To receive a report on the pontoon and consider any actions and associated expenditure

APPENDIX A

Immediately on reading the report, it was apparent that I needed to go down and look at the pontoons and walkway myself.

The pontoons do have a manufacturer's tally plate on it for a Totnes company called Docking Solutions Ltd. Unfortunately, they no longer exist and were bought out by Walcon (based in Fareham) that their website now links through to. I am waiting for a call back from them about any recommended inspection and maintenance regimes they may have on file. It probably won't be until Monday now though.

So, referring to the report, there are things I agree with, and elements that I think needed to be more detailed (current condition for instance, I would have expected a photo report to accompany a condition assessment).

Para 4.1: Pontoon Structure- I agree with his assessment. Minor repairs to coating protections are needed in some visible areas, these are not urgent. I am uncertain what the buoyancy sections are made of though and they are heavy with marine growth. Over time, marine growth will degrade any protective coating. What I couldn't really fathom is why the section of the pontoon under the ramp is solid is it just acts as receptacle to fill with water and rubbish (as can be seen in one of the images) furthering corrosion of submersed framework. Mike Lyness (or Walcon) can perhaps advise on whether this can have drain holes added.

Para 4.2, Articulated walkway. His report is dated March and we are now in October, so there would have been some deterioration since his attendance but what I have seen today however is severe corrosion in one area to the point that the bottom of the box section where the ramp sits on the upper walkway is wasted to almost nothing (see photos). This will not have progressed to this state in just 6 months so I am surprised he did not draw attention to it and question how closely he looked (it took me all of 60 seconds to find it). I consider that it requires fairly urgent repairs as its strength will be significantly degraded. I would have expected attention to be drawn to this back in March, including through a photo report. Similarly (as can also be seen in the couple of the images, the side railing frame is completed corroded through where it meets the vertical on both sides of the walkway. If I identified structural corrosion of this severity in one of the ships I manage, I would be pushing the alarm bell and notifying the relevant Classification Society for the vessel

Paa 4.3: Concrete Support Pillars I assume this is referring to the tall round pillars at each end of the main pontoon? Do we have any history on these support pillars? When were they put in place? Has any below water inspection ever been conducted? Are they definitely concrete as a brief tap on one of them gave a metallic sound.

They appear sound above water but as Mike highlights in many areas of his report, the condition of them below water is unknown. I think this should be conclusively established as a baseline for a future inspection and maintenance regime.

Para 4.4: Decking & Surface Finishes I agree with his assessment, the wooden deck boards on the walkway and the pontoon surfaces seem generally in good condition. They should give years of service yet, though the wooden areas have no non slip so would benefit from cleaning to remove any algae growth that may cause people to slip. Perhaps once annually in the off season.

Para 4.5: Fixings & Connections Generally agree with this also, though I did notice a few proud screwheads that could cause injury if anyone were to be using the pontoon barefoot or in flip flops, there's a photo of one such screwhead in the folder for the articulated walkway

The element of his report that I agree with is that we should immediately put an inspection regime in place. These are mild steel structures exposed to the elements in a harsh, corrosive environment. They are also used by the public (I assume we have adequate public liability insurance in place for public use of the facility?). Pending feedback from the manufacturer. My recommendation would be

1. Annual inspections the like of which Mike Lyness has conducted (and describes at para 9 of his report). We should be clear on what our expectations are from those reports though, they should include a photo report and grading of any deficiencies found (in terms of urgency of need to action any repairs). It should not automatically include for Mike Lyness to carry out the repairs though (as his para 9 does currently) as that gives him an incentive to find fault.
2. An inspection regime, method and periodicity to be established for inspecting the underwater elements, i.e. the pillars and the pontoon floats. Some info on this may be forthcoming from Walcon. This is covered within para 10 of the report.

End of Report Findings.

Cllr Scott Slavin