Gmail by Google

Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Fwd: FW: Proposed Slipway Shoreham 0261/15

1 message

Peter Barnett <peter.barnett@adur-worthing.gov.uk> 22 January 2016 at 09:56
To: Planning - <planning@adur-worthing.gov.uk>

Please can this be indexed as a representation

Thanks

Peter Barnett | Principal Planning Officer | Adur & Worthing Councils
01903 221310 | http://www.adur-worthing.gov.uk

-------- Forwarded message --------
[redacted]
Date: 21 January 2016 at 10:52
Subject: FW: Proposed Slipway Shoreham
To: "james.appleton@adur-worthing.gov.uk" <james.appleton@adur-worthing.gov.uk>, "keith.dollemore@adur.gov.uk" <keith.dollemore@adur.gov.uk>, Peter Barnett <peter.barnett@adur-worthing.gov.uk>
[redacted]

Hello All

Further to the discussions on the proposed slipway at the Adur Recreation Ground which all neighbouring and only water operating organisations are 100% against, I thought it prudent to let you have sight of comments from an environment expert we have spoken to as he has examined the Slipways Report as provided by CHM2Hill for WSCC.

Here are the comments:

Section 6.3 of the CHM2hill report is very poorly written and misleading.

This part is a reasonable statement but needs further explanation to put into context:

Extracts from the report in *italics*

Shoreham Port Authority provided a report Survey of Shoreham Port & River Adur: To Measure Flow Rates at Sites Suitable for PowerTube (Saunders Energy Ltd, 2013). This provided measured flow speeds at points close to the three proposed slipway locations. The mid-tide flow (considered

to correspond to the maximum flow speeds) was measured at 2.6kn (1.3m/s) under the A259 bridge, 1.1kn (0.6m/s) under the pedestrian bridge and 1.8kn (0.9m/s) near slipway location C1, but these flow speeds would correspond to the part of the channel where the flow speeds would be at their maximum.

Just to be clear "Flow" is volumetric discharge, often measured cubic metres per second (m3/s) not a rate of speed. This is important to understand in a project such as this with differing use requirements and consequences.

The rest is very misleading:

CH2M Hill interrogated the results from an existing 1D-2D numerical ISIS-TUFLOW model which was developed by Halcrow (now CH2M Hill) for the planning of the Lower Adur Strategy. The output for a 1 in 5yr tidal event.

Firstly this model was built to indicate flood extends for tidal flooding, not a typical tidal cycle. Which is a very important aspect for this purpose as quite different!

Secondly the "*2D cell averaged velocities*" is the average speed over the model run. This model will have been run for at least 1 tidal cycle possibly more. It would have included both the flood tide and the ebb tide (possibly negative velocities) to come up create the 2D cell average velocity. These are not maximum rates. That is why the velocities are so low.

So if you are trying to gauge the effect on craft etc, this is not suitable.

What is required is a chart showing velocities throughout the tidal cycle.
If this is their preferred option it would be prudent of them to get this data.
All of the hydraulic models have been built for flood risk purposes only.
The best data would come from a gauging of the river using a boat mounted ADCP.

Alternatively a bed mounted Doppler placed near the foot of an existing slipway for a day or two would provide more accurate information for initial views.

So if you look at what he is saying, the report is fundementaly flawed as it was based on calculations for flooding not tide cycles . Also the the 2D cell averaged velocities are not the flow rates that would be experienced during a normal boating session on the river which is what this is all about.

The average figures featured will include still water periods such as High Water Slack and depending on the spread and siting of measurent devices, could even be physically out of the water at Mean Low Water Springs.

The conclusion is that using the provided existing reports would be wrong for making accurate assumptions. Therefore ADC / WSCC should engage a independant survey of flows pertinent to actual location and need. To not do so would not be in public interest or safety.

I would appreciate your views on these expert SME comments in relation to the slipway and boating activities.

Thank you

Tom Smith

[redacted]

Adur Valley Scout District Water Advisor
West Sussex Scouts RYA Sea School Chief Instructor

West Sussex Scout County Assessor