

## **23 PROJECT APPRAISAL FRAMEWORK FOR PORTS**

### **23.1 INTRODUCTION**

23.1.1 Section 1.6 provides an overview of the requirements of *A Project Appraisal Framework for Ports*. In the following sections an explanation is provided on the identification of the alternatives to the proposed channel deepening that have been considered in the appraisal and an Appraisal Summary Table is presented for each option (the beach nourishment schemes are not relevant in this context). This table present the findings of the EIA process in relation to the various objectives and sub-objectives of the appraisal framework.

### **23.2 IDENTIFICATION AND DESCRIPTION OF ALTERNATIVES**

#### **Do minimum**

23.2.1 *A Project Appraisal Framework for Ports* recommends that a 'do minimum' option should be considered. The guidance (DfT, 2003) describes the 'do minimum' case as one which assumes no new investment is committed beyond that required to keep the port operation at its present level. The appraisal of the 'do minimum' case should include an estimation of what would happen to current or future traffic that could not use the port because the development does not take place.

23.2.2 With respect to the proposed scheme and for the purposes of this assessment, the 'do minimum' case is taken to be a continuation of the existing maintenance dredging regime with no other alternations to the approach channel. In effect, the 'do minimum' case represents the existing environment conditions as described throughout this ES. It could, however, be argued that the proposed deepening represents the 'do minimum' case, because the investment proposed is required to keep the operation of the Port of Poole at its present level (see Section 1.2).

#### **Better use of existing transport infrastructure**

23.2.3 The guidance recommends that promoters should consider alternatives at sites they control that could increase the productivity of existing quays, natural or dredged channels, operational land and buildings and landside links. In this respect, PHC do not control any ports other than Poole and are not responsible for the provision of navigational access via any dredged or natural channel other than those that are proposed to be dredged. Therefore, there are no alternatives within the control of PHC to make better use of existing infrastructure.

#### **Alternative sites at the port in question**

23.2.4 The guidance states that new port developments could take different forms at the same location, for example different sites within the port area, different capacities, different dredging options and different layout of quays and buildings.

23.2.5 With respect to the approach channel deepening, in order to meet the need of the proposals, the only possible alternatives are to dredge a new (i.e. different) approach channel to the Port at the required depth or to realign sections of the existing channel.

Neither of these options are considered feasible alternatives to the proposed deepening of the existing channel because of the environmental and cost implications of doing so and, therefore, are not considered further.

### Alternatives at other ports

- 23.2.6 The guidance recognises that detailed information about the effects of possible, as yet undefined, new developments at different ports is unlikely to be publicly available and assumptions may be contentious. The framework does not require promoters to make detailed comparisons of alternatives outside their control. However, in this case it is considered that there are no current alternative proposals that would meet the needs to be fulfilled by the proposed channel deepening (i.e. the improvement of navigational access to the Port of Poole). In addition, there are no alternative developments that are within the control of the developer. Therefore, no alternatives have been considered.

### Assessment of alternatives

- 23.2.7 The guidance suggests that the appraisal of 'do minimum', making 'better use of existing facilities' and 'alternative sites at the port' should assume that existing facilities at other ports remain in their current state. However, the appraisal should allow for projects that have the necessary approvals and assume that they are built to the stated time and capacity. In this case, no such other projects are known to exist.

### Appraisal period

- 23.2.8 *A Project Appraisal Framework for Ports* suggests a 30 year appraisal period from the time the development becomes fully operational (early 2006). Therefore, the scheme has been appraised for impacts likely to be occurring in the year 2036. It is, however, recognised that some predicted effects may be longer lasting (assuming other conditions remain constant) and this is indicated where necessary.

## 23.3 APPRAISAL SUMMARY TABLE

- 23.3.1 Following the recommended format in *A Project Appraisal Framework for Ports*, Table 23.1 presents an Appraisal Summary Table (AST) for the proposed scheme. It is not useful to present an AST for the 'do minimum' as this represents the baseline conditions and, hence, a scenario does not exist for it to be assessed against. Therefore, the following assessment describes the implications of the proposed deepening compared with the existing (i.e. 'do minimum') scenario.

- 23.3.2 The appraisal framework recommends the use of a seven point scale, based on the GOMMMS approach. This scale has, where possible, been used to make an assessment of the proposed scheme against the 'do minimum' scenario, as follows:

- *Large adverse* – potential for significant negative impacts;
- *Moderate adverse* - potential for moderate negative impacts;
- *Slight adverse* - potential for negative impacts;
- *Neutral* – no changes envisaged;
- *Slight beneficial* – potential for positive impacts to occur;
- *Moderate beneficial* - potential for moderate beneficial impacts to occur; and,
- *Large beneficial* - potential for significant beneficial impacts.

**Table 23.1 Appraisal Summary Table for the proposed approach channel deepening**

Objective and sub-objectives	Qualitative assessment	Quantitative assessment/score	Relevant section of the ES
<b>SAFETY</b>			
Health and safety of workers at the port	Accident rates at the port are low and the scheme does not have the potential to affect this. The nature of goods handled at the port would be unchanged	Neutral	Section 1.2
Risks to surrounding population	Given that the nature of goods handled would be unchanged, no change is predicted	Neutral	Section 1.2
Marine safety in approaches to port	Port Marine Safety Code procedures will continue to ensure that the risk of incidents to vessels in port are minimised	Neutral	Section 11
Accidents on road and rail network accessing ports	The scheme would not result in a change in the level of risk of accidents on the road and rail network	Neutral	Section 18
Physical security of port users and workers	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the scheme	Neutral	N/A
<b>ECONOMY</b>			
Cargo owners/passenger leisure/port operators	The scheme would allow the Port to maintain its existing ferry business and accommodate the general trend towards larger vessels, thus ensuring the long term viability of the Port. Without the proposed deepening the Port would be likely to become less competitive and would lose business to other ports	Large benefit	Sections 1.2 and 19
Port workers	The proposed deepening is not expected to generate significant additional employment, but in the absence of the deepening job losses would be expected as a result of a long term loss of competitiveness and, therefore, a loss of business	Moderate benefit	Sections 1.2 and 19
Ship operators	Larger vessels would be able to be accommodated, thus enabling existing operations at the Port to continue given the general trend for larger vessels in the shipping industry	Moderate benefit	Section 1.2
Government	N/A	N/A	N/A
Surface access providers	The scheme would not result in changes to existing access providers (e.g. rail)	Neutral	Section 18

Objective and sub-objectives	Qualitative assessment	Quantitative assessment/score	Relevant section of the ES
Regeneration and redistribution of economic activity/productivity growth across the economy	Port activity generates both direct and indirect benefits to the region and would continue to do so. In the absence of the deepening, the overall level of business at the Port would decline, with negative knock on effects for the regional economy. The deepening would therefore enable the continuation of the generation of direct and indirect economic benefits and potentially attract additional investment	Moderate benefit	Sections 1.2 and 19
Foreign direct investment and trade	Improved water depth would enhance the attractiveness of the Port for trade	Slight benefit	Sections 1.2 and 19
Benefits to particular industries	There is the potential for indirect knock-on benefits to a range of local and regional activities (e.g. marine/port related industries, tourism and other industries such as the local clay mining industry)	Moderate benefit	Section 1.2 and 19
<b>ENVIRONMENT</b>			
Noise, dust and vibration	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	Sections 14 and 15
Local air quality	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme and no adverse effect on air quality objectives	Neutral	Section 15
Climate change	The proposed scheme would not result in a significant change to carbon dioxide emissions	Neutral	Section 15
Landscape	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	Section 16
Townscape	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	Section 16
Biodiversity	The overall impact of the scheme on designated and non-designated habitats and species is considered to be minimal. Although effects are predicted, an adverse effect on the designated status of nature conservation sites (e.g. SSSI, SPA, cSAC or Ramsar) is not predicted	Slight adverse	Section 6, 7, 8 and 22

Objective and sub-objectives	Qualitative assessment	Quantitative assessment/score	Relevant section of the ES
Heritage	The proposed dredging has the potential to directly and indirectly affect known and potential sites of archaeological importance. Some adverse and some beneficial impacts are identified. It is proposed that a detailed mitigation strategy would be developed and agreed with English Heritage and other specific mitigation measures are being developed for specific features	Slight adverse	Section 12
Water	A number of effects are predicted (e.g. changes to tidal range and sediment budget). These effects in themselves are neither positive or negative, but manifest themselves in changes to habitats within the Harbour and coastal system (i.e. they have the potential to affect 'biodiversity'; see above).	Neutral	Section 3
<b>ACCESSIBILITY</b>			
Access by non-road modes	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	N/A
Access for disabled people	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	N/A
Option of access to port facilities	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	N/A
Severance of local trips	There would be no change from the existing situation as a result of the proposed scheme	Neutral	N/A
<b>INTEGRATION</b>			
Transport interchange facilities at ports	The proposed scheme is in accordance with relevant national port policies in that the proposed channel deepening would make use of existing infrastructure at the Port and promote UK and regional competitiveness by encouraging reliable, efficient distribution to markets. In addition, <i>Modern Ports: A UK Policy</i> states that there is a presumption in favour of making best use of existing infrastructure where possible.	Slight beneficial	Sections 1.2 and 1.5
Land use policy	N/A	N/A	N/A

Objective and sub-objectives	Qualitative assessment	Quantitative assessment/score	Relevant section of the ES
Local transport strategy	The scheme is in accordance with policies relating to transport in the Bournemouth, Poole and Dorset Structure Plan (i.e. "the port facilities at Poole should be improved subject to safeguarding the ecological value of the Harbour and its use for recreation")	Slight beneficial	Section 1.5
Economic strategy for the area	The proposed scheme is in accordance with policies to enhance economic activity in the area	Slight beneficial	Section 1.5
Environmental protection policies	The scheme is in accordance with relevant policies	Slight beneficial	Section 1.5
Regeneration policies	N/A	N/A	N/A
Other Government policies	The most relevant Government policies are those set out in <i>A New Deal for Transport</i> and <i>Modern Ports: A UK Policy</i> ; the proposed scheme in accordance with the principles of these policies	Slight beneficial	Section 1.5