration masterplan of harbour.

IMPLICATIONS

I confirm that other than those implications which have been agreed with the appropriate Directors / Heads of Service and are referred to in detail below, there are no other implications associated with this report :

Signed: Ian Jones

Head of Leisure & Sport

Policy, Crime & Disorder and Equalities	Legal	Finance	ICT	Risk Management Issues	Staffing Implications	Physical Assets
YES	YES	YES	NONE	YES	YES	YES

1. Policy

The Harbour is part of the Burry Port regeneration master-plan, and its continued maintenance, operation and viability was recognised as such by the Executive Board on the 13th July 2015, contributing towards key corporate objectives around, economic development, physical regeneration, leisure, health, and tourism.

2. Legal

Potential issues with CADW if the authority fails to maintain the Grade II listed Harbour Walls. Any work within the Harbour must also comply with the [Harbour Revision Order, 2000](#), and be undertaken with cognisance to environmental policies relating to its status as a [SAC](#) and [SSSI](#) site. The Harbour also forms part of the Millennium commission funded Millennium Coastal Park.

A number of licenses and consents are required as part of any agreed maintenance works.

3. Finance

Additional resources will need to be identified within the revenue and capital programme in order to maintain the harbour on a sustainable basis. Grants, development loan funding and potential capital receipts could all contribute as possible sources of funding to address these additional pressures. Capital funding required in the current 5 year programme (2017/18 – 2021/22) is £2.34m with £1.39m required post 2021/22.

Additional Funding Required

Revenue

£70k per annum (£40k Additional Income and £30k growth bid)

Capital

£430k for Major Silt (2017/18)

£500k Ongoing Silt Dredge (2022/23) – Year 6 (Outside current capital Programme)

£860k High Priority Harbour Wall Works (2017/18-2018/19)

£1.05m Medium Priority Harbour Wall Works (2019/20-2021/22)

£0.89m Low Priority Harbour Wall Works (Year 6-10) (Outside current Capital Programme)

4. Risk Management

Potential claims against the authority for mooring holders' vessels that may be damaged due to grounding within the Harbour resulting from a lack of dredging maintenance.

Potential action instigated by CADW if we do not maintain the Harbour Walls.

5. Staffing Implications

Potential redundancy / redeployment issues for 1.5 FTE if the Harbour were to revert to its original status as a tidal Harbour with no pontoon moorings.

6. Physical Assets

The Harbour is owned and managed by CCC. [Elements of it have listed status](#). The Harbour office (portakabin) is in a poor condition – the intention being for the office to be re-located to the existing [RNLI building](#) as part of a land swap deal allowing the RNLI to build a new station within the vicinity.

A recent meeting between leisure, property and planning officers concluded that a boatyard for the harbour could be housed to the North of the harbour at the proposed work / live site (site 7 on regen masterplan), which may in turn free up MCP land for future development / receipts.

CONSULTATIONS

I confirm that the appropriate consultations have taken in place and the outcomes are as detailed below

Signed: Ian Jones

Head of Leisure & Sport

1. Scrutiny Committee

A Community Scrutiny site visit took place on the 30th October 2014 to better understand the issues facing the Harbour.

Concerns over the siltation of the Harbour were also raised during the [Annual Countryside Unit update report 2nd April 2015](#) (Item 7), with a recommendation to bring a report back on the maintenance, dredging and future of the Harbour to a future Community Scrutiny Committee.

2. Local Member(s)

Cllr. J. D. James, Cllr. P. E. M. Jones and Cllr H Shepardson are fully aware of the issues at the Harbour.

3. Community / Town Council

As above. Pembrey & Burry Port Town Council wrote to the CEO of CCC on the 15th May 2015, highlighting concerns and requesting a meeting. The Head of Service subsequently met them on the 15th July.

4. Relevant Partners

Previous technical advice for dredging work at the harbour has been provided by specialists [Shoreline Management Wales](#), who also advise the authority's Environmental Services Department on Coastal erosion and management issues.

5. Staff Side Representatives and other Organisations

N/A at this stage.

Section 100D Local Government Act, 1972 – Access to Information

List of Background Papers used in the preparation of this report:

Title of Document	File Ref No.	Locations that the papers are available for public inspection
Burry Port Harbour		Regeneration & Leisure Scrutiny committee 17th October 2007
Burry Port Harbour	Item 10.1	Executive Board 3rd March 2008
Burry Port Harbour	Item 6	Executive Board 17th March 2008
BPH – Future Maintenance	Item 11	Executive Board 13th July 2015