

# **New Ferry Connections and Improved Viability of the Gravesend Town Pier Pontoon**

## **A Report and Suggested Business Plan for Gravesham Borough Council**

**By Graham Galpin  
May 2014**



**The Interreg IVB  
North Sea Region  
Programme**

*Investing in the future by working together  
for a sustainable and competitive region*



**European Regional  
Development Fund**  
Investing in your future

## Contents

<i>Background</i>	<i>Page 3</i>
<i>Ferry Service Tender</i>	<i>Page 5</i>
<i>The Present Management Structure and Engagement</i>	<i>Page 6</i>
<i>New Ferry Opportunities Examined</i>	<i>Page 9</i>
<i>Options Analysis</i>	<i>Page 12</i>
<i>Conclusions &amp; Recommendations</i>	<i>Page 15</i>
<i>Appendices...</i>	

## 1. BACKGROUND

### **Preamble**

- 1.1. Gravesham Borough Council is a partner in the iTransfer North Sea Region Interreg IVb project which is being led by the Institute for Sustainability in the UK. Other partners are located in Scotland and across the European mainland.
- 1.2. As part of the Interreg project Gravesham is committed to capitalising upon its investment in the Pontoon located on Town Pier Gravesend. This report is examining options for additional and improved ferry services to use the Pontoon.
- 1.3. In addition the project is seeking to establish how the Pontoon can be financially sustainable, and whether there is added value by extending the pontoon.

### **Pontoon: Phase 1**

- 1.4. In 2009 GHg Consultancy Ltd, led by Graham Galpin provided a business plan for the proposed Pontoon as initially designed so as to provide mooring options for visiting ships and boats. It was also to be the Gravesend base for ferry services between Gravesend and Tilbury and possibly to London.
- 1.5. As a result of an iTransfer Partner workshop in Gravesend on 6 September 2010, based on input from Project Partners, the decision was taken to simplify the design, including reducing the length of the pontoon by 50% and hence bring the construction costs within the budget available.
- 1.6. At the time of writing the final balance on the project is still under discussion.
- 1.7. The existing operator of the Gravesend - Tilbury Ferry was the owner of the pier from which it operated on the south bank, but the service was relocated in 2012 when the Pontoon was commissioned.
- 1.8. The pontoon serves a number of markets for moorings. Historically the originally proposed pontoon was to be twice the length than that constructed. This has created some issues and conflicts in maximising its utilisation. This is because the present provider of the Tilbury ferry needs a great deal of berthing space throughout the year, creating a situation where other vessels cannot use the outer berth.
- 1.9. After commissioning the pontoon has hosted a wide range of other vessels, including the Paddle Steamer Waverley and her sister ship Balmoral.
- 1.10. Since the time of the pontoon's construction, a number of major new proposals have been announced which potentially offer opportunities for new passenger ferry routes using the pontoon and hence increasing travel by water. Included in these are the Paramount Park proposed for the Swanscombe Peninsular, London Gateway and most recently

the Chancellor of the Exchequer has announced an investment of £200 million in kick-starting a Garden City of 15,000 homes in Eastern Quarry at Ebbsfleet. The time frame is not clear as yet, nor the source of funding, but it is clear that up to 30,000 new ferry route users could be located close to the river.

- 1.11 The proposed Paramount theme park is expected to receive 15 million visitors annually and to open by 2017.
- 1.12 It was always foreseen that the pontoon could maximise interconnectivity with other public transport routes such as High Speed 1, Eurostar at Ebbsfleet, C2C, bus and other rail services. This remains on the agenda

## 2. FERRY SERVICE TENDER

- 2.1 The Tilbury\Gravesend Ferry is funded by a joint agreement between Thurrock Council and Kent County Council. Kent County Council is operating a procurement process for a three year contract to deliver the ferry service. Presently the contractor is The Lower Thames and Medway Passenger Boat Company. This present service supplier is reluctant to use the inner face of the Pontoon, although the pontoon has been designed and constructed specifically to allow the ferry to use both inside and outside faces.
- 2.2 The present schedule is shown in Appendix 1.
- 2.3 The criteria on the tender documentation places most emphasis on cost (90%) with only the remaining 10% on quality. The project has a limited duration of three years.
- 2.4 A concern could be that the successful operator would not recover its initial investment over such a constrained period and thus the viability of an operation complying with the tender brief could be severely compromised.
- 2.5 In broader terms the tender suggests that a service deliverer can propose new routes based with the present Pontoon as a base. If it is assumed that the service will be time and profit constrained, it appears likely that the appetite for developing routes beyond the base offer will be reduced.
- 2.6 It is worthy of note that the successful tenderer must commit to mooring on the inside of the pontoons on both sides of the river. This should be rigorously enforced to ensure that the out face of the Gravesham Pontoon is available for other craft.

### **3. THE PRESENT MANAGEMENT STRUCTURE AND ENGAGEMENT**

#### ***Access***

- 3.1 The pontoon is accessed from the south bank of the Thames (of necessity) via Town Pier. This is through an access shared with the leaseholders of the Riva Bar. Access is manually managed with gates locked by the Riva Bar. Presently this is restricted to between 9am and Dusk.
- 3.2 The pontoon could be provided with an automatic door control system eliminating dependency on the Riva Bar. This is discussed later.

#### ***Span of Control***

- 3.3 The Pontoon is owned by Gravesham Borough Council (GBC) and mooring buoys owned by the Port of London Authority (PLA) but leased to GBC. They are managed, along with St Andrew's Quay on behalf of Gravesham by London River Moorings (LRM). This organisation includes the two principals and a part time worker. Between them they maintain the bookings and have, in the past, heavily marketed the pontoon to the sailing community (they "blitzed the river"). In addition they have communicated via email and postings on boating websites and through advertisements in yachting magazines.
- 3.4 A critical success factor for the pontoon is that it is "one tide" from London. This has had some benefit in marketing and as the company also runs the Canal Basin (St Andrew's). LRM comment that by having the three mooring assets they are able to provide flexibility, for example by holding vessels on the buoys until the tide is right for them to enter the Basin. This flexibility could prove important in future ferry and mooring management.
- 3.5 LRM have had some success in mooring management and claim to have turned the St Andrew's Quay around from a loss making asset to one generating profit.

#### ***Charging, Present Usage and Finance***

- 3.6 In a report from LRM the utilisation of the Pontoon (other than for the present ferry service) was not great and the tariffs levied were not high, but were at substantially at the market rate. Compare the table below with Ramsgate Marina which levies a charge of £2.96/metre per day (summer) on private leisure craft and £2.45/metre during winter month. At this rate a 10m vessel would be charged at almost identical rates to Gravesend.
- 3.7 The table 1 in Appendix 2 shows that total income via usage of the pontoon is £6,563. There are potentially 95 days when no users are mooring on one side of the pontoon, or using the space not utilised by the Tilbury Ferry. Were two moorings made per day there is the

- potential for an additional £5,700 income. This provides a potential total income of £14,263. This should be seen as guidance only.
- 3.8 Table 2 in Appendix 2 shows that the costs incurred by LRM are £7,110, hence providing and operating loss for the management of the pontoon of £547. This is offset by £15,000 fees paid by Gravesham Borough Council for managing the facility. Hence the profit before taxation for LRM is £14,453.
- 3.9 If utilisation of the pontoon by additional mooring as suggested in paragraph 3.8, then the pontoon would more than break even. The increased usage could come from a daily ferry to London Gateway and a commuter route to London then this could create a consistent surplus.

### ***Quality of Service***

- 3.10 A significant weakness in the provision of the service is the robustness of the LRM principals. It is a small business and is close to being at full stretch. The systems are unsophisticated and it is thought unlikely that they could cope with the additional pressures of continuously marketing and managing a busy pontoon. Some of that pressure could be relieved should spare capacity be filled, in part, by additional and regular ferry services.
- 3.11 This research suggests that LRM are a credible organisation for the day-to-day running of moorings including the pontoon. Increasing the attractiveness of the pontoon and moorings to other users, including ferries, will require a different standard of strategic management. This appears to be beyond the resources of the present contractor, but it is suggested that they are effective in and capable of running the day-to-day, on site activities.
- 3.12 Therefore it appears to be a sound case for seeking an additional strategic delivery partner, which can have a stake in the profitability of the pontoon and buoys. This would need to be procured through standard routes and with the terms of reference set out.
- 3.13 The strategic partners' terms of reference could allow for:
- Marketing
  - Dealing with ferry operators and facilitating new route provision
  - Electronic access management via the monitored CCTV
  - Bookings via a dedicated website
  - Financial management.
- 3.14 Costs for this in-house service should reflect a profit share clause to encourage active promotion of the facilities. There is evidence of interested parties to provide this element of the service.

### ***Accommodating Passengers***

- 3.15 Whilst in the foreseeable future potential constraints are unlikely to be in terms of existing pontoon infrastructure, it must be borne in mind

that there may need to be modifications to the pontoon mooring space in the future. This is not projected until evidence of growing usage is available.

- 3.16 In addition the ease of access for passengers arriving to use the pontoon must be considered. In terms of car parking is assumed that ferry users would be long stay (more than 3 hours) rather than short stay.
- 3.17 A 2009 car parking survey commissioned by the Council showed that the take up of vehicles parking for a 2 plus hours stay, most likely for work purposes in close proximity to the pontoon is as shown below
- Market Square 14.2%
  - Horn Yard 13.9%
  - West Street 22.0%
  - St George's Centre 2.6%
  - Rathmore Road 65.4%

#### Car Parking Capacity costs and distance from Pontoon

Car Park	Capacity	Short/Long	Cost 6+Hrs	Future Planned	Walking Distance*
Horn Yard	88	Short	£6.50	131	190m
Market Square	123	Short	£6.50		240m
St George's	372	Short	£5.00	454	280m
West Street	76	Short	£6.50		200m
Milton Place	136	Long	£3.00	136	600m
Lord Street	185	Long	Permit only	185	550m
Rathmore Road	224	Short	£6.50	224	560m
Parrock Street	648	Short	£6.50	648	670m
Gurdwara	231	Long	£3.00	231	940m

\*Walking distances are to Town Pier entrance

#### Issues around parking

- There is no evidence as to existing usage of car parking by ferry passengers
- 'Future Planned' relates to new permitted development
- Local car parks close to ferry are all managed as short stay (with some permit use for a variety of reasons)
- GBC has had a report on car parking which did not consider this issue but that does not exclude it from future consideration as circumstances change



- The figures given are for public usable car parking spaces and accepts the prospect of ownership change and perhaps some change in emphasis in client base but not overall capacity change
- 3.17 Peak usage of the ferry could realistically be served very well by charter coach feeds. These could relay passengers to the ferries at peak times without adding significantly to town centre traffic. It is understood that there is a potential market which could use a coach link from the Medway towns.
- 3.18 Accommodating increased usage as an embarkation point for commuting should also consider a travel plan that encourages access via walking, cycling and public transport.
- 3.19 The 40 metre pontoon is, at present, available much of the time. One half is used by the Tilbury Ferry. When the Waverley is berthed this takes up the whole of the front mooring but this is only for a limited period of the year. With careful management it should be possible to operate two ferry services simultaneously, and moor other vessels.

---

## 4. NEW FERRY OPPORTUNITIES EXAMINED

### *Partners*

- 4.1 In the first instance the research discussed the opportunities for Partners in iTransfer for linking their services to Gravesend. None were able or enthusiastic in long distance links to Gravesend. Some were constrained by their articles of association others by their degree of preparedness. It should be noted that Gravesham has progressed considerably faster in some aspects of the iTransfer programme.

### *Cruise Terminal*

- 4.2 The managers of the Tilbury Cruise Terminal appeared uninterested in an enhanced ferry service, believing that they were better served by the C2C rail link and the on-site parking facilities they had. The Cruise Terminal spokesman was adamant that any new ferry service to Tilbury had to moor to the rear of their pontoon north of the river. In the past they have articulated an evidence based need for a Sunday Gravesend – Tilbury ferry service in addition to the weekday services.
- 4.3 It was also observed that services from the pontoon to Southend would prove difficult to integrate into a river ferry service. This was because by Southend the vessel would have to be seaworthy, moving it to a more costly level and with consequent incompatibility with river transit.

### *Paramount*

- 4.1 Paramount films have granted a licence for a proposed £2.8 billion Theme Park at Swanscombe Peninsular, 3 miles west of Town Pier Pontoon on the River Thames. It is expected that the theme park will open in 2017 or 2018.
- 4.2 This resort is viewed by Kent County Council (KCC) as the primary development opportunity in Kent for the Thames Gateway. In the South East Local Enterprise Partnership Growth Plan submitted to Government it is identified alongside Ebbsfleet Garden City.
- 4.3 GBC and KCC Cabinet members are of the view that the Theme Park is most likely to create economic growth in north Kent. It may precede the Garden City in delivery.
- 4.4 The park could generate up to 27,000 jobs, both part and full time. In addition there will be 15,000,000 visitors per year. It is viewed by KCC that most of these employees and visitors will reach their destination by rail to Ebbsfleet International, with a significant number arriving by motor vehicle from a new junction from the M25/M2 linked to a new Thames crossing. The developer has proposed 4 river-taxi berths on the site which offers increased potential commuter usage
- 4.5 The number of visitors and employees on site shows a potential for thousands of additional new river passenger trips per annum. A

- Thames-based ferry company known to the Council has expressed an interest in this service and Paramount has equally foreseen this as a facility. The division of potential visitors between road, rail and potential river routes has yet to be established, but the provider will need to negotiate directly with the managers of the franchise. It is likely that most visitors are likely to travel to Paramount from London.
- 4.6 It seems likely that this service would run in concert with commuter traffic to London, covering the costs of the return journey. This operators vessel will accommodate 200 passengers and will prove a valuable tool in justifying a continuous service, at least to Swanscombe. As this facility is not likely to be required until 2018, this should be considered only in the medium term.

### ***Commuter Services***

- 4.7 There is genuine interest in a shuttle ferry to move commuters to and from Gravesend to Canary Wharf, Stratford and London. At Canary Wharf it will be possible to access Cross Rail which will provide linkages to London and beyond to Heathrow and Reading and ultimately HS2.
- 4.8 This route in the most direct way to access the commercial heart of London and can be delivered throughout the year. The Thames-based ferry company known to the Council has expressed interest but would require 120 passengers daily to break even, based upon 260 working days per year.
- 4.9 At present the fair is likely to be £12 return, hence an annual season ticket based on this cost would be £3,120. To carry out the same journey by rail on an annual season ticket would cost £3,176 for traditional rail services and £4,284 on the high speed service.
- 4.10 It should also be noted that Reliance Travel has daily commuter services from Gravesend to London and back at £2,000 per annum. This service takes just under an hour to reach central London, but can be impacted upon by traffic difficulties.
- 4.11 A potential service would be at peak times morning and evening and one Thames-based ferry service has had preliminary discussions with a coach company. They have discussed bringing commuters from Medway to Gravesend to board the commuter vessel and take them back daily. This adds capacity to the coach company's daily commuter service and adds capacity to a Ferry service.
- 4.12 This appears to be a workable service and negotiations with the ferry company could proceed to establish a time frame and publicity strategy to create this market. The operator should pay a reasonable fee for use of the Pontoon.

### ***London Gateway***

- 4.13 UK's newest deep-sea container port (London Gateway) which is combined with Europe's largest logistics park. This is located on the north bank 7 miles downstream of central Gravesend.
- 4.14 During a visit to the port it was noted that the port was in operation at about 25% capacity. The port is capable of accommodating the largest container ships with an impressive storage and logistics centre. Marks & Spencer's southern distribution centre will be located on site.
- 4.15 In addition to taking the world's largest container ships with their crew, this will create 12,000 direct jobs over the next 10 years. Presently 10% (33 people) of employees are from south of the Thames. A travel pattern is shown on the table in Appendix 4. Most come from Medway, Gravesham and Dartford, but others travel from as far as Ashford.
- 4.16 London Gateway are confronting their sustainable travel plan and realise that access from Gravesend via river ferry is a realistic option. They have made available a berth to the western end of the port which can receive a ferry without interruption from the container ship traffic.
- 4.17 At its peak, after 10 years development, the potential proportion of people coming from south of the Thames is likely to be in the region of 1,200. These will be split into four shifts to provide 24 hour seven day coverage for the Port. Hence each shift will require approximately 300 people. The rotating shift changes are at 6am, 2pm and 10pm, with one shift always resting.
- 4.18 Tilbury has expressed an interest in being part of the service to and from London Gateway. This is likely to increase the viability of the service and will potentially allow mooring during rest periods at either the Pontoon or at the Tilbury side.
- 4.19 A Thames based vessel operator has expressed considerable interest in this service and their vessel could accommodate 200 on each trip. The likelihood is that the demand for 200 passengers will not be achieved for some time, but the service could be dovetailed into the commuter service to the Capital, with the ferry mooring after the evening return journey until ready for the evening trip. Other trips could be piggy-backed onto the early morning London service. The ferry operator would be expected to pay a service charge for use of the pontoon.

### ***Ferry access to the Pontoon***

- 4.20 There may be times when the pontoon is quite full with other vessels and the Gateway and London ferry would appear to be precluded from mooring; however there is little evidence that investing in a significant extension to the pontoon would be value for money. The evidence at this time is that there are only about ten days a year when the pontoon is full. This would be when the Waverley is in the town.

- 4.21 A consideration for the future, after the letting of the contract for the Gravesend - Tilbury ferry now, or in three years time, at renewal, is that the present operator may not be retained. If this is the case the owner may be open to offers to sell his West Pier. However it appears that the state of repair is poor and it may well be more economically viable to install a modular extension to the pontoon.
- 4.22 In the short term the West Pier facility could supplement the pontoon resource, before evidence is gathered to support an economic case for procurement. Alternatively, the use of partner's resources in Tilbury may be possible.

## 5. OPTIONS ANALYSIS

### ***Option 1 – do nothing***

- 5.1 If there remains no change to the present usage and management then the outturn will be that the pontoon will continue to cost Gravesham Borough Council £15,000 per annum but without the security of a robust organisation to manage the facility.
- 5.2 It could continue as it stands but there remains the potential for increased usage which will strain the resources of the existing managers.
- 5.3 The organic development of take up of the pontoon as a mooring is unlikely as it would appear that regular marketing would be a priority to achieve this.
- 5.4 Marketing the pontoon to a greater degree than that which has already taken place may generate more casual usage, but at about £3/metre/day, even were the pontoon full only £120 per day could be realised, or at 100% usage £43,800 return could be achieved. This is unlikely given the seasonal nature of recreational vessel usage and usage to date.
- 5.5 Doing nothing would mean missing out on the potential to run ferries to London, Paramount and London Gateway will have a negative impact on Gravesend communities and the surrounding areas.
- 5.6 By doing nothing there will be no added strain upon the car parking resources close to the river.
- 5.7 Remaining unchanged it is accepted that there may need to be a change in managers in time. The pontoon will remain under-utilised and will continue as a revenue cost the Council.

### ***Option 2 – Managed by contractors and accepting the new ferries***

- 5.8 It is presumed that it will take at least one year to negotiate a commuter ferry service to London with a willing contractor. In the meantime it will be necessary to ensure that ultimately there could be some car parking demand from commuters on weekdays.
- 5.9 The proportion that will need parking capacity will be considerably mitigated by a joint arrangement with a coach operator to bus-in a significant number of commuters to Gravesend, from Medway to use the commuter services. It is recognised that an additional proportion will be “dropped off” by partners and friends using a stopping area.

- 5.10 The ferry link to London Gateway could be under way in a similar time frame. Presently with only 33 employees south of the Thames, this would be uneconomic at this time, but must be brought forward as part of the sustainable travel plan.
- 5.11 The development of the ferry link will depend upon GBC acting as facilitator of a relationship between a ferry provider and the Gateway. It is strongly recommended that introductions are made between the Gateway and a potential contractor, for example one which delivers ferry and tourism services within London.
- 5.12 The parking situation to accommodate the potential passengers for London Gateway should be based upon three peaks where those arriving will be parking whilst those leaving will not yet have left the port.
- 5.13 As the Gateway's enthusiasm for the ferry is based upon their need to provide a green transport plan, it seems likely that they could organise a car share or public transport access system, relieving this to some degree. It will be necessary however to consider that access times are not generally contemporary with rush hour frequency public transport.
- 5.14 It should be considered that there is the opportunity for the use of a scheduled coach service link to the pontoon as for those who are commuting to London.
- 5.15 Access to the pontoon early in the morning and late in evenings to service the Gateway ferry would be impossible on the present arrangement of opening the pontoon access door, presently in the gift of Riva. An automatic opening door triggered from a central point has been explored by GBC officers and appears economic. Simple code operated doors could be provided even more economically and could be activated by ferry crews and be provided to casual users for out-of-hours use upon payment of a mooring fee. The code should be regularly changed.
- 5.16 The present management team has attempted to market the pontoon to sailors and casual vessels with limited success. The outlets for their marketing information appear to be appropriate and the response remains disappointing. There is there no evidence that at infrequent "busy times" there will be insufficient capacity for the new ferry services. There is little evidence that at this time there is a case for extending the pontoon.
- 5.17 If pontoon management goes to tender, the successful tenderer may wish to carry out all aspects themselves. Alternatively, they may wish to sub contract day to day work to LRM. This is a decision for GBC to make, dependent on the tender submissions At this time it should be recognised that its main usages will be ferry provision with secondary usage being casual users.
- 5.18 Strategic management and marketing the pontoon to ferries and casual users should be through the commissioned contractor with a profit share agreement negotiated by the Council. This will allow

contractors with strategic management and marketing experience and with an understanding of sailing, and moorings to keep promoting and managing the facilities. They will have the experience and understanding of the economics of the business to signal to the Council when to trigger an examination of adding a module to increase the mooring capacity.

- 5.19 The capital cost for modifying the gates could be less than £1,500, and revenue costs to LRM should remain the same (£15,000) but there will be some added costs to secure the services of the strategic contractor. This must be mitigated by the provision in the contract of a profit sharing clause. This will incentivise the contractor to increase the use of the pontoon by casual and ferry users.
- 5.20 It is impossible to estimate the surplus because the fees that may be paid by ferry operators cannot be established at this time.

### ***Option 3 – Increasing mooring capacity***

- 5.21 This option is similar to Option 1 except that there is greater capacity by either extending the pontoon or procuring additional moorings.
- 5.22 The cost of extending the pontoon is presently being explored by GBC. But it is our view that the investment should follow a significant increase in usage to evidence need. It would require that there were at least two new pile driven uprights to secure the new facility. This would require licensing from the Port of London Authority.
- 5.23 The type of extension would not have to reflect the current pontoon's design. It could be a standard system tailored to relate to the built pontoon, linking elements to allow passenger traffic between the new and existing pontoons, plus one or two new piles.
- 5.24 Extending the present pontoon to double its length would add up to 40 metres of mooring capacity (both sides of the pontoon) with a potential at approximately £3/m is similar to the present potential income, however there is little indication that sufficient increase in income could forthcoming.
- 5.25 An alternative suggestion could be the purchase of West Pier. This would provide overspill capacity but it is in poor condition. The cost of the site will depend upon the financial strength of the vendor at the time of approach.
- 5.26 It is difficult to justify in economic terms an extended pontoon at this time.



## 6 CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

- 6.1 There is clearly a case for two new ferry services to operate from the Pontoon.
- 6.2 It is recommended that option 2 is adopted and that management and control are as suggested. This will have a cost that is neutralised by increased surpluses.
- 6.3 Emphasis for use of the pontoon should be shifted to ferry operation, with income from casual users secondary. Casual use should be promoted through GBC, its contractors and perhaps the TownCentric team with a dedicated budget from the Council for marketing the pontoon. Take up of capacity will be gradual.
- 6.4 GBC should work with potential service suppliers to develop ferry services to London and Paramount with additional services to London Gateway. As this service will be commercial and is not commissioned by GBC or partners the Council can act as honest broker for the new services. This must include departure fees charged to the operators of the ferries. An existing ferry provider has expressed interest, but other service providers have not expressed interest, however those who have tendered for the Gravesend-Tilbury ferry could be approached.
- 6.5 Links to scheduled coach service providers that service the pontoon should be developed to mitigate the impact on Gravesend. This should be put in place contemporaneously with the development of the new ferry routes.
- 6.6 Fees charged to casual users should remain unchanged at approximately £3/m. Larger pleasure vessels will be by negotiation.
- 6.7 The flexibility of the mooring resources in St Andrew's, the PLA buoys and the pontoon should allow for considerable traffic growth during the expansion period and the strategic contractors should advise GBC when the need to increase the pontoon length is required. There must be an economic case for this and a repayment on capital that is greater than any borrowing or opportunity costs.

## APPENDIX 1 – TILBURY – GRAVESEND FERRY SCHEDULE 2014

### *Gravesend – Tilbury (Monday - Saturday)*

0540 (from West Pier);	1230;
0610;	1300;
0645 (not Saturdays);	1330;
0710;	1400;
0740;	1505;
0810;	1530;
0840;	1600;
0900;	1630;
1005;	1700;
1030;	1730;
1100;	1800;
1130;	1830;
1200;	1900

### *Tilbury – Gravesend (Monday – Saturday)*

0550;	1742;
0620;	1812;
0655 (not Saturdays);	1910 (to West Pier)
0725;	
0800;	
0850;	
0910 (to West Pier);	
1015;	
1042;	
1112;	
1142;	
1212;	
1242;	
1312;	
1342;	
1410(to West Pier);	
1515;	
1542;	
1612;	
1642;	
1712;	

## APPENDIX 2 – PRESENT FINANCIAL TABLES

**Table 1**

INCOME:				
Source of income	Cost per Night/Stay	Number of visits	Accrued Value of Visit	
Private leisure craft @ £30 per night:	£30.00	56	£ 1,680.00	
Commercial vessels (invoiced) @ £30 per stay:	£30.00	15	£ 450.00	
Private Thames barges @ £30 per night	£30.00	5	£ 150.00	
Charter craft x 3 periods:		3	£ 715.49	
Waverley (Paddle Steamer) from Sept 28-October 13th berthing including waste disposal and water:		16 days	£ 3,567.57	
<b>Sub-Total</b>			<b>£ 6,563.06</b>	<b>£ 6,563.06</b>
Gravesham BC pay a subsidy of £1250 per month				<b>£ 15,000.00</b>
<b>Total Income</b>				<b>£ 21,563.06</b>
<b>Total visits in excess of Tilbury Ferry</b>		<b>79 Casual visits</b>		
		<b>16 days of Waverley</b>		
		<b>Use by Tilbury Ferry 25 services, Mon-Sat</b>		

**Table 2**

<b>Costs of servicing pontoon</b>			
	Electricity paid to Culinary Solutions (Riva):	(£ 1,650.00)	
	Water paid to Culinary Solutions (Riva):	(£ 500.00)	
	Management fees:	(£ 2,400.00)	
	Accountancy:	(£ 580.00)	
	Office Expenses:	(£ 800.00)	
	Pontoon Supervision:	(£ 800.00)	
	Banner:	(£ 180.00)	
	Bank charges:	(£ 200.00)	
	<b>Total Expenditure</b>		<b>(£ 7,110.00)</b>

## **Appendix 3**

**THIS PAGE IS DELIBERATELY BLANK**

---

## APPENDIX 4

### Postcodes of London Gateway employees south of the Thames

CT12 4BT		ME17 4SP
CT5 2LJ		ME2 4GX
CT9 5NL		ME3 8HT
DA10 0DQ		ME3 9QY
DA10 0JP		ME4 5BN
DA11 8PH		ME5 0TX
DA11 8SA		ME5 8LS
DA11 9NT		ME5 9UL
DA12 4DN		ME7 2TS
DA12 4RA		ME7 4BJ
DA12 5AZ		ME8 9NA
DA12 5UL		ME9 7NF
DA15 7PD		TN15 6RU
DA2 6DA		TN23 3RE
DA6 8JZ		TN24 9JP
DA7 6RU		