

**There were several drafts of the Gifford report which was paid for by CCC and these extracts are taken from the first draft which was not made available to the whole Board of the Pier Trust – the later drafts which they acted on watered down this more decisive initial opinion.**

Gifford Report draft 1 Page 75

It can be seen from the distances involved that the development is very much detached from Herne Bay itself and whilst providing a point of interest, the attraction and long-term success of the activity centres must be questioned. Access for visitors and users will be arduous and upon arrival at a marina berth there may be a sense of remoteness. Furthermore, it is suggested that the pier or causeway link will need to

18404 - Herne Bay Marina Feasibility Study

76

be of reasonable construction to allow access for personnel transport and service vehicles. This option does have a potential advantage in that the pier or causeway link could be designed to mitigate any potential impact on the coastal process however, it is judged that this attribute does not outweigh its disadvantages and alternative options must be considered.

This Option 2 is considered to address the concerns raised with Option 1 and create a development that is more integrated with Herne Bay. The arrangement of activity centres also have the potential to add interest along the entire length of the pier development and 'draw' users towards the outer reaches. It also allows the activity centres to be located in an optimum position that best suits their needs. For example, the water sports centre can be relatively sheltered whilst having access to deeper water.

A further iteration of this option is presented in figure 6.2 that seeks to position the various activity centres in an optimum position.

This option is considered to have clear advantages and design development may give rise to indirect benefits such as coastal protection, particularly from the North and North East as justified by the construction of Neptune's Arm.

There are perhaps three primary disadvantages of the concept firstly, the potential impact on the coastal process, secondly the extensive construction works and thirdly, the potentially high capital cost. Initial capital cost estimates confirm figures in excess of any previous expectation however, the concept is worthy of further consideration under this study such that conclusions can be drawn with respect to the marina element.

Subsequent work will confirm the contribution and viability of other activity centres.

This conclusion is also drawn in light of the market assessment and potential shortcomings of Option 1. In all cases, it is the market that will limit the size of the marina rather than physical barriers and the viability of a marina set some 1,100m offshore is doubtful. Similar questions are raised over the other activity centres that will make up the full development and Section 4.5 indicates that a conservative position should be adopted in respect of the wind farm opportunities until further investigations confirm otherwise. Therefore as a whole, potential viability and success favours Option 2 over Option 1.