

Machine assisted transcript of the Zoom meeting between the CHM and representatives of the ECSC Pontoon Development Sub-committee at 1400 on Thursday 12th November 2020

Present:

Stuart McIntosh CHM and CEO CHC (CHM)

Ed Walker Deputy CHM (DCHM)

Paul Walker (PW)

David Tebay (DT)

David Nixon (DN)

Apologies

Tony Cole

CHM

David, thank you for the latest feedback. Hopefully, you have had time to consider our latest drawings.

We picked up your comments, but we thought it would be a good idea to have this meeting, just to have a fairly frank discussion on where we are, and, how, potentially we move forward.

Also, whether you think that there is a reasonable chance of getting, real progress on this project.

We've been working on this project with East Cowes Sailing Club as a partnership project for quite a long time.

Going back to the start, the initiative was from East Cowes Sailing Club. CHC and I have always made it abundantly clear that, we're very supportive the proposals and ideas, because we do think it will add value to, all our stakeholders, our customers, etc. And hopefully it does to your members.

But at no point, do the CHC want to be seen to be really over pushing this project.

If it's not really fully supported by a majority in East Cowes Sailing Club

We've dealt with a number of committees and individuals very happy with that, etc.

But, at the moment, we just want to make sure that we're not going around the same mark time and time again, if you'll excuse the sailing or racing pun, and that we've all got a chance of getting successfully to the finishing line.

In your last email us, you indicated you'd like us to, to cost up it or not, a number of proposals again, and a reverted to one of the proposals that previously we thought you discounted, moving the pontoon further to the north. There's Ed's and my time. That's, that's not so important in some ways. But we're also incurring consultants charge time.

Every time we go back to [the consultant] or if we go back to the MMO, etc, their clock is ticking. So hopefully you didn't mind me being fairly frank and forthright?

DN

Absolutely not, my one objective in the total exercise has been to put a proposal before the membership.

I think the proposal that we have now, is pretty close. And there's no fundamental objection to the walkway to the northeast corner of the clubhouse. And there's no fundamental objection, I don't believe, to the transverse pontoon but you have a fundamental objection to the transverse pontoon.

CHM

I don't think we have a fundamental objection to the linking pontoon in the intertidal mud, the north south.

DN

Good.

CHM

That's good because it's not the fundamental one is the just the advice that it will be a lot more palatable to the end. And the potential risk of effectively having to do a full environmental impact assessment, including the potential of refusing the application.

DN

Yes, I would agree that it's considerably more complicated to go ahead with this transverse pontoon. So, Paul, do you want to comment on the other bits of the layout that you thought might be put forward?

PW

Well ... I've been speaking to members ... [about] taking the pontoon across and not having the bridge. That seems to be the one that if we went to the members could go through. The one ... on up to the clubhouse with the bridge is the one we will get objections to was that members which will drag it out more.

And the other thing I was going to say was our piles are right on our boundary ... I'd like to keep the piles on our boundary.

It was the pontoons the questions I have on it would be could the pontoons have their piles up in the middle? Would that be valuable? Or would it have to be on the outside? Or would there be on the side of the pontoons you know just stacked inside pontoons questions I would have okay,

CHM

On the piles position etc, that will depend on the width of the pontoon that is used. If you went for a 1.8 or two metre pontoon yes you could have them in the centre. However, that does act predominantly as an access point to having your pontoon having your piles in the centre, especially on a drying pontoon where effectively the pontoon is not sitting on it on a level floating. So, you could have it sit down at a bit of an angle. From a safety point of view. For an access pontoon you're better having the piles on one side.

And as I say, at the moment you have indicated that you are not intending to have north south drying berths off the access pontoon. Are you hoping to have west east alongside moorings?

Because if you are then you are going to be far better to have the piles on the north side with the pontoon on the south side, you've got the better access.

PW

That was the next question. So, we would be looking at mooring boats east west. Both sides hopefully.

... what I will say [for the] piles that go down on Main boundary, if the piles just sat inside the pontoon, is that feasible?

DCHM

It's an additional cost but yes, you can do it.

PW

The reason I'm asking for that because my experience with the pontoons in the past we've got there we tend to lose quite valuable space with a pile when putting the boat alongside. But yes, sitting on the outside.

DCHM

Technically you only lose the diameter of the pile.

PW

Yes, but then the boats will be set back and then the ropes and the fore and aft. And I'm just thinking about the type of members we've got and the way they tie-up sometimes

DCHM

You could offset piles pretty much wherever you want in the design stage.

PW

... just set inside so as a straight levelled edge down the side of the pontoon would be far better.

But the other question I've asked that if the pontoons were put down on the north side of the piles, ... were sitting on GKN land if there was an issue, that they sold their premises and that bit of mud that they own, and they want it all back. The pontoons could have been reversed or put the other side. This was the reason I was thinking down that route. If that makes sense,

DCHM

In which case you'd be better off having external pilot guides so you could just move them.

PW

Yes, okay, that's, this is just I'm just looking at things that were people have been [asking] ... I can go back to them with these answers.

DCHM

Yes, you order standard pontoons with no insets for piles. You can customise them in whichever way you want by bolting stuff on the outside. Hence, why we use a lot of pile guides because you just reverse them if you want to remove the pontoon if you inset something and it's not on the centre you end up with something you wouldn't be able to do anything else with.

PW

Okay, that answers that question?

CHM

Customising pontoons is quite expensive. Right?

PW

Okay, so we're got to keep it as basic as possible.

Yes, that was the only thing really the drawings I think David sent you ... we could just come straight across and straight out. I think that is the one if we went to the members, listening to them is where we may get the go ahead ...

DCHM

The advice we've been given is, the more you can minimise the footprint, the easier the application is. So, our thought processes will go to the easiest and work backwards.

PW

We've always had pontoons all along those piles. I know, we haven't gotten them there at the minute, because we've taken them underneath the clubhouse, because it needed repairing and everything. So, you know, minimising I'm thinking, you know, we've always had them there. Is that an issue? Doesn't that count?

DCHM

So, the join that is the additional footprint, right? Which is why we've tried to alleviate that bit. You're right, you've got pontoons already in place, and that will be taken into consideration. It's the north south join that is or will be considered as the new part and therefore it was what could we do to remove that bit?

CHM

Just up just out of interest Paul, and it's not really our business but what are the concerns from your members about the bridge at the north end?

PW

Well, one of the I one raised because I actually built the club house that was me was involved [there were] problems with counterbalance ... we [commissioned] engineer instructional drawings ... through planning it was very difficult to get what we got. And we were told we couldn't add on or enhance now we're adding on to it. I know we can brace down from the wall but we actually had to [drill]. A pilot hole to see what we had below. Now the end the clubhouse is built on a raft [to spread] and bury load. And so a counterbalance as well for the balcony. Now if we add to that, I'm just wondering, we're goanna cause more problems with weight. And that's one of the issues. But the main objection I'm getting from the members is people walking up and down the side of the club house. Personally, I don't think that's an issue but it's one of the things [we] they have to tackle with the members. Plus we'll lose some berths having the ramp go quite way out

CHM

Okay, I think what we wanted to do We're still really having this meeting first, because I think we had a few. Maybe we read too much into it. But in in David's email when I think you indicated you had still a fairly significant element within your club. That was, Yes, Yes. against the proposals. Full stop. Most was making sure that Yes, we were all going to spend a lot more time and expenditure without a reasonable chance to get to the finishing line.

PW

Right. Yes, this is where I didn't know, there is there is still obviously we're always going to have a hard core who've got objections. And they will try and stop us. But I do think the majority of them that we've spoken to now have come round. But it's more, I think what we need to do is get a drawing much we both accept and is feasible. And happy to do that. We go back to them and say, Look, this is what we'd like to do. And like I said, at the Pontoon in my I seem to be the one prefer would have to go to the MMO to get the worms and everything else. Admittedly, I that's another bit to it. But I do feel that would be the one we would get majority in the club to say yes, but I'd like to see what the cost is everything and would actually go for

CHM

Good. Can I just speak across to Ed a second, just to see whether you've heard from Paul Tosswell, has he reviewed the link pontoon as far as mitigation is concerned? ... Okay. Yes, I think if you're all saying that you think that there is reasonable intent and reasonable chance of sort of moving forward positively. Yes. And being received positively, then I think I'll Yes, what I can do is get our consultant, project consultant to do a bit more of an assessment on the potential impacts and potential mitigation or compensation that might be necessary to put a reasonable case to the MMO. He's seen it. Yes. And he's commented, informally to Ed an I on the on the telephone and said, Well, Yes, can you look at other alternatives, hence the bridge. But Yes, if you, if you strongly feel that you don't think that you're either This is the proposal that your committee is happy to put forward, then, you know, we can we can go spend a bit more money to, to see what the consultant says.

DT

Let's just say one thing that that hasn't been mentioned. I'm not opposed to the bridge; I think a bridge would be absolutely fine. But one of the problems that wasn't mentioned is obviously with the additional height of the existing ramp, it means it's going to be a much, much longer run than we've got at the moment.

CHM

Yes, I mean, we (Ed and I) had a look at it, we have sort of drawn it out, etc. We, as Paul mentioned, we did go up under there and look at the structure and go from a sailor's point of view. Yes, we thought that they were putting a strong post in the corner down to the concrete capping beam, and then a 45-degree angle up. And then just you using a fairly lightweight bridge, we thought that that was potentially feasible.

DT

Don't see that as a problem. But if you've got an extra five foot of height is five foot higher than the existing one. So obviously, you're going to have to have a much longer run a longer run down to the pontoon before you actually get on the pontoon otherwise, it'd be excessively steep.

CHM

The longer pontoon from mitigation is actually a slight advantage.

DCHM

A lot longer gangway means less pontoon, which means less footprint.

DT

Okay, Yes.

PW

Yes. That was that that base plate is actually 1.5 above the EOD. And I think under the planning, we have to be 1.3. If that makes sense. Okay.

DN

I don't think the bridge to the club will find favour with the majority as the transverse pontoon would.

CHM

Okay. Right.

DCHM

I will refresh the drawing. Because the other option for the perpendicular pontoon is to arrange between your existing pontoon and then the north south bit and just take another bit of footprint out. So we still end up with a pontoon. But instead of it all being you just might end up with a, another gangway if it becomes clear that footprint is too much. So we've got a mitigation we can potentially use.

PW

I did think that myself, that was one of the next questions I was going to ask, could, you know, a couple of floats with like the bridge, like, you know, put across would be a way around it. So we're not going to have so many floats sitting on the seabed?

DCHM

Okay, well, I'll refresh the drawing and put that across, we will get hold of Paul [T], and send that to him as well and get him to officially comment on it. And then hopefully, we can push this on a bit a bit further. And if you want to take the revised drawing to the members, and see where they lie, and we can get all the parties sort of on the same page?

PW

What I would thank them. So if you're happy for doing that. So again, back like with the pontoon straight across? Would it be best for me to wait, give us a drawing of it, and where you would be and then don't try and get them members together?

CHM

I would personally suggest that we add changes or updates to the drawing. We send that to Paul T, our consultant, and get him to provide us with formal commentary to it. We then maybe have

another meeting with you, prior to you taking it to your members with I don't think we should potentially take something to your members. If Paul T comes back and says, this is probably not going to fly.

PW

That was my feeling ... Yes, we need to be positive and go back to the members this time.

DN

We have several stages to this. We have to get the approval of the subcommittee, then the approval of the general committee, and then we go out to membership. Now, I would be unwilling, a bit strong, but I would prefer to have some idea of cost before I went to the membership.

CHM

Well, as I say we cannot, you know, once Ed's done the drawing, we sent it through to Paul, we'll have a chat with Paul on how quickly he can turn it round. And, you know, in the interim, we can potentially start looking at costs. Okay.

DCHM

I could go with that. We've got a fair idea of costs already. So that that won't be too difficult. And I can do the drawing this evening and send it to Paul so we can move on fairly sharpish.

DN

Okay, any comments from the rest of us, David and Paul?

DT

You first Paul

PW

Me, um, no, not really. It's that, you know, we go with that drawing, I think that will move members a lot nearer a lot faster with the club. And obviously, costings are going to be one thing we need to work out. Have a rough idea of what it's going to cost and where we're all meeting together on this.

CHM

So you indicated that you're you will use it for moorings, that's on north and south side of the pontoon.

PW

Definitely the south side, the north side. I can't see why we can't but I know the membership and the Stores are at the moment is sort of adamant against that. Like all things until we get it into place. It's more goes back to the issue of safety. If you had earlier on in the conference, with the channel down backed up by the Chainferry is one of the issues they still worried about that with boats moored on that North Side.

DT

I think that's been dealt-with with a space at the end.

PW

it was just one of those things that, you know, David T that they will [mention]

DT

We've got in this extra space in providing this extra space at the end. And there's a safety pontoon then I don't need anyone will have a problem

PW

That will work. Yes.

DN

Okay, we're getting a bit ahead of ourselves. I think we've agreed a layout. Ed have you got in your mind what you're going to draw?

DCHM

Yes.

DN

That's fine. Sorry [Paul] ...

PW

The Hammerhead, obviously is going to move to the south. Um, but what 24.5 metre Hammerhead? How much it was, we're going to move to the south the drawings I got here doesn't really show.

DCHM

Sorry, was that how far to the south?

PW

Yes. 10 metres to the south? Or?

DCHM

Yes, it's roughly about a pontoon's length.

CHM

Just under that I think 10 metres.

PW

10 metres yes.

Just like a juggler. You know, the [existing] boats we've got there ... That will be our argument ... But if I know what I've got, I can come up [say] well, that won't matter. This boat goes here, that boat can go there. And it will ease the way if we've got answers for them.

DCHM

I make those gaps as equal as I could, because that would seem to be what you were you were wanting we can make that those gaps. Any ratio we work. Right. Okay. I went for pretty much equal. So it was it was in line with what we had from you.

PW

So I'm happy with whatever that is just, I just wanted to run some answers there. When I get tackled, I know what happens. You obviously get all the time people procure, and then if you can't give a definite answer.

DCHM

Those gaps in that position can be pretty much whatever you want.,

PW

That's good then so that's my answer. We can know we can solve that to whatever, that's good.

DT

Okay, I'm quite happy with everything.

DN

So am I. Stuart, concluding remarks?

CHM

So we'll, we'll progress with that. And we'll send you the drawing as soon as possible, hopefully within the next 24 hours or so.

PW

Sounds good

DN

Thank you, Stuart. Thank you, Ed., And thanks to our guys too. So, I'll shut off now. Thank you. Bye bye.