

**From:** [REDACTED]  
**To:** [Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing](#)  
**Subject:** SoCG (RYA / Applicant)  
**Date:** 22 October 2019 20:40:45  
**Attachments:** [REDACTED]

---

Sir,

In order to ensure that the SoCG (RYA / Applicant) achieves Deadline-2, I attach my copy of the agreed final version.

Applicant, as I understand it, is subsuming all SoCGs within one overarching document, in which case my submission may be a tautology; however belt-'n-braces to be sure.

I have written to my contact at The Applicant to say, **“Yes, I am content with the SoCG. ... please forward to ExA ...”**

This has also been shared with RYA(HQ) at Hamble, Hants.

Best regards,  
Ben FALAT  
RYA(East) Appointee

# **Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing Application for Development Consent Order**

---

## **Document 7.5(T): Royal Yachting Association (RYA)**

---

### **Planning Act 2008**

### **The Infrastructure Planning (Applications: Prescribed Forms and Procedure) Regulations 2009 (as amended) (“APFP”)**

APFP regulation Number: 5(2)(q)

Planning Inspectorate Reference Number: TR010043

Author: Norfolk County Council

Document Reference: 7.5T (RYA)

Version Number: 3

Date: 22 October 2019

---

---

| <b>CONTENTS</b>   | <b>PAGE No.</b> |
|---|-----------------|
| <b>Tables .....</b>   | <b>iii</b>      |
| <b>Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms .....</b>                | <b>iv</b>       |
| <b>1 Introduction .....</b>   | <b>1</b>        |
| 1.1 Purpose of this Document.....                                       | 1               |
| 1.2 Aim of this document .....  | 1               |
| 1.3 Terminology .....   | 1               |
| <b>2 Record of Engagement.....</b>                                      | <b>2</b>        |
| <b>3 Summary of Topics Covered by the Statement of Common Ground ..</b> | <b>3</b>        |
| 3.1 Covered in the Statement of Common Ground.....                      | 3               |
| 3.2 Not Covered in the Statement of Common Ground .....                 | 3               |
| <b>4 Matters Agreed.....</b>  | <b>4</b>        |
| <b>5 Matters under Discussion .....</b>                                 | <b>8</b>        |
| <b>6 Signatures .....</b>   | <b>12</b>       |

---

---

## Tables

|   |   |
|---|---|
| Table 2.1: Record of Engagement .....     | 2 |
| Table 4.1: Matters Agreed .....           | 4 |
| Table 5.1: Matters under Discussion ..... | 8 |

## Glossary of Abbreviations and Defined Terms

|                  |   |
|------------------|---|
| The Applicant    | Norfolk County Council (in its capacity as Highway Authority and promoter of the Scheme)          |
| DCO              | Development Consent Order   |
| RYA              | Royal Yachting Association  |
| The Planning Act | The Planning Act 2008   |
| Scheme           | The Great Yarmouth Third River Crossing project for which the Applicant seeks development consent |
| SoCG             | Statement of Common Ground  |
| SoS              | Secretary of State  |

---

---

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Purpose of this Document

---

1.1.1 This Statement of Common Ground ('SoCG') has been prepared in relation to the application by Norfolk County Council ('the Applicant') of an order granting development consent ('DCO') under the Planning Act 2008 ('the Planning Act 2008') for the construction, operation and maintenance of a new bridge over the River Yare in Great Yarmouth, Norfolk ('the Scheme').

1.1.2 The application was submitted on 30 April 2019 and accepted on 28 May 2019 by the Planning Inspectorate on behalf of the Secretary of State.

## 1.2 Aim of this document

---

1.2.1 The aim of this SoCG, between the Applicant and the Royal Yachting Association (RYA), is to provide a record of engagement between the parties, including the issues discussed between the parties and the current status of those discussions.

## 1.3 Terminology

---

1.3.1 In this SoCG:

- Where a table is entitled 'Matters Agreed', this signifies matters that have been stated as agreed between the parties;
- Where a table is entitled 'Matters under Discussion', this signifies matters still under discussion;
- Where a table is entitled 'Matters not Agreed', this specifies that both parties are confident that no agreement can be reached.

## 2 Record of Engagement

2.1.1 A summary of the key meetings and correspondence that have taken place between the Applicant and the RYA in relation to the Scheme is outlined in Table 2.1.

*Table 2.1: Record of Engagement*

| Date       | Form of Correspondence | Key Topics / Outcomes (if any)  |
|------------|------------------------|---|
| 20/09/2019 | Telephone Discussion   | Telephone discussion with agreement to enter into a SoCG                                      |
| 20/09/2019 | Email                  | Email to the Applicant, where RYA provided details of the key issues to be included in a SoCG |
| 24/09/2019 | Meeting                | Meeting between Applicant and RYA to produce initial draft of SoCG                            |
| 24/09/2019 | Email                  | Initial draft of SoCG sent to RYA by Applicant  |
| 4/09/2019  | Email                  | Revised SoCG to Applicant by RYA  |
| 7/09/2019  | Email                  | Revised SoCG sent to RYA by Applicant   |
| 17/10/2019 | Tele-Conf. Discussion  | Telephone call to progress matters under discussion ( RYA / Applicant / Consultant )          |
| 21/10/2019 | Email                  | Updated SoCG issued to RYA by Applicant   |
| 21/10/2019 | Email                  | Suggested changes to SoCG provided to Applicant by RYA  |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Updated SoCG issued to RYA by Applicant, which included RYA suggested changes                 |
| 22/10/2019 | Telephone Discussion   | Telephone call between Applicant and RYA to discuss updated SoCG contents                     |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Suggested changes to SoCG provided to Applicant by RYA  |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | Updated SoCG issued to RYA by Applicant, which included RYA suggested changes                 |
| 22/10/2019 | Email                  | RYA confirmation that contents of the SoCG is agreed  |

---

---

## 3 Summary of Topics Covered by the Statement of Common Ground

### 3.1 Covered in the Statement of Common Ground

---

3.1.1 The following topics discussed between the Applicant and the RYA are commented on further in this SOCG:

- Need for the Scheme;
- Air Draft of Bridge;
- Adequacy of Waiting Pontoons;
- Bridge Operating Regime;
- Impact of Knuckles.

### 3.2 Not Covered in the Statement of Common Ground

---

3.2.1 For the avoidance of doubt, matters not covered in this SOCG have not been discussed between the parties as they have not been raised by the RYA.



## 4 Matters Agreed

Table 4.1: Matters Agreed

| Ref.                       | Description of matter | Details of Agreement ( <i>Matters Agreed</i> )   |
|----------------------------|-----------------------|--|
| <b>Need for the Scheme</b> |                       |  |
| 1                          | Need for Scheme       | The RYA appreciates the economic needs for the Third Crossing and does not object to the Scheme. Rather the RYA seeks clear and explicit addressing of its concerns regarding recreational and small boat users. These are detailed in Section 5 below.  |
| <b>Air Draft of Bridge</b> |                       |  |
| 2                          | Air draft of bridge   | <p>The RYA considers that the air draft is an issue and without reference to data it is felt that at an air draft of only 4.5m, most craft will require an opening. RYA considers that yachts should not be required to de-mast for any reason, not least that:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Boats may be unable to de-mast because of the mast size and weight;</li> <li>(ii) When a yacht de-masts it will then carry a significant overhang, which brings with it additional dangers to navigation and to crew.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant considers that the clearance height of 4.5m under the bridge at the navigation channel is dictated by the lengths and gradients of the approaches to the opening span, the lengths are limited by the locations of the tie-in points to the existing road network and the gradients are constrained by practical accessibility requirements.</p> <p>The alignment and gradients of the approach road and embankments are being designed in accordance with national standards from The Design Manual for Roads and Bridges (DMRB), including up to a maximum 1 in 20 (5%) gradients on the approach roads which are suitable for non-motorised users (pedestrians and cyclists).</p> <p>Consideration was given to the maximum height of bridge that could be achieved at 7.5m clearance, however analysis of recorded vessel movements indicated that this increased clearance would produce only a minor reduction in the number of openings required and was</p> |

| Ref.                                | Description of matter           | Details of Agreement ( <i>Matters Agreed</i> )  |
|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|---|
|                                     |                                 | <p>not cost effective compared to the increased cost of construction. (pNRA Appendix B) (Document Reference 6.14, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-185)</p> <p>In choosing a way forward there is a balance to be made when considering conflicting considerations. A 10m clearance scheme would have a number of design compromises and a 14m clearance scheme would require the scheme to extend well beyond South Denes Road, significantly into the peninsula with much greater associated land, property, cost and visual impacts. It would also not remove the need for a lifting bridge. The traffic modelling work undertaken to date for the Scheme assumes that the bridge will open for all commercial river vessels and that the bridge will operate 24 hours a day, 7 days a week. The impact on both cost and benefits is reflected in the traffic modelling and economic work. A design that enables the bridge to open for all commercial river vessels on demand does significantly reduce the argument to provide a bridge with a higher clearance with its associated costs and impacts.</p> <p>It is agreed that the height of the bridge is dictated by the required highway geometry and that it is unfeasible to provide a higher structure. It is also agreed that there will be no requirements for vessels to de-mast to secure a bridge passage and the bridge will be raised for vessels in accordance with the scheme of operation provided for in the DCO.</p> |
| <b>Adequacy of Waiting Pontoons</b> |                                 |   |
| 3                                   | Suitability of mooring pontoons | <p>The RYA considers the form of pontoons immediately either side of the bridge should be suitable for small boats rather than large ships, which have different mooring needs and characteristics.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Stepping on/off boats onto pontoons must be a 'safe' operation (immediacy of harbour walls present unsafe environment);</li> <li>(ii) Fendering for ships may be steep D-rubber with bollards on quayside, while for boats this needs to be horizontal water-level fenders with on-pontoon cleats.</li> </ul> <p>The Applicant can confirm that its intention is that the waiting pontoons incorporated into the Scheme will be designed for recreational vessels and potentially very small commercial vessels</p>  |

| Ref.                         | Description of matter                       | Details of Agreement ( <i>Matters Agreed</i> )  |
|------------------------------|---|---|
|                              |   | <p>(less than 30m length maximum), they are not intended nor will be suitable for use by larger commercial river traffic.</p> <p>It is agreed that the waiting pontoons will be specified so as to be suitable for recreational craft, this will include suitable and sufficient quay furniture and fendering. It is further agreed that there would be no specific provision for shoreside access from the waiting pontoons, this is to discourage crew from leaving vessels while awaiting a bridge lift and potentially not being present on board when their lift commences.</p>  |
| 4                            | Mooring pontoon facilities elsewhere        | <p>The RYA requests the provision of small boat mooring pontoons on both up-steam and down-steam sides of all bridges. RYA suggests that pontoons are needed:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) Above Breydon Bridge,</li> <li>(ii) Between Breydon and Haven Bridges,</li> <li>(iii) Between Haven and the new bridge,</li> <li>(iv) Below the new bridge;</li> </ul> <p>The RYA consider such 4-part provision would provide for smoothest passage in either direction without impeding other harbour movements.</p> <p>The Applicant can confirm that it does not intend to provide additional mooring pontoons beyond those provided either side of the proposed new bridge.</p> <p>Whilst the RYA recognises, unhappily, that these additional moorings will not be provided as part of the Scheme it suggests that mooring provision on Heritage Quay could be provided as part of any future schemes proposed in this area.</p> |
| <b>Bridge Opening Regime</b> |   |   |
| 5                            | Bridge opening regimes should be managed so | The RYA requests that the opening regimes for all three bridges (Breydon Bridge, Haven Bridge and the Third River Crossing) should be carefully managed to allow smooth passage of vessels  |

| Ref. | Description of matter                          | Details of Agreement ( <i>Matters Agreed</i> )  |
|------|--|---|
|      | <p>that all three bridges are coordinated.</p> | <p>through all three bridges in succession. This would minimise the need for waiting at the pontoons, since each coming alongside a pontoon manoeuvre is a time of increased personal risk; it is recognised that some waiting will be a necessity particularly when boats or ships may be moving in opposing directions. The RYA suggests there exists an inherent opportunity of a single overarching control point from the new bridge.</p> <p>The Applicant advises that the draft DCO (Document Reference 3.1, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-020) contains, at Schedule 10, a Scheme of Operation that outlines how the scheme bridge is intended to function – and it is noted in particular that it permits on demand openings for commercial vessels.</p> <p>It is agreed that, for safety reasons, the physical operation of each bridge should be conducted in the vicinity of each bridge so as to ensure acceptable visual assessments of conditions can be undertaken. It is also agreed that the management process for booking bridge openings could be undertaken remotely and could be co-ordinated so as to simplify the booking process as much as possible.</p> <p>To this end the Applicant will work with GYPC, who operate Breydon and Haven Bridges (on behalf of Highways England and Norfolk County Council), to coordinate, where this is feasible, the opening regimes of the three bridges.</p> <p>The Scheme of Operation is intended to allow for publication of recreational opening times, when a vessel will be permitted an opening without needing to make use of the waiting facilities.</p> |

## 5 Matters under Discussion

Table 5.1: Matters under Discussion

| Ref.                         | Description of matter                                    | Current Position ( <i>under Discussion</i> )  |
|------------------------------|--|---|
| <b>Bridge Opening Regime</b> |  |   |
| 1                            | Use of VHF radios for communication                      | <p>The RYA considers that it cannot be anticipated that all small boat users have access to onboard operable marine VHF radios. Therefore, other systems of communication need to be considered, including the use of Variable Message Signs and traffic lights.</p> <p>The Applicant advises that along with VHF equipment, E-mail, web and telephone communications are also to be provided within the control tower and the bridge will have standard marine traffic control signals and aids to navigation.</p> <p>Navigation lighting requirements, including bridge control signals, will be discussed with the GYPC/A as the Local Lighthouse Authority prior to obtaining approval from the General Lighthouse Authority (Trinity House).</p> <p>The Applicant notes the suggestion for Variable Message Signs and will continue to discuss these with RYA.</p> |
| <b>Impact of Knuckles</b>    |  |   |
| 2                            | Impact of knuckles on Broads Basin hinterland Flood Risk | <p>The RYA considers that the narrowing of the river between the bridge knuckles, by approximately 36%, will have a knock-on effect to the ability of the Broads system to empty into the North Sea. Upstream raised water-levels may exacerbate the risk of flooding within the Broads basin as well as restrict navigation beneath low bridges of which there are many. In consideration of small-boats within the Broads basin, some surety is sought by RYA that potential risk of flooding on higher points of the navigation has been duly considered (EA's improved study?).</p> <p>The frequency of Environment Agency Warnings for flooding of upper reaches as far as Potter Heigham and Geldeston due to "Tidal Gate" at Great Yarmouth has increased over most recent</p>   |

| Ref. | Description of matter                           | Current Position ( <i>under Discussion</i> )  |
|------|---|---|
|      |   | <p>years; and RYA anticipates that the frequency of Tidal-Gate type of pluvial and fluvial flooding can only be increased if the ‘gateway’ river flow is restricted (effective 36% damming of the river).</p> <p>Any changes to the underlying Flood Risk model (promised by EA with request for additional time) could result in additional Interested Parties wishing to make Representation to the Examining Authority, or existing parties modifying their response. Such parties could include the Broads Authority, Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association, Goodchild Marine, Natural England, and RYA.</p> <p>The Applicant advises that the signed SoCG for the Environment Agency (Document Reference NCC/GY3RC/EX/010, Planning Inspectorate Reference REP1-004), submitted at Deadline 1, summarised the discussions undertaken to date. The Environment Agency’s letter dated 31 July 2019 expressed concerns about the Flood Risk Assessment, Environmental Statement - Appendix 12B (Document Reference 6.2 / Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-135) and the associated modelling. The letter also requested further information.</p> <p>Discussions have continued further to the Environment Agency’s letter. To address the concerns raised, the Applicant has been undertaking further sensitivity modelling which will be submitted to the Environment Agency in due course.</p> <p>The RYA wishes to view the EA update to their holding objection made in Relevant Representations and the responses to the Examining Authority’s First Written Questions before discussing this matter further with the Applicant.</p> |
| 3    | Impact of knuckles on local adjacent river flow | <p>The RYA considers that narrowing of the river between the bridge knuckles, by approximately 36%, will have a knock-on effect to local river flows with the resulting impacts of:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>(i) The increased speed-of-flow could prove at times to be an insurmountable barrier to small boats with limited available engine power;</li> <li>(ii) Adjacent currents and eddies could provide unpredictable dangers to small boats which would otherwise expect relatively uniform safe progress;</li> </ul>   |

| Ref.                                | Description of matter                               | Current Position ( <i>under Discussion</i> )  |
|-------------------------------------|---|---|
|                                     |   | <p>(iii) Any back-eddies may be collection points for sediment causing shallows;<br/> (iv) Proximity of moored boats particularly close to passing ships may create considerable surge and yaw on the moored boats putting unwarranted strain on mooring lines and fixing points.</p> <p>It is agreed that the anticipated effects of the knuckles have been assessed through modelling, the outputs of this are contained in the Sediment Transport Assessment contained in the Scheme Environmental Statement (Document Reference 6.2, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-131).</p> <p>The Applicant considers that as the anticipated effects on current velocities are, except during extreme flow events, no greater than those experienced at the existing Haven Bridge that these should not present a barrier to small craft.</p> <p>The RYA wishes to discuss this matter further with the Applicant.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the wake from vessels passing in close proximity to a moored vessel could produce significant movement on the moored vessel. It is further agreed that the setback of the waiting pontoons, with a 3m beam vessel being at least 10m from the passage fender line, should provide sufficient clearance to mitigate these effects.</p> |
| <b>Adequacy of Waiting Pontoons</b> |   |   |
| 4                                   | Mooring of small boats close to the bridge knuckles | <p>The RYA is concerned that small boats moored close to the knuckles (impact zone) on the bridge-pier creates additional risk to themselves:</p> <p>(i) Because the boats could lie within the impact protection zone of the piers;<br/> (ii) The proposed position of pontoons lies on ‘outside’ of a 28° bend in the river; this increases likelihood of ships impacting the adjacent pier and moored boats.</p> <p>The Applicant advises that the commercial nature of the quays on the east bank makes location of a facility on this side of the river impracticable. The size of the swell generated by passing vessels is not determined by which side of the river the berth is located, rather it is a function of</p>  |

| Ref. | Description of matter | Current Position ( <i>under Discussion</i> )  |
|------|-----------------------|---|
|      |                       | <p>the distance between the passing vessel and the occupied berth. In the majority of runs during the vessel simulations, vessel passages have favoured the inside of the bend therefore it is likely that a waiting facility located on the east bank of the river would be more significantly affected by swell from passing vessels.</p> <p>It is agreed that the risk of passing vessels contacting moored vessels is present in all circumstances and is not specific to the location of the pontoons. It is also agreed that the positioning of the pontoons on the outer edge of the river bend slightly increases the risk of contact should control of the passing vessel be lost.</p> <p>The risks associated with collisions during large vessel passages is considered within the pNRA (Document Reference 6.14, Planning Inspectorate Reference APP-185) and additional operational measures are considered to reduce these risks, in particular the adoption of a practice ensuring that any small vessels waiting on the pontoons would be released through the bridge prior to a large vessel transit.</p> <p>The Applicant considers that the implementation of the recommendations from the Navigation Risk Assessment, namely that any vessels on the pontoons awaiting a bridge lift would be released to continue their passage in advance of any large vessel bridge transits, would suitably mitigate the risk.</p> <p>The RYA wishes to discuss this matter further with the Applicant.</p> |



## 6 Signatures

|              | [Stakeholder Name]               | Norfolk County Council (the Applicant) |
|--------------|----------------------------------|--|
| Signature    |                                  |  |
| Printed Name | Ben FALAT                        | Gavin Broad                            |
| Title        | RYA(East) Appointee              | Project Engineer                       |
| On behalf of | Royal Yachting Association (RYA) | Norfolk County Council                 |
| Date         | 22/10/2019                       | 22/10/2019                             |

