

MHIC Long Term Strategy Consultation Stage 1 Responses

The numbers used are to identify the comments made by each respondent. In some areas comments were not made or priorities were not given. It is not intended that this list of respondents is attached when it is distributed more widely.

Area	Examples (only) of thing which might be considered here DO ADD YOUR OWN IDEAS	Your comments	Your priority list (1 highest priority)
Promotion of the Port	<i>Should use of the Port by Uk and overseas visitors be encouraged and developed?</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, tourism is the key to Maldon's future and everything should be done to encourage growth in tourism. The River Blackwater was the key to Maldon's past and must play a significant role in its future. 2. Yes, to support the growth of tourism in Maldon which the Council is working hard to do. 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. Yes. The council do a good leaflet but info should also be in the pilot books 6. Yes, Pump out facilities , Laundry and shower facilities. Electric/water/gas metered hook-ups, Information boards showing shops/entertainment, town centre, tourist attraction, bus routes. 7. Yes but this is not MHIC position as they are not responsible for any facilities. MDC should do it. 8. This is an important area that should be developed. There needs to be a simple contact system for visiting vessel owners to ask about berthing; radio/phone/email. Facilities need to be improved; water, electricity, toilet etc. Vessels should be visited by an official to take dues and to give out informational and promotional literature. 9. Yes. We give this a low priority because other things need to be in place before the port is sufficiently attractive; for example adequate berths, depth of water at the berths and facilities. Otherwise it is an important item. 10. Yes Please 11. The port as a major feature of the Maldon tourism industry, a focal point for the town's heritage and link to the wider world through both the industry and history of the town's association with the Blackwater 	<p>1</p> <p>2</p> <p>2</p> <p>5</p>

<p>Encouraging marine industry</p>	<p><i>How do we encourage further marine based industry? e.g. Sailmaking.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. We must accept that any growth in this sector will be connected to leisure and or very small scale cottage industries. Reductions in business rates for start-up businesses is essential to encourage individuals to start in Maldon. 2. Financial incentives to encourage and help them may be helpful, plus the availability of suitable waterside premises. 3. Support existing businesses 4. Provide affordable work space 5. Need to develop “seed bed” industrial units along with creating more berthing facilities such as a marina 6. By proposing that port uses are protected by District Council Policies to enable residential developments to be refused. We need businesses and jobs, Encouraging schools/colleges to provide vocational training in sea-faring and maritime trades/skills and ancillary infrastructure and associated businesses. 8. River frontage should be designated for riparian usage. On the south bank of the river there are sites at risk of ‘slipping’ into residential use. This should be prevented. On the north bank the quayside areas should be maintained for berthing and shipyard use. Maybe historic vessels should be allowed free/ subsidised moorings here. Industries, such as sailmaking, will come to the town if there is a demand. 9. Grants/low rates/ establish a shore-side charity or Community Interest Company to attract low rates/rents and hire plots to businesses/apply for EU money. This is a higher priority as it will assist growth and facilities. Such facilities require a site as a focal point. 10. Don’t give planning permission for more houses by the river. 11. The town is best known for the salt, oysters and the battle of Maldon – all factors that tie it to the sea. 	<p>4</p> <p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p>
---	---	--	-------------------------------------

<p>Maintenance Dredging</p>	<p><i>Where are our priority areas for maintenance ?</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. If Maldon's port is to encourage visitors it should be accessible and easily navigated by consistent dredging of the channel. There must also be areas for visitors to moor boats with easy links into the town. 2. The Hythe Quay repairs. Getting rid of dangerous underwater obstructions (such as the wrecks port side as you go upstream just under Fulbridge). Cleaning the public hard at the prom to stop it being slippery and the Old Town Hard, which is messy. 3. From Viking Saga pontoon to Queens Head 4. Sand bar at end of heybridge creek channel 5. Shore side approach to the Hythe quay and the visitors pontoon in urgent need of maintenance/dredging to make it accessible 6. The entire channel up to Fullbridge. Removal of the built up silt near the Hythe quay and dumping at Northey to mitigate the erosion there. Maintaining depth of deep water channel 7. No comment. 8. Channel , boat yards, quay, public hards. 9. Removing the levees outside the central gravel bed to give a wider river. Hythe Quay and visitors berths need regular planned dredging or mud washing. In the past Council staff have done this, now it hardly ever happens and expensive contractors are used. Regular maintenance avoids build up and keeps overall costs down. 10. No complaints. 11. Maintaining access to the Hythe quay 	<p>2</p> <p>5</p> <p>7</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>7</p> <p>1</p>
------------------------------------	--	---	--

<p>Finance</p>	<p><i>Ideas for raising revenue to improve the river and waterside.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Selling off areas of the dock for housing may generate funds for other areas. 2. Not sure, sorry. 3. Charge Riverside Businesses 4. Licence fee to yachts 5. Make a greater proportion of the town's waterside business rates available to spend on promotion and improvements of the riverside. What are mooring fees spent on at the moment? 6. Charge a fixed fee for EVERY craft based at Maldon, not just the commercial vessels. A nominal fee of £10 or £20 per annum, collected by the boatyard owners with the mooring fees, would raise a considerable sum. Alternatively, but more complex, charge EVERY vessel so much [per foot of hull length. We understand recreational vessels do not pay towards it, but would benefit from the channel dredging. If the charge for "all vessels" is in place, then the entry/exit charge for commercial vessels should cease. More events, eg. Charity, commercial, semi-permanent stalls, Music events, Band stand, corporate events which use both barges and quayside in partnership. 7. Read your remit MHIC. The only revenue is from harbour dues. 8. People visit Maldon because of the attraction of the waterside. Council revenue from car parking and leases of foreshore should go towards improvements as should dues from visiting craft. Maldon should have a big Sea Festival, nine days or a fortnight and incorporate as many as possible of its attractions; mudrace, carnival, steam fair, barge race regatta, concert, shanty singers, stalls and activities, fireworks etc. As a trust MHIC could look into grant funding to buy sites which are vulnerable to being lost. 9. Form a partnership, constituted as a CIC, agree constitution, raise funds from Govt. development funds from EU, heritage funds, seek classification as a heritage site from people like NHS UK. MHIC/MDC/local stakeholders to facilitate with support in kind and seed corn money. Given MHIC has limited finance, to achieve their ideas they need to develop partnerships. 10. The EC are looking for projects to spend money on. 11. EU/HLF funding for community and heritage projects to emphasis the town's link to the river and the river's significance as an important wildlife area. 	<p>8</p> <p>1</p> <p>8</p>
-----------------------	---	--	----------------------------

<p>Environmental protection</p>	<p><i>Facilities that protect the environment; e.g. to pump out sewage waste, how to encourage rubbish collection FROM the riverside.</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. I am not sure how this works currently but simple education for locals and visitors must surely be the first step. 2. Sewage pumping should be linked to new berths and pontoons. Litter picking days on the river's edge to encourage public awareness and a shared sense of responsibility/duty/effort. Chelmer Canal Trust and Essex Waterways Ltd are good at harnessing volunteers to such regular working parties. Surfers Against Sewage are worth a look (OK we don't have surf but we could look at their volunteer models!) 3. 4. Pump out facility, Oil waste reception 5. No point in having pump out facilities unless more yachts are encouraged to use Maldon and this could be linked in with a marina facility. 6. Provision of a pump out facilities. Recycle bins Chemical toilet waste disposal This could be placed nearer to Fullbridge if not convenient to the quayside 7. MDC 8. Maldon should provide facilities for emptying grey/black water tanks. Walks on the sea walls should be arranged for collecting rubbish. 9. If there is a need there will be either a statutory or market-led supply. Thus a low priority at this stage. 10. Repair the sewer that is leaking onto the Town Hard 11. Maintain biosecurity in the harbour Dredgings screened before disposal Sea wall at landfill site checked and secured 	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>9</p> <p>1</p> <p>9</p> <p>10</p>
--	---	---	--

Environmental enhancement	<i>Can more beneficial use of dredged material be made to help manage saltmarshes and muddy habitats?</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are many projects throughout England where dredging companies are working with Wildlife Trusts and the EA re-establish saltmarshes which in turn will encourage more wildlife. Greater coordination of all agencies is required which must be a role for the local authority 2. Not sure, sorry 3. Yes 4. Yes 5. There is plenty of space to dump dredged waste in the saltings opposite the town Quay ,provided that the dredgings are not contaminated 6. Deep water channel to be dredged regularly to maintain same depth of channel . Dumping the silt at Northey would help to mitigate erosion of that site. 7. All dredging by Landbreach has been for beneficial use for nearly 30 years. 8. The present system of dumping the mud where the saltings have eroded must be beneficial for the river. 9. This happens now and presumably will continue. The Nature lobby appear to value it. There may be something in a long-term blanket approval for MDC/MHIC/Yards in the port from MMO? Unsure how the issue of small scale dredging will finish with MMO and an effort may be needed to ensure it remains cost-effective. The group is grateful to MHIC for effective lobbying with MMO in the past. 10. Landbreach does a super job 11. Yes- sediment recharge of screened dredgings to be used in restoration/realignment projects in Blackwater 	<p>2</p> <p>5</p> <p>1</p> <p>12</p> <p>7</p>
Launching facilities	<i>Should more be made of the launching facilities that exist e.g. Using the old Town Hard. The prom launching ramp.</i>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. There are several boat clubs in Maldon more should be made of these facilities freeing up much need finance to facilitate other areas. 2. Yes, for us Stand Up Paddle Boarders these are essential. The old Town Hard is so clogged and cluttered it is not useful. 3. No Opinion 4. Not useful nor required 5. Town Hard could be cleaned up and a new concrete apron built to meet up with Noddy's slipway (with his permission of course). This would allow clean access for up to 1.5 hours each side of HW. However there is the problem of parking if this area is developed. The prom launch ramp should be dredged as required and possibly extended to the deeper water 6. Yes, More mooring/launch facilities for public to use closer to Quayside 7. MDC 8. The public hards should be clean and usable and promoted; people are not aware of them or the fact that they are there for public usage. 9. Only if they can be managed. The Town Hard is not useable at present and to make it so would enable jetskis to launch, which would be counter-productive. Recent plans for MDC staff to police ramps are excellent. 10. Where would you park? 11. Yes - definately 	<p>5</p> <p>10</p> <p>3</p> <p>6</p> <p>5</p>

Facilities ashore for yachts people	<i>Should toilets and showers be provided on the quay to encourage more visitors afloat ?</i>	1. Berthing and other facilities must be linked all under the same umbrella. If it is to be done it should be done correctly and done well probably with private enterprise and the co-operation of the Council's planning department.	3
		2. Definitely.	
		3. Hopefully people come to Maldon for more important reasons than for toilets and showers	3
		4. Need to provide berthing to attract visitors otherwise facility would be under used	6
		5. Yes it is a shame that the council closed them down. However we have to attract more visiting yachts to make this worthwhile.	
		6. Yes we had some at the Hythe, they fell into disrepair and visiting yachtsmen stopped using them. Key to be left at either or both pubs in vicinity for late night moorers.	2
		7. Yes and for existing vessels. More important where does all the sewage from Hythe Quay go now? MDC	
		8. Facilities could be provided on the quay at the River Bailiff's shed. This building should be manned at weekends and holidays for a period of time, say 2 hours before and after daytime high waters, by the River bailiff, Harbour Master or volunteers to deal with visiting yachtsmen and members of the public. It could include a small amount of tourist information of items relating to the river.	5
		9. Clearly important. MDC seems to have turned its back on a presence on the quay as costs outweigh benefits for them.	3
		10. Yes please	

<p>Moorings</p>	<p><i>Should more or less moorings be encouraged in the in the river? Should there be better/more secure dinghy stowage?</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Yes, but this must be controlled and consistently monitored and not the haphazard system that appears to be operating currently. Mooring must also be co-ordinated with the land owners adjacent to ensure access is available. 2. The more the merrier, doesn't really affect us. Yes, we would think dinghy storage would be useful but again, doesn't really affect us. 3. No Opinion. More moorings are dependent on siltation 4. Less moorings 5. The river is so silted up that even the MLSC has had to abandon its moorings. There is also a problem of dinghy storage and clean access on the beach foreshore which has become covered in mud. 6. More permanent moorings would mean greater siltation. However, Dinghy storage areas could be facilitated by putting gates across the channel from Brythnoths statue to Maldon Sailing Club where the channel can be flooded, but gates could be opened at low tide to alleviate any flooding caused by storm surge or spring tides. Thus allowing dinghy practice sailing in the lagoon so formed. 8. More moorings equals more income, therefore it is a good idea, provided they don't impede river usage. If the public hard was dredged and made fit for use, then it would be useful to have dinghy storage nearby. This would enable mooring owners to access their moorings more readily. 9. Moorings are about right but unused ones should be removed after a period of grace. Dinghy stowage is either private or non-existent. If large vessels are to continue to sail into and out of the port moorings need to be carefully placed with consultation and allow room for manoeuvre and tacking of sailing vessels. 10Yes 11. Yes- so long as biosecurity measures are in place to prevent invasives from being brought into/out of the river 	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>4</p> <p>3</p> <p>10</p>
------------------------	--	--	---

<p>Berthing</p>	<p><i>Should the visitors pontoon be improved and extended?</i></p>	<p>2. Yes.</p> <p>3. Only once you can maintain dredging on site</p> <p>4. Yes</p> <p>5. Yes certainly maintained by dredging and possibly extended towards the Queen's Head foreshore which seems to be used for boat storage at the moment. A depth Gauge would also be useful so visiting yachts actually are aware of the depth of water and so prevent them running aground</p> <p>6. Visitors pontoon to have an additional length which is positioned at a right angle to the existing pontoon. To allow extra mooring facilities on both sides of the new extension.</p> <p>7. Yes and keep it for visitors instead of houseboats.</p> <p>8. Extending the existing pontoon would impede access to their berths for the barges. The council could consider the provision of a second pontoon for smaller yachts and dinghies at the prom, maybe below Cook's Yard, with access to the shore, perhaps a mirror image of the Landbreach pontoon for the trip boat.</p> <p>9. If dredged, a hammer head would add to the available berths. Access ashore needs to be via the ends of the quay (eg perhaps via the pub?) to leave room for large vessels on the quay.</p> <p>10 yes</p>	<p>3</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>4</p> <p>1</p>
------------------------	---	---	---

<p>Dockside</p>	<p><i>Should the remaining commercial dockside be retained for the future for business potential or allowed to be developed by more housing ?</i></p>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. The dockside should only be retained if it is active and financially viable. Some areas are akin to derelict land; surely it is better to regenerate through housing and leisure than to retain a link with the past which non-productive and contrary to growth in tourism. 2. Kept for business. 3. Public access and mooring facilities should be the objective 4. Retained at all costs 5. It is a great shame that planning development on Sadd's Warf was not linked in with riverside moorings/businesses or an improvement of Heybridge creek area. This could have been made into a marina much like Tollesbury Marina which would help to rejuvenate the area as Maldon would certainly be a popular town for people to keep their boats and visiting boats even though we have limited tidal access 6. Retained for port uses only. 7. MHIC do not own any property. 8. Crucially, I feel, the remaining commercial dockside is holding the balance of the Port's future. Were this area to be given over completely to residential and commercial/retail use, it would be likely that the remaining boatyards opposite would in the end be forced into closure. We have already seen, and are still seeing residential development taking place ever closer to David Patient's ship yard and the dry-dock area. This is a concern. Residential and industrial sites do not live side by side happily. It is very important that the Harbour Commissioners and others do all they can to ensure that the remaining commercial dockside on the north bank can exist in a way that enables the quayside areas to be used for shipyards and berthing. As mentioned under 'Encouraging Marine Industry' historic vessel berthing could be along this quayside. A working riverside maritime museum would be an added attraction as would a maritime traditional skills training centre. There would be likely to be support from National Historic Ships for this. I mentioned before; could grant funding be available for development of this area? There needs to be planned action. Loss of this area of commercial dockyard could lead to the demise of the upper reaches of the river and loss of any maritime use here. This could have a knock on effect with the loss of businesses and boatyards between Fullbridge and the quay to residential development. 9. There should be a space required on each developed quay sufficient for use by vessels with gangways and enabling vehicular access (double width for crane and passing vehicles). Essential if the next item is to be possible. 10. No more housing 	<p>2</p> <p>3</p> <p>2</p> <p>1</p> <p>1</p> <p>2</p>
------------------------	---	---	---

<p>Encouraging sustainability</p>	<p><i>Are there businesses out there wishing to use the water for transport of goods ?</i></p>	<p>2. Not us. 3. Unlikely 4. Unfortunately few 5. Sea Change” is apparently thinking of this which should be encouraged – there must be many more. 6. Yes, but the trend towards waterside living makes it more difficult for vessels to load and unload. It has been found that port facilities at Rowhedge, Colchester and Wivenhoe have all had housing built on them, so All goods into the Colchester area now have to come by road or rail; mostly by road. This situation has been repeated throughout the country. This would need to have the deep water channel regularly dredged to maintain depth. 8. Maldon is probably not sustainable as a port for cargo vessels, now that Sadd’s wharf could not be used for this purpose. However the possibilities should be explored. 9. Yes, but this needs championing and is not necessarily profitable unless true carbon mile costs are reckoned. MDC/ECC could assist by requiring building materials for riparian development to be transported by water. It is a missed opportunity that material from the demolition of Bradwell Power Station is not removed by water when much was brought by water during construction. One windfarm operator brought materials in by water to the Crouch at considerable expense but thereby proved it is possible. A mixed use of the river is healthy. 10 Not realistic</p>	<p>1 1. 11 3</p>
<p>Speed Limit</p>	<p><i>Should the speed limit in the port be reduced from 8knots to 4knots</i></p>	<p>1. Yes, the speed limit from eastern end of Northy Island into the port should be reduced. This will help curb speeding and thoughtless behaviour from other river users. 2. Yes please, from our perspective. 3. Yes 4. No 5. 8 kn is ok up until the beginning of the Prom extension. Upriver of this it should be 4kn. 7. No as I have said before this would make Maldon unusable <u>Think about it</u> If the harbour was used more and a bit more wash there would not be so much mud. 8. It could be 4 knots above Cook’s Yard, if there has been damage caused by vessels travelling at 8 knots here. 9. There are areas within the port where 8 knots is too fast. 4 knots would seem right down to No 14 and 6 knots to the end of the Harbour limit. MDC should be encouraged to review byelaws that exempt commercial craft which are among the most liable to speed and set a poor example. MHIC should establish what ability it has to introduce and enforce byelaws. This is a high priority as it concerns safety. 10 Live and let live</p>	<p>1 5 1 13 1</p>

Please do add further area/s that you feel have been left out in this consultation document.		<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <ol style="list-style-type: none"> a) Additional moorings for long stay on the Heybridge side of the river, opposite the Quay (Hall Road). b) Encourage local people and clubs (rowing to use the river for recreational purposes. Eg, teaching local children to row/ sail). c) Hiring of sail boats, row boats for public use. 	
	Fees	9.The cost of running the port should be shared by all users and not met entirely by commercial passenger vessels.Only passenger vessels pay fees to MHIC. This was introduced when cargo carrying into the port ceased in the 1990s. It is perfectly possible to charge fees to other users via mooring charges and boatyard fees to owners.	2

Additional Comments

1. It is clear to all that the future prosperity of Maldon's port is heavily reliant on leisure which can be tourists visiting on foot or from the water. In order to sustain this potential there needs to be a clear lead from MDC assisted by other public bodies. However, more private river users, barge operators, tour boats, sailing clubs etc must actively participate. A clear framework and strategy should be adopted that benefits the area and no individual group.

5. I visited Heybridge creek recently and was appalled by the state of it. I have no objection to legitimate houseboats but the numerous wrecks and the general unkempt state of the place is a disgrace. Surely the council ought to take more pride in this area and develop it. If a half tide sill was put into hold back water and sufficient dredging done (with the waste filling the back channels) to make a reasonable depth of water to keep boats afloat alongside finger pontoons the whole place could become a thriving marina with associated businesses. There is plenty of space for businesses, parking and boat storage unlike the south side of the river with its picturesque hilly foreshore. The drawback is that it is walk to the town but this is a mere inconvenience over all the other facilities it could offer. The traditional boatyards seem almost full to capacity and I don't think they would suffer and only benefit from the new breed of boat owner a marina would attract in the future. This could reinvigorate Maldon as a modern maritime port worthy of its heritage.

7. There are some good ideas here but I feel MHIC should take the time to consult the White Paper. I feel most of these ideas are for the MDC not MHIC. We did have facilities at the quay – gone. As an owner of a commercial quay in Maldon if I was offered the right price it would be sold, as would anyone else. The only way MHIC can stop this is to buy them – not an option. Owning a boatyard or quay is fine apart from people moaning about noise boats, views etc.

8. A slow erosion of the character of Maldon's waterfront has taken place over the last 25 years with a loss of riparian activities and a slow, but insidious increase in residential development. If this is not curtailed then in another 25 years, the special character of Maldon may be largely lost. Can the maritime uses of the upper reaches of the river be maintained or will it eventually all be residential as is the case for many upriver ports?

It is hard to know where the remit of MHIC lies in the promotion of the port. With the cessation of cargo carrying ships to the town and the likelihood that there will not be a return of such, it is unlikely that MHIC can ever now have the influence that they enjoyed previously. Their income is too small. The port as envisaged by those that set up the Trust aims 150 years ago was very different. Do the Harbour Commissioner's need to change direction to meet today's needs? Should they continue to care for the river and its usage as they do now, whilst accepting an inevitable decline? Should they be more actively involved in looking at the revitalising of the port

11. MHIC clearly has some ideas for development but little or no money to achieve it. There is no prospect either of obtaining funding without a plan and effective partnerships to meet it. The ball is in MHIC court to demonstrate they are capable of acting in this way. Otherwise they simply continue as an additional burden of costs on the port. As part of this process they should agree with stakeholders a set of measures of effectiveness with timescales. If they are unsuccessful they should agree to uncontested dissolution. They should also be expected to share their resources, though slender, to prime worthwhile goals.

Your comments
?
?
?
?
?