

My name is Ross Fender, I am a home owning, Tax paying, Boat owning Mechanical Engineer and CEO.

I would like to thank the council for undertaking the production of the Aitkins report, as Councillor Crossley put it 'I am particularly pleased with the comprehensive structural report, which is very clear in its findings as are the recommendations before us'

On Jan 16th 2020 the council met, minuted, and stated in point 2.2 'Officers are to report back to cabinet once the results of the structural survey are known, to enable cabinet to make an informed decision on the long term use of this land'

You agreed in January that the Decisions you make must be based on Factual Information from this report.

Let us look at the factual information you have paid for.

It really cannot be clearer,

In the short term, do nothing,

In the medium term, enforce laws regarding engine/generator usage, Restrict draught, and improve mooring provision.

As I understand the first 2 recommendations in the medium term are obvious. So what does improving mooring provision mean?; I could talk over the report, and pick it apart, but the key, and only important word here is IMPROVE.

A recommendation to improve does not mean remove.

If someone parks inconsiderately in your road the solution is not to remove all the parking.

We know a colossal amount of money was set aside for the Mead Lane report and in the report it indicates 8 possible future mooring locations. The structural bank surveys and reports alone for these locations would be costing huge sums of money based on the current run rate of spend and previous comprehensive reports. It would be crazy to spend such vast sums of money investigating when the homework has already been done and a safe mooring location is available. You cannot expect for people to moor a boat on land that hasn't been scrutinised for safety and bank integrity to the extent Mead Lane has.

As a tax payer I will be incredibly disappointed if more money is wasted on needless surveys and reports, and as a boat owner and live a board I will be even more disappointed if science and facts are ignored. That leaves only one real option. Listen to science; reason with fact, which is the obvious option. Duncan Hounsell was quoted saying "im pleased that the lib dem administration is listening to local people and will initiate a structural survey, its vital decisions are based on the proper evidence.

Follow the recommendations.

Mead lane is safe, it has been tested, and proven

I would like to close with a thought for you. I own a rather nice beach hut in Lyme regis, I don't own the right to the sand, and I don't own the sea. I cant stop family's from picnicking in front of it. But I do know, it would be dangerous for them and WRONG, if they were told for no reason other than my view of the sea has been impaired, that they now had to play in the carpark.

No more reports, no more surveys. No more wasted money. Einstein defines insanity as 'doing the same thing over and over and expecting different results'

You have an elected responsibility to base your decision on the report you have paid to be professionally compiled, comprehensively detailed and exhaustive in content.

Act on fact.

Thankyou.