

Inland Waterways Amenity Advisory Council

**REPORT
ON
WATERWAY RESTORATION PRIORITIES**

SUMMARY

Background

Over the last 40 years, and inspired largely by the voluntary sector, more than 700 kms of Britain's inland waterways have been restored for navigation. The work has revitalised areas of our transport and industrial heritage, generated jobs and development, and increased the opportunities for leisure, recreation and tourism. At least as much remains to be done.

Access to funding from Europe and national grants for economic regeneration and environmental improvement, followed by the multi-million grants for waterway projects from the Millennium and Heritage Lottery Funds, fuelled hopes within the restoration movement that large-scale restoration had come to stay.

Competition, however, is fierce, the project development process complex and funding sources for comprehensive large-scale restorations unpredictable. The Government decided in 1997 that an overview of priorities was needed. This report is the outcome.

What is covered

It covers 80 projects, spread throughout the UK, whose promoters responded to a questionnaire asking each for details of their proposals. The focus is on restoration of un-navigable waterways or un-navigable lengths of waterways for leisure cruising but the report also includes restorations of historic navigation structures and some proposals for new leisure waterways. References to complete restoration do not preclude interim or partial restorations towards the goal of full restoration.

Assessing the projects

The questionnaire was designed to identify, against published criteria referring to the key stages of the restoration process, the objectives and significance of each project, the benefits to be gained, the stage it had reached and what remained to be done. The Council then assessed when each project appeared likely to be ready for all, or a significant part, of its main funding, distinguishing short term (approximately one to five years), medium term (five to ten years) and longer term (beyond ten years). The information base is as of mid 1998 but the assessment should, in broad terms, be robust beyond this until it is repeated.

The Council also made its own assessment of the historical importance and nature conservation interest of each waterway/structure.

The assesment

Of the 80 projects (see **Map** following and listings in the *Main Schedule Annex A*), the following

- 12 others likely to be ready for main funding in the **medium term** (see Section 5) :

in England, projects listed for the Burslem Branch, Thames and Severn Canal, Dorset & Somerset Canal, Ipswich and Stowmarket Navigation, Lichfield Canal, Northern Reaches of Lancaster Canal, North Walsham and Dilham Canal, Sleaford Navigation, Somerset Coal Canal, Worsley Delph and Wyrley Branch;
in Northern Ireland, the Ulster Canal;

- 47 others (see Section 6) whose current status indicates that readiness for main funding will occur in the **longer term**. Some of these projects require a great deal of work before they can be considered further but a number will be able to make progress on interim projects pending full restoration. Funding agencies and local authorities should consider their needs with care.

Recommendations

Section 7 is a series of recommendations, designed to assist and progress restoration activity, addressed to Government, funding agencies, local authorities, navigation and regulatory bodies, and those promoting schemes. They cover:

- funding from agencies, particularly from the new Regional Development Agencies (and national agencies in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland), and National Lottery funding bodies;
- action by Government on the issue of new roads crossing disused waterways, on national planning guidance and on future management of completed projects;
- the focus for Heritage Lottery funding;
- action by local authorities;
- good practice in project development, and in respect of built heritage and environmental matters.

The Council will take up the recommendations as appropriate with the organisations concerned.

Next steps

The Council believes that money invested in worthwhile waterway restoration is money well spent and that restoration work merits its place in the policies and programmes of funding agencies. All projects listed in the report have something to offer. How far each project accords with their priorities and offers value for money is for funding agencies to judge as individual applications come forward. The Council hopes that the report and main schedule will help to inform the resource allocation and decision-making processes of funding agencies, regulatory bodies and other key parties who need to be consulted.

Monitoring and updating

If Ministerial approval is forthcoming, and given the necessary resources, the Council is willing to

1 INTRODUCTION

About this report

1.1 This report concerns the current status of some 80 waterway restoration projects in the United Kingdom. They range from the restoration of an individual navigation structure to the re-opening for navigation of a waterway of more than 100 kms, from projects costing tens of thousands of pounds to ones costing tens of millions, from projects where work is about to start to proposals which are little more than a gleam in their promoter's eye.

1.2 What follows is an overview of all this activity. It records what the promoters of each project have told the Council they are trying to do, how far they have progressed and what remains to be done. It then assesses each against published criteria and reviews when it will be ready for significant funding for completion - in the short term (one to five years), in the medium term (approximately five to ten years) and in the longer term (beyond ten years).

1.3 This, in the Council's view, was the fairest means of assessing priorities. There is, therefore, no rigid prioritisation of schemes by numerical ranking: no recommendations that Project A should go forward and Project B should not: no discrimination against local projects and smaller voluntary bodies. Nor does the report seek to interpose itself between applicants and funding agencies.

1.4 Funding is the key issue and funders are the primary audience for the report but they will continue, as now, to be guided primarily by their own criteria and the merits of each application. Nonetheless, for them, for local authorities and for everyone involved in waterway restoration, the Council hopes that this report will provide a useful contribution to the restoration scene.

1.5 It is quite clear that funding sources will remain at least as unpredictable in the future as they have in the past and that they could easily be more constrained, by changes to criteria or to geographical boundaries. A pro-active restoration body will already know how important it is to be flexible in the packaging and promotion of its proposals.

1.6 The information base is, of course, valid only as at mid-1998 but, in terms of readiness for significant funding, the assessment overall should be robust for some time. No category, however, is permanent. Projects in the short term category will reach completion. Others will take their place. Development of some projects will accelerate.

to restoration bodies to exploit every opportunity for partial funding towards the goal of full restoration.

1.9 The restoration scene is characterised not only by a remarkable range of voluntary effort and commitment extending over years, indeed decades, but also by the scope for productive investment in waterways which this report demonstrates is available to funding agencies. The restoration of more than 700 kms over the last 40 years has revitalised key parts of the country's transport and industrial heritage, generated jobs and development, and increased the opportunities for leisure, recreation and tourism.

1.10 At least as much remains to be done. The Recommendations at the end of this report are addressed to Government, funders, local authorities, regulatory and navigation authorities, and voluntary organisations in an effort to improve the prospects of this being achieved.

Origins of the study

1.10 The Council most recently expressed support for sustainable restoration of abandoned inland navigations in its 1996 Consultative Report ***Britain's Inland Waterways – An Undervalued Asset***. The Report pointed to the value of a restored waterway to the surrounding community and to the heritage, environmental, economic, social and other benefits which could be derived from it.

1.11 In response to the Report, some funding agencies, and others concerned with inland waterways projects, expressed the view that, admirable as it was, restoration activity needed a more coherent national overview and a demonstration as to how individual projects related to the waterways system as a whole.

1.12 The Council accepted this view and in its ***Final Recommendations (2.3)***, submitted to Government in 1997, suggested that the issue might form part of the work of the newly-established Association of Inland Navigation Authorities (AINA), already charged by Government with identifying the main aims and priorities for inland waterways. In the event the Council, with the support of AINA, agreed to undertake the study.

1.13 As the work involved, for the most part, many waterways other than those managed by British Waterways (BW), it was strictly speaking outside the Council's statutory remit. Angela Eagle MP, the Waterways Minister at the Department of the Environment Transport and the Regions (DETR), considered therefore whether the Council should become

2 WHY AN OVERVIEW IS NEEDED

Growth of Restoration Activity

2.1 Interest in restoring navigation for recreational use on the national legacy of abandoned and unused waterways – canals and rivers, which were once navigable and used for commercial traffic, until overtaken by rail and road - has grown rapidly in the post war period. The movement first developed under the inspiration of a handful of pioneers, who established the Inland Waterways Association (IWA), in the 1940s. Some remarkable successes were achieved, against stiff opposition from Government and BW's predecessor body (the British Transport Commission) in the 1950s and 1960s.

2.2 Activity gathered pace from the late 1960s, with the official recognition of the leisure potential of the waterways, with the setting up of BW and with the opportunities which appeared for working on the Board's Remainder Waterways. Work also began on some historic waterways outside the BW system. These tended to present more difficulty because of the need to overcome problems of fragmented ownership.

2.3 **Table 1** (extracted from a *Supplementary Paper* to the Council's **Undervalued Asset** Report), shows some of the restoration projects completed since 1955. If progress to date has been commendable, a great deal of potential remains. **Table 2** shows the estimated extent of un-navigable waterways at the time of the Council's Report in 1996.

Funding sources

2.4 There has never been a central fund earmarked for waterway restoration work or for meeting the running costs of completed projects. Government, while broadly supportive of restoring navigations where justified, is acutely conscious of BW's and EA's existing liabilities, and will not permit Exchequer grant meant for upkeep of the publicly maintained systems to be spent on restoration work or on maintaining completed projects. Other waterways receive no support for upkeep anyway. Money for restoration has thus always had to be found from whatever other Government budgets or other sources are available at the time.

2.5 In the early days, work was done mainly by volunteers, through work camps, under youth and Government training opportunities programmes, with help from the army, and even by prison labour. The general approach had to change to be successful and

important part. Private funding came into play where waterside property development could be involved as a source of additional finance.

2.8 As closer links with local authorities (LAs) were necessary in order to take full advantage of the potential resources on offer, partnerships were formed to put together funding packages for comprehensive restoration projects, using a mix of public and private money.

2.9 More recently, the approval of Millennium Lottery funding for the completion of the Scottish Millennium Link, Rochdale Canal and Huddersfield Narrow Canal projects and the construction of the Ribble Link, plus the Heritage Lottery Fund's (HLF) substantial grant to secure the restoration of the Kennet and Avon Canal, have served to encourage hopes that further major projects will now be able to reach completion, indeed that almost all former navigations may now be restorable.

2.10 Completely new recreational navigations have also been proposed in recent years, mainly to link existing waterways and hence create and develop leisure cruising options.

Scene changes

2.11 Over the past 40 years, waterway restoration has grown from an almost exclusively grass roots movement into one where the voluntary sector, while still retaining its commitment and vision, has had to learn how to prepare for and manage multi-million pound projects, requiring a high degree of professional input and demanding a more systematic approach to their implementation.

2.12 This is evident from the typical steps involved in getting any restoration project going and working it up to a stage where large scale funding can be sought, namely:

- securing local political and public support;
- gaining the agreement of BW or other navigation authority and/or land owner(s) concerned;
- establishing, via a professional study, engineering and water supply needs, environmental impacts and other issues of feasibility, and the financial costs of the work;
- identifying the benefits to provide justification for potential sources of capital funding; and preparing a business plan, these also calling for a professional study;

2.13 Some aspects have become simpler. If new legislation was needed for early restoration proposals a private Act of Parliament had to be promoted, often an expensive and lengthy process. The Transport and Works Act (TWA) now offers a relatively simple, inexpensive way for promoters to obtain simultaneously all the powers needed for restoration, operation and management.

2.14 Other aspects remain difficult. The cost and complexity of land acquisition, together with opposition from land owners and conservation interests, present huge obstacles for some projects. Restoration of river navigations, which adds to the use of an existing waterway and raises land drainage issues, can be particularly contentious. Where canal restoration involves the re-watering of a dry canal line it often raises water resource and supply issues, even where from another perspective it may offer an environmental gain.

2.15 Yet other aspects have become more complex in recent years. Increased awareness of the need for conservation of the built and natural environment means that greater emphasis is placed nowadays on the quality of restorations, on the assessment of environmental impacts and benefits and on consultation with those potentially affected by restoration proposals, to identify issues and resolve difficulties early on.

2.16 Local authorities (LAs) have an increasing interest in restoration. Their statutory planning powers are essential for the protection of the line of disused canals pending restoration, and their support is often crucial for funding for preliminary studies of projects, for coordinating funding applications and, if necessary, for assistance with the cost of upkeep of the restored waterway.

2.17 Many authorities are now persuaded that restored waterways offer significant benefits, economic and social, and there are several examples of projects being successfully promoted by partnerships between LAs, restoration groups and waterway authorities. However, not all LAs are yet willing or able to make the necessary practical and financial commitments.

2.18 In England, the relevant planning guidance, which might encourage a more enlightened and proactive approach from LAs, is scattered over several DETR Planning Policy Guidance Notes (PPGs) and fails to draw together the relevant strands. The lack of protection afforded for disused waterways in the Highways Act 1980 allows them to be severed by new roads whilst awaiting restoration. Long-promised revised policy advice for those preparing road proposals has yet to emerge from DETR and the Highways Agency.

2.21 To gain their support, a wide range of economic, social and environmental benefits have to be offered in forms clearly relevant to the objectives and criteria of those agencies and authorities. Enthusiasm for an expansion of leisure cruising is not, in itself, usually sufficient. Some voluntary groups are clearly not adequately organised or resourced to cope with the complexities involved in assembling and making the case for restoration funding.

2.22 To some funding agencies, on the other hand, the restoration scene must appear particularly confusing. They see a plethora of projects and proposals, involving in some cases very large sums of money, and struggle to make sense of it in terms of what is important and where the priorities should be. The responses the Council received to its 1996 consultative report remain valid.

Future funding

2.23 Money from the European Union (EU), English Partnerships (EP) and the recent National Lottery funding approvals have fuelled expectations of continued funding for large-scale restoration. These may or may not be fulfilled.

2.24 While the useful Landfill Tax Credit Scheme, overseen by ENTRUST (the Environmental Trust Scheme Regulatory Body), should make an increasing contribution, the most urgent need is for the new Regional Development Agencies (RDAs) in England, and their national equivalents in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, to continue their commitment on land reclamation funding and fill the gap left by the loss of EP funding for those projects which provide major economic and environmental improvements. The HLF's commitment to important heritage-led restoration schemes must also be maintained. If these are not done, a number of very worthwhile schemes will face a serious shortfall in funding.

2.25 Restoration promoters will need to respond to new policy priorities, criteria and boundaries by exploiting the strengths of restoration activity, especially the extent to which it can be phased and the range of benefits it can provide. It has also to be recognised that there will be strong competition between the individual projects for finite resources. In the absence of a central funding programme for restoration, and as funding regimes alter and available monies fluctuate, an overview which sets out the range and significance of projects available for funding becomes essential.

3 THE STUDY

Approach

3.1 The formal work was carried out between September 1997 and June 1998. A Member-level Working Group, with co-opted members from the local authority and voluntary sectors, was established to pursue the study, reporting regularly to the full Council.

3.2 The Group's first decision in September last year was to pursue an appraisal system which avoided crude numerical ranking and did not discriminate against local projects or smaller voluntary groups. This was communicated in January to the IWA Restoration Committee, by way of reassurance for IWA members.

3.3 With the possible number of projects and proposals to be considered exceeding

reached? Did it have a realistic expectation of being achieved over a reasonable timescale of, say five, ten or 15 years? Such an appraisal would provide for waterway organisations, funding agencies and other interested bodies who need to make sense of the restoration scene, as comprehensive, comparative and objective a view of current known restoration projects as possible, together with some considered advice about restoration in general.

3.6 It is not the Council's business to interpose itself between applicants and funding bodies. Their decisions can take this report into account but it can neither guarantee funding nor determine failure to secure approval.

Consultation

3.7 A two stage approach was adopted, first consulting on draft key assessment criteria applicable to the restoration process, then going on to devise a questionnaire.

3.8 As the first stage, a letter from the Council Chair, Lady Knollys, issued in October 1997 to restoration organisations and others interested parties, consulted on the proposed assessment criteria and on the detail of a schedule of abandoned waterways and known restoration projects in order to establish an accurate database.

3.9 Interested bodies have been kept in touch with progress throughout and received copies of the October 1997 consultation and February 1998 questionnaire packages. National bodies consulted included BW, EA, AINA, the Lottery Funds, the Countryside Commission, EP, English Nature and their Welsh, Scottish and Northern Ireland equivalents. All have been supportive and the HLF responded that the study was timely in view of the HLF Trustees' decision to review their contribution to waterway restoration because of the switch of National Lottery funding to a new sixth "good cause".

British Waterways aspects

3.10 As statutory adviser to the British Waterways Board, the Council has kept in close touch with BW throughout the study. The extent of the Board's commitment and involvement in respect of projects for its own waterways varies from case to case, but they all require BW's endorsement as landowner and manager. Restoration of other waterways outside BW control, the majority of projects in this study, but which interconnect with BW waterways may also have implications for the Board's business and water supply or raise other issues.

3.12 The EA has issued for comment a consultation draft as a National User Forum Paper *Environmental Assessment of Inland Waterways*. (NNUF (98)4). Previous advice is contained in *the NRA Guidance note on the Environmental Impact Assessment of Canal Restoration* (January 1997). In January 1998 the Agency published *An Action Plan for Navigation*, which emphasises the need to integrate navigation with other channel functions in catchment management and to take careful account of environmental issues when developing inland navigation.

Heritage Lottery Fund aspects

3.13 The HLF introduced a moratorium on waterway project applications pending the outcome of this study, although it has continued to take decisions on certain applications received before the study began. The Council has had no contact with the Fund on these cases, or indeed on any other.

3.14 Issues raised by the HLF review and the moratorium have been discussed with the Fund's officers who stressed:

- that nature conservation and industrial archaeology should be properly considered;
- the importance of free access for the public to the waterway in contrast to any suggestions that charges might be introduced for towpath use; and
- the need to address the issue of additionality in relation to work on BW and EA waterways.

3.15 The Fund's current criteria and priorities for waterway restoration were published in March 1998 and are:

- the historical significance of the canal or structure should be central to any application, for example logistical importance, date of construction, the extent to which engineering features were innovative;
- the restoration of working waterway landscapes will be assessed on the basis of the benefits to the network as a whole, rather than as isolated examples;
- HLF will only consider support for historic elements of the canal system when financial need can be demonstrated. Applicants will have to demonstrate that other bodies with responsibilities for canals have contributed where applicable;
- strong access, recreational, ecological and educational benefits should be demonstrated;

The HLF has promised revised guidance on canals to prospective applicants at the end of its policy review which will take this report into account.

3.17 The HLF has also set up the Local Heritage initiative with the Countryside Commission. This may be of value for some small restoration schemes.

Questionnaire

3.18 Suggestions and comments in response to the October 1997 consultation letter were reflected in the final agreed key assessment criteria and the questionnaire which issued on 10 February 1998, together with the revised schedule of waterways and projects. This was sent to over 90 bodies in respect of some 150 projects, as the second stage of the exercise.

3.19 The questionnaire was lengthy but was designed to elicit responses covering the six key criteria and all the stages set out in para 2.12 above. The criteria, covering **feasibility, benefits, disbenefits, sustainability** (both in environmental and exit strategy meanings), **implementation** and **vision** are set out in full in **Annex A page E**. Four weeks were allowed for reply but many responses took longer to arrive. All received up to early June have been included in the analysis.

Response

3.20 The response was excellent. More than 80 questionnaires were returned, including a number completed in respect of projects for which no lead restoration body had been identified. There was no response for 14 projects (see list in the **Commentary to Main Schedule, Annex A page A**). Individual responses are available for inspection at the Council's office, unless respondents have specifically asked that they remain confidential.

3.21 Responses in respect of projects concerning BW's waterways have been sent to the Board for comment, in view of its interest as owner and navigation authority. In some cases where BW is closely involved in progressing schemes BW staff have completed the questionnaire.

What is included?

3.24 The main emphasis is on restoration for navigation of all or substantial lengths of a waterway. Restoration organisations and funding agencies should note, however, that the Council's conclusions are not intended to preclude works to safeguard a waterway route or structure against loss by decay, pending restoration at some time in the future, nor funding of restoration of individual structures and features integral to a waterway, in isolation or in advance of a main project.

3.25 This may well be justified, for example, where a discrete, free-standing project can serve to demonstrate what is possible in order to attract further investment, or is ready to proceed ahead of the rest of the project and can provide benefits whether or not the overall scheme proceeds. It may also be appropriate for work to conserve decaying structures so that they survive to become potential subjects for full restoration.

3.26 The majority of projects concern non-BW waterways. None of the BW/EA projects appears to include work which should properly be considered part of their statutory day-to-day maintenance responsibilities for operational waterways.

The assessment (see Map and Main Schedule, Annex A)

3.27 A full explanation of the basis of the assessment is given in the **Commentary, pages A-D in Annex A**. Certain features need to be emphasised, in particular;

- it incorporates the independent assessment, carried out by Council Members on the Working Group, consulting where necessary with external experts, to rate the historical importance (waterways and structures) and nature conservation interest of the waterway/structure in its present state. This is an initial assessment in a field where a comprehensive evaluation is currently lacking. If resources are available, the Council hopes to refine and develop the work and would welcome comments and inputs to this end;
- apart from this, and some of the factual material presented, the assessments are based entirely on the responses to the questionnaires. Given the nature of the exercise, it is impossible for the Council to be able to vouch absolutely for the accuracy of the responses made in the questionnaires. The Council has had necessarily to accept the information in good faith in assessing whether a project appeared ready for funding. Funding agencies will still wish to satisfy themselves in each case that individual applications meet eligibility criteria, that statutory bodies have been consulted and that any necessary consents will be forthcoming.

This allows schemes of national, regional and local significance to be considered together, does not involve the Council in unrealistically detailed judgements about the quality and value of schemes, and should be useful to funding agencies, including local authorities, when considering the possible time-scale for significant spending commitments;

- **the information on which the main assessment is based constitutes a snap-shot of restoration activity in the first half of 1998. The Council believes that the assessment, by and large, will remain robust for some time but it is well aware that individual projects develop and evolve and that their situation can readily change. No project is, or should be, regarded as “relegated” in perpetuity to the medium and longer term categories. They are spurs to progress not sentences. They serve to highlight what more needs to be done. The Council’s objective, as this exercise is repeated in the future, is to see all worthwhile and feasible projects progress ultimately into the short term category and so to completion.**

4 PROJECTS FOR MAIN FUNDING IN THE SHORT TERM

Overview

4.1 Of the responses to the questionnaire, there are **twenty one** projects (**Table 3**) judged as ready for funding in the short term. They comprise a range of projects located throughout the country but predominantly in the Midlands and North, plus one in Scotland, three in Wales and two in Northern Ireland. They in the main concern BW Remainder Waterways, although some are in other/private hands. Most are well advanced, but two have emerged relatively recently.

4.2 Half have costs in excess of £10m but there are relatively inexpensive schemes as well as large ones. The total estimated spend involved is £378m. Discounting the three Millennium projects (see para 4.3 below) that total reduces to £247m. All have something significant to offer - nationally, regionally or locally. Funding bodies will be able to see which projects best match their respective priorities and the level of funding available in each area.

Millennium projects

Other projects by region

East Midlands

4.5 Five projects, three concerned mainly with regeneration of the local economy, one to allow full navigation on a recently restored waterway and one with heritage tourism potential.

Ancholme Navigation (£60,000) *Local status. Restoration of a lock which will allow access to the already restored upper section of the waterway. This will complete the earlier restoration and provide a local recreational facility at very modest cost. Once completed it will also strengthen the rationale for constructing an Ancholme-Rase Link (see projects for longer term funding below) thereby creating a useful cross-country recreational link.*

Ashby Canal (£10m) *Regional status. Restoration of the former Ashby Canal from its present terminus at Snarestone to Measham (with at some possible future date the final length to Moira, not included in present cost). A rural waterway with restoration planned to revive the economy of a former mining area by acting as a catalyst for regeneration. There are historic associations –the Moira Furnace sits alongside the Canal above Measham - and there will be significant environmental gains. The restored length will connect with the existing BW-owned Ashby Canal. The response indicates a strong scheme, well worked out, with the land acquisition problem being addressed and with local authority and public support. Completion appears practical subject to funding, though some sensitive issues surround the effects of any consequent increase in boat traffic upon the wildlife interest of the currently navigable section of the Canal.*

Bugsworth Basin (£0.75m) *National status because of the outstanding historical importance of the site. Restoration of the waterway needs to be completed and secured. The main proposals involve new facilities for boaters and a new museum/interpretative centre for the unique canal/tramway interchange. Strong in heritage terms.*

Derby Canal (£30m) *Regional status. A large project with substantial benefits. It will reconnect to the national system at both ends thereby creating a new cruising ring, as well as offering employment, tourism, heritage, nature and leisure benefits for the area. It is not, however, in any special area for funding and the scheme is high cost (road severance and diversions) while the historic interest in the centre of Derby has been lost. The response, however, does indicate substantial recreational benefits, a strong regeneration case and local support. Restoration will produce a large extension to the national connected system from the Trent at Nottingham into a scenic rural sub-region with no other navigable water. There are no significant land assembly problems and, given local authority backing, deliverability is high notwithstanding the high cost and*

Anderton Lift (£6.9m) *National status. A BW Scheduled Monument of European importance and interest for waterway heritage. The Council hopes that a revised funding application will be successful so that this unique structure, the only lift on the network, can be restored to working condition.*

South East

4.7 Three projects, one to make a restored waterway reliably open for navigation, one for a small local heritage canal restoration and one for reducing the cost of water supply for a BW operational canal.

Basingstoke Canal post restoration projects (£1.7m) *Regional status. The proposals will improve the water supply to locks 1-6, and provide a lock gate workshop and visitor facilities. Like the Kennet and Avon, which preceded it, the Basingstoke Canal was re-opened without a satisfactory solution to its water supply problems. The use of its eastern link via the Wey to the Thames is severely constrained by shortage of water for the locks each summer. The waterway is of considerable historic interest and requires further work to make it open for navigation throughout the year.*

Chichester Ship Canal (£2.5m) *Local status as it is likely to remain an isolated navigation for some years.. Of historic importance, this short canal connects to an important South Coast marina. Restoration would be relatively straightforward.*

Wendover Arm (£8m) *Local status. A BW Remainder Waterway. Of limited historic importance and not in an area for special funding but a useful recreational and amenity addition to the system. The benefits will need to be carefully presented without over-reliance on the operational benefits to BW.*

South West

4.8 1 project, part of a historic national link

Cotswold Canals – Stroudwater Navigation (£10m) *Regional status in its own right but of national status, when taken together with the Thames & Severn Canal (see medium term projects), as part of the historic waterway link between the Thames and Severn. The Stroudwater in itself is an important heritage canal still owned by the original canal company, possibly the oldest surviving in the UK, and so relatively unhindered by land ownership and acquisition difficulties. Restoration offers valuable heritage, environmental and regeneration gains. For the maximum benefits to be achieved, both waterways will have to be fully restored and realistically managed, with legislation rationalised within a joint unit strategy.*

Droitwich Barge and Junction Canals (£5.5m) *National status* Both waterways and structures are of very considerable historic interest in a scenic area rich in industrial archaeology. Restoration offers benefits both for the locality and for waterway recreation (the connections to the Severn and the Worcester and Birmingham Canal make for a commercially attractive small cruising ring). There is local authority support including a large financial contribution, continuing beyond the recent County Council reorganisation, but no other special funding mechanisms are available.

Montgomery Canal (£9.5m in England) (see also under Wales) *National status.* An outstanding BW Remainder Waterway, of substantial historical and wildlife importance, involving major opportunities in the conservation of the built and natural heritage, rural regeneration and the only possible connection in Wales to the national system. Restoration is a long-standing BW commitment. Two lengths have already been restored and the rest should be a high priority for funding, although most likely programmed over several years because of the high cost and the time needed to complete the work.

Yorkshire & Humberside

4.10 One significant heritage project.

Pocklington Canal (£2.7m) *National status.* An unaltered rural canal with very important wildlife interest in unspoiled countryside. Restoration of this BW Remainder Waterway offers benefits for heritage, leisure, education and improved access, all compatible with a high degree of wildlife preservation. The short term ranking is intended to encourage an early resolution of conservation issues with English Nature. The project should be a high priority for funding.

Wales

4.11 One national scheme, a Welsh Marches waterway, with unique structures, heritage and waterway recreational importance; one large restoration, heritage, environmental and regional tourism project and two historical waterways, considered together, and geared to regeneration of their area.

Monmouthshire Canal (£32m) *Regional status.* A waterway of considerable historical importance. Restoration will link with the BW Monmouthshire and Brecon Canal and create a sub-regional tourist network for SE Wales. Other benefits include heritage enhancement for education, and protection of the canal corridor environment.

Montgomery Canal (£28.2m in Wales) (for rest see England/West Midlands)) *National status.* An outstanding BW Remainder Waterway, of substantial historical and wildlife importance,

4.12 Two significant projects in heritage and regeneration terms.

Lower Lagan Navigation (£7.5m) *National status for future connection to Lough Neagh and rest of Irish network. Of high historical interest because much of the built heritage survives and with substantial benefits for recreation, conservation, industrial heritage promotion, enhancing access to countryside and economic regeneration in the corridor. With the support of the Rivers Agency, this restoration should be deliverable.*

Newry Canal (£15m) *National status as for above because it is another strategic link in the Irish network but also because of its very high historical importance (it is the oldest summit level canal in the British Isles) and, like the Lower Lagan, it should be deliverable in a Northern Ireland context.*

5 PROJECTS FOR MAIN FUNDING IN THE MEDIUM TERM

Overview

5.1 The **twelve** projects assessed for medium term funding are shown in **Table 4**. They are spread throughout England, including for the first time some in East Anglia and the South West, with one in Northern Ireland (none in Wales or Scotland).

5.2 The list contains proportionately more rural and non-BW canals than the short term grouping. This may be accounted for by the greater difficulty which such canal projects, without a single controlling authority or owner and in rural areas, tend to experience in progressing schemes and attracting funding. They are grouped according to the Council's view of their strategic significance.

5.3 It is important that the three heritage projects of national status receive further assistance in order to make faster progress. In particular they need support from their local authorities and others to overcome problems associated with being ineligible for special regional funding, of multiple ownership, or the absence of a responsible controlling body, which may be holding back implementation. Partial funding, or resources for resolving difficulties, may allow them to make such progress. The remaining schemes would add to the system in various useful ways. They also appear capable of delivery.

National significance

5.4 There are three major heritage projects in this group:

Ulster Canal (£30m) (Northern Ireland) *The UK's only international restoration project. Jointly developed with the Irish Republic, it will restore the key strategic route in the Irish network linking the Erne and Shannon systems (which in turn link to Limerick, Waterford and Dublin) to Lough Neagh and the Lower Bann Navigation in the North East. It is less advanced than the Lower Lagan and Newry waterways listed in Section 4, largely because much of the land is in private hands, but it is at least as important and like them it should be deliverable.*

Regional significance

5.5 There are five projects in this group:

Lancaster Canal - Northern Reaches (c.£20m) (North West) *An important heritage canal. Restoration (coupled with the provision of the Ribble Link) will re-extend the northern limit of the national connected system, foreshortened at Tewitfield by the building of the M6 motorway, and so enhance the recreational and economic state of the rural corridor northwards to Kendal and into the Lake District National Park.*

Lichfield Canal (£9m plus land costs) (West Midlands) *A strategically important project for the creation of new cruising rings, the development of leisure cruising on the under-used northern part of the BW Birmingham Canal Navigations (BCN) system and the revitalisation of this part of the West Midlands.*

North Walsham & Dilham Canal (£1.1m) (Eastern) *Restoration of the only locked canal on the Broads, with heritage interest and with environmental and leisure benefits in the heart of a national tourism area.*

Sleaford Navigation (£4.3m) (East Midlands) *Restoration to navigation of an important early waterway, connecting to the Witham and on to the Trent and Wash, which, with restoration of the former navigation house and warehouses, will help to revive Sleaford town centre.*

Somersetshire Coal Canal (Not costed) (South West) *Protection of the line of the canal and of important remaining structures from decay, although restoration to navigation is not currently intended.*

Local significance

5.6 There are four in this group:

Burslem Branch (c.£5m) (West Midlands) *A local restoration and regeneration project providing*

6.1 There are **forty seven** projects currently assessed as longer term funding options (**Table 5**). They are mainly in England with one in Wales and one in Scotland. For all candidates in the longer term category the Council wishes to underline the points already made in para 3.27.

6.2 Positions will inevitably change as more immediately ready schemes move to completion. Groups promoting the longer term projects and proposals should see it as an incentive to make progress with whatever steps are needed - consolidating public and local authority support, ensuring the waterway or structure is safeguarded in the local development plan, preparing feasibility studies, exploring short-term initiatives for funding within their overall programme, and so on.

6.3 Three groups of projects merit particular mention: key heritage schemes; East Anglian waterway restoration projects and proposals for new links. There is further comment below on some very large individual schemes on which the Council would wish to see progress. There is, also, a number of other schemes potentially offering important recreation, regeneration and environmental benefits but for the majority of these there is too little information available at present to make for sensible comment.

Some key heritage schemes

6.4 In all these cases the Council wishes to see further progress made towards establishing via appropriate studies whether restoration is possible and what form it might take. The Council is pleased to note that a consultant's study of the Bude Canal has now been commissioned and that one is also proposed for the Foxton Inclined Plane. The need for high-quality work is emphasised in view of the nature and location of these former waterways/structures. On some projects, funding for restoration of individual structures should be pursued in advance of the main scheme.

National significance

Bude Canal (South West), *remarkable industrial archaeology with a tub boat section and six inclined planes.*

Foxton Inclined Plane (East Midlands), *site owned by BW, the only plane on the national system.*

Local significance

Louth Canal (East Midlands) *with unique barrel-shaped locks*

East Anglian waterway restoration projects

6.5 Several projects in East Anglia – eg **Blyth Navigation, Bottisham Lode, Bourne Eau, Ivel, Lark, Little Ouse, South Forty Foot Drain, Swaffham Bulbeck Lode, Waveney** – are mostly fairly modest, local status schemes which would provide useful additions and good gains for navigable length in return for, on the face of it, relatively little outlay. They do not necessarily require extensive preliminary studies to produce a workable scheme.

6.6 However, they will require some work and firmer costing before they can be considered for funding. Most of the questionnaire responses did not allow for a judgement as to what may be feasible and what constrained by environmental matters or water supply. The Council would like to see a more systematic approach and cooperative support from the relevant waterway recreation/navigation bodies to assess what can be achieved over a reasonable period of time.

Proposals for New Links

6.7 Taken together, the proposed **Higher Avon Phase II** and **Higher Avon–Leam Link** projects (both West Midlands) are considered of national significance because of the value of the link which would be created between the Severn/Avon and the Grand Union Canal but there are still outstanding questions as to environmental acceptability and feasibility.

6.8 An **Ancholme-Rase Link** and **Ancholme Witham Link**, both of local importance and a **Sleaford-Grantham Link**, of regional importance (all East Midlands), would provide expanded leisure potential but it is impossible to judge how practical they might be without further detailed study.

6.9 Other proposed links are a new waterway between the **Grand Union Canal and the Bedford-Great Ouse**, which would be of national significance, and one between the **Slough Arm and the Thames**, of regional significance. They appeared in the original schedule of projects but no responses were received to the questionnaires for them.

Other projects

Barnsley Dearne & Dove (Yorks & and Humber) and the **Wilts & Berks Canal** (South West/ South East) *both of regional status and both linking through to create new cruising rings as well as regeneration benefits but both high cost as they involve new, alternative canal routes. The Council believes that in both cases smaller interim projects, towards eventual full restoration, should be progressed within an overall programme.*

No active schemes

6.12 The Council is also aware of important heritage waterways/structures where there appears to be no active scheme for conservation and/or restoration. Among these are:

Chard & Ilminster Canal (South West) - *several significant heritage features survive on the line of this tub-boat canal, in particular the 1.6km long Crimson Hill Tunnel and its adjoining incline, embankments and aqueduct.*

Royal Military Canal (South East) - *a unique military defence canal which was also used for navigation. Virtually the whole waterway survives and is only partially conserved.*

6.13 There may also be other canals and also river navigations which contain features which should be conserved. Much more research is needed on surviving remains of former navigations and a responsible attitude to their protection by local authorities. The Council would welcome further information on all these and on any other potential waterway/structure restorations which do not appear on the project list.

7 RECOMMENDATIONS

7.1 This study has raised a number of issues, problems and weaknesses which the Council considers should be addressed to enable waterway restoration activity to progress and the multiple benefits it generates to be secured. The following recommendations are accordingly made for consideration, response and action to:

- **A Government**
- **B The Heritage Lottery Fund and other heritage bodies**
- **C Local Authorities**
- **D Regulatory and Navigation Authorities**
- **E Voluntary Restoration Organisations and others promoting restoration schemes**

For many voluntary organisations, the recommendations in E below will already be common

- ***A2 In Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland, the equivalent Government Development Agencies to maintain, and where possible enhance, their commitment to restoration as a priority in the use of resources.***

National Lottery Funding Bodies

- ***A3 The Heritage Lottery Fund to retain its distributor status of Lottery funds after 2001, in order to preserve a vital source of funding for heritage-led restoration projects.***
- ***A4 The Department for Culture, Media and Sport to consider how the gap in Lottery funding for waterway projects which provide environmental improvement and regeneration benefits can best be filled, either by the creation of a new funding distributor or by extending the remit of an existing body.***

A new funding mechanism

- ***A5 Government to consider and respond to the Council's recommendation in its Britain's Inland Waterways: An Undervalued Asset: Final Recommendations 1997 for the establishment of a Waterways Heritage Trust to draw in and disburse funds for waterway restoration.***

New roads crossing disused waterways

- ***A6 In view of the long standing nature of this problem, and the most recent decisions in respect of the Lichfield and Hatherton and Derby restoration projects, the DETR and Highways Agency to issue the long-promised guidance as a matter of urgency, after the previously agreed consultation with the Council.***

National planning guidance

- ***A7 In England, the DETR to draw together the current advice, spread through a number of Planning Policy Guidance (PPG) notes, into a single waterway PPG (or failing that some other kind of Government advisory document). This should make clear***
(a) that the PPG13 guidance about the importance of not severing the potential

B HERITAGE LOTTERY FUND (HLF) AND OTHER HERITAGE BODIES

- ***B1 The HLF to reconsider any reduction in its current commitment to heritage-led waterway restoration and to commit funding to selected and worthwhile large restoration projects, perhaps programmed over several years, as well as smaller projects for waterways and structures.***
- ***B2 The HLF to recognise the value of restoring important heritage waterways as working navigations and be more flexible in the application of their criteria for funding any necessary short new sections or new structures.***
- ***B3 English Heritage (and its equivalents in Wales, Scotland and Northern Ireland) to recognise that restoration involves many non-BW waterways, managed by small and local organisations which cannot necessarily be expected to have high levels of expertise in the identification and management of heritage projects, and therefore to work closely with the voluntary sector on ways to improve restoration practice, while recognising the need for restoration methods to be compatible with the requirements of a working waterway.***

C LOCAL AUTHORITIES

- ***C1 All projects to restore abandoned or derelict waterways, and all surviving lines of waterways, listed in this report, to be supported by the responsible local authorities including, where necessary, protection of the lines in the relevant statutory development plans.***
- ***C2 Where a restoration proposal is at a very early stage, the relevant local authority to ensure nothing is done which might pre-empt the possibility of restoration, pending proof of feasibility and value for money.***
- ***C3 Local authorities to ensure that their planning policies protect both waterways and their corridors for restoration, allow for the full benefits from restoration to be secured and for restored waterways to be self-financing as far as practicable.***
- ***C4 Local authorities to ensure that action is taken to record and safeguard any significant remains of disused waterways and structures in their areas, assess***

D REGULATORY AND NAVIGATION BODIES

Environment Agency (EA)

- ***D1 The EA to give due weight to restoration activity, conservation of waterway archaeology and navigation/recreation proposals in each of its Local Environment Action Plans (LEAPs); be pro-active in supporting restoration schemes to reach fruition, and develop more detailed practical guidance to restorers on ways to handle environmental impact assessment and mitigation.***

British Waterways (BW)

- ***D2 BW to continue to assist voluntary groups with their advice and expertise, e.g. in engineering feasibility and project management, commercial evaluations and promotion, funding applications and management agreements, and to consider help with feasibility and other studies where restoration proposals will impact on their own waterways.***

Rivers Agency (Northern Ireland)

- ***D3 The Rivers Agency to obtain powers to facilitate restoration projects and to regulate future restored navigations.***

Association of Inland Navigation Authorities (AINA)

- ***D4 AINA, as the representative body for inland navigation, to consider what practical steps its members could and should take to assist one another and those in the voluntary sector, to promote good practice in the development and management of waterway restoration.***

E VOLUNTARY ORGANISATIONS AND OTHERS PROMOTING RESTORATION SCHEMES

Good practice : project development

- ***E1 All restoration proposals and projects to demonstrate popular local support***

- ***E4 Unless there is exceptionally a single funder, larger projects to be broken down, wherever practicable, into discrete elements and phases on the basis of who might be willing to fund each part.***
- ***E5 Promoters of restoration projects to take the widest possible view of the public benefits - regenerative, physical, environmental, economic, educational and social - to be obtained from restoration within the waterway corridor so as to maximise local support and funding opportunities.***
- ***E6 All funding applications to be closely focused on the objectives and eligibility criteria of the funding body in question, and demonstrate verifiable financial control systems and capacity to implement the project.***
- ***E7 Funding to be allocated for the employment of a competent project development officer wherever practicable and not to be considered an unwarranted diversion of resources from restoration on the ground.***

Good practice : built heritage

- ***E8 Restoration schemes to respect existing historic fabric both of structures forming an integral part of the waterway (locks, lock cottages, bridges, aqueducts, weirs) and of buildings associated with the waterway (warehouses, canal-workers' housing, pubs etc). Historic surfaces, such as cobbling and paving, also to be respected.***
- ***E9 Except for very small projects, a conservation management plan to be prepared (as now required for all applications for HLF funding), explaining the historic importance of the waterway and associated and integral structures, their sensitivity and vulnerability to change, and policies to be adopted for the restoration in order to respect and retain significant features; and to be updated as necessary.***
- ***E10 The importance and suitability of existing structures for statutory listing or scheduling to be assessed and discussed with the local authority before any repair or restoration work undertaken.***
- ***E11 Where necessary, listed building and scheduled monument consent, at least in principle, to be in place before funding applications are made.***

- ***E14 BW to continue to demonstrate to restoration organisations, and encourage them to use, its developing expertise in heritage conservation and training, its Environmental Code of Practice (also in respect of environmental matters below) and Waterside Planning and Design Handbook.***

Good practice - environmental matters

- ***E15 Environmental issues to be considered from the start of project planning and throughout project development, with clear evidence of professional advice being taken. Essential components to include:***
 - (a) baseline inventories of existing resources and wildlife;***
 - (b) assessment of likely impacts on those resources and wildlife;***
 - (c) development of measures to neutralise, or at least mitigate, damaging impacts;***
 - (d) maintenance and enhancement of bio-diversity generally, and specifically in harmony with national and local Biodiversity Action Plan targets;***
 - (e) ensuring long-term sustainability specifications, in both the construction and the subsequent management phases of the project.***
- ***E16 As national water resources are having to be managed increasingly carefully, any water supply aspects to be set in the context of integrated catchment management: any potential changes in flood control characteristics to be clearly identified and a solution found acceptable to the relevant regulatory authority.***
- ***E17 The general Environmental Impact Analysis (EIA) format, suitably adapted to local circumstances, to be used in all cases, even if a formal EIA is not required.***
- ***E18 English Nature (and equivalents elsewhere in the UK), together with other environmental and wildlife conservation agencies and interest groups (both professional and amateur) to be consulted for their knowledge, advice and, where applicable, permissions. These organisations should provide prompt and open access to relevant information in their possession and should help project promoters to understand any conservation issues raised by their proposals. They should also assist promoters in any work they undertake to determine the extent to which those conservation issues could be resolved within the aims of the project. Specific statutory issues, such as maintenance of the special interest of any SSSIs (and equivalents elsewhere in the UK), and harmonisation of proposals with Biodiversity Action Plans, to be set out clearly.***

8.1 The assessment in this report has revealed a wide range of worthwhile projects, in all parts of the country, ready for main funding in the short term. As individual applications come forward, it is up to the various funding agencies to judge how far each accords with its own priorities, offers value for money and makes a credible and competent case for funding. The Council hopes that its own work will help to inform the decision-making processes of funding agencies, regulatory bodies and other key parties who need to be consulted.

8.2 More projects, currently seen as medium term funding options, need to set about the additional work to allow them to move into the short term category. Of all the projects listed, however, more than half are currently judged as not being ready for main funding until the longer term. The Council hopes that these too will benefit both from the assessment process, in terms of identifying what vital areas need to be pursued if they are to make progress, and from the recommendations on good practice.

9 UPDATING AND MONITORING

9.1 Subject to Ministerial endorsement and to resources being made available, the Council hopes to repeat this assessment at regular intervals. Before the first update, it hopes to monitor restoration activity, collect view on this first report and refine its methodology, including the assessment of historical importance and nature conservation interest.

9.2 When an update is produced, the Council hopes to be able to report on progress on all the projects assessed in this report, and on others which it has not been able to cover.

Table 1 Some waterway restoration projects completed since 1955

Waterway	Km	Year(s)	Current Waterway Authority
Ashton-under-Lyne Canal (to Dukinfield Junction)*	10.5	1974	BW
Avon (Lower)	45.1	1962	Lower Avon Navigation Trust
Avon (Upper)	28.2	1974	Upper Avon Navigation Trust
Basingstoke Canal (to Greywell Tunnel)***	49.9	1991	Basingstoke Canal Authority
Birmingham Canal (Old Main Line Loops)	6.4	1970s	BW
Bridgwater & Taunton Canal	25.8	1994	BW
Caldon Canal*	28.2	1974	BW
Caldon Canal Leek Branch (excluding final section)*	4.8	1974	BW
Chelmer & Blackwater Navigation	0.8	1993	Co of Prop of Chelmer & Blackwater Nav
Dilham Dyke	0.8	1972	BA
Dudley Canal No 2 (Windmill End to Halesowen)	4.0	1974	BW
Dudley Tunnel BCN	4.0	1972	BW
Erewash Canal (Upper section)*	8.1	n/k	BW
Forty Foot River	17.7	1991	Middle Level Commissioners
Grand Western Canal Barge Section	17.7	1973	Devon CC
Great Ouse	20.9	1978	EA
Kennet & Avon Canal (Bath to Hamstead Lock and Bulls Lock to Tyle Mill Lock)	99.0	1990	BW
Linton Lock	15.3	1966	Linton Lock Commissioners
Llangollen Canal	74.1	1955	BW
Monmouthshire & Brecon Canal* (to Crown Bridge)	54.7	1970	BW
Ditto (Crown Bridge to Cwmbran)	1.6	1995	BW
Montgomery Canal (completed in phases)**	25.6	1996	BW
Peak Forest Canal (Lower)*	12.9	1974	BW
Pocklington Canal (Lower)	6.4	1986	BW
Prees Branch (Llangollen Canal)	2.4	1980	BW
Ridgeacre Canal (BCN Wednesbury Old Canal –part)	2.4	1970s	BW
Ripon Canal (upper section)	1.6	1996	BW
Rochdale Canal (The Nine)	1.6	1974	Rochdale Canal Company
Ditto (Sowerby Bridge to Littleborough)**	24.0	1995	Rochdale Canal Company
Shannon-Erne Waterway	63.0	1994	Rivers Agency (NI)/Irish Republic
Stourbridge Canal	10.5	1967	BW
Stourbridge Arm	3.2	1981	BW
Stratford-upon-Avon Canal (Southern Section)	20.1	1964	BW
Titford Canal (BCN)	3.2	1974	BW
Welford Arm (Grand Union Canal – Leicester Section)	2.4	1969	BW
Well Creek	8.9	1975	Middle Level Commissioners
Total	705.8		

* Remainder Waterways upgraded by British Waterways Act 1983

** Projects partially completed (lengths are additions to connected system not total length of project)

*** Project incomplete because of continuing water supply problems

Source: Extract from IWAAC Consultative Report 1996 Supplementary Paper 2

Table 3 Projects for main funding in the short term

Ref Annex A	Project	Waterway authority	Cost £m	Status	Project objectives	Region
	Funding secured/about to be secured					
77	Scottish Millennium Link (Forth & Clyde and Union Canals)	BW	78.0	National	Sea to sea passage, leisure , tourism, economic regeneration	Scotland
36	Huddersfield Narrow Canal	BW	30.0	National	New cruising ring, regeneration catalyst for Pennine valleys, heritage and leisure development	NW/Yorks & Humber
52	Rochdale Canal	Canal Co	23.0	National	New cruising ring, regeneration of canal corridor, transform environment, stimulate recreation and tourism, conserve/enhance historic features	NW/Yorks & Humber
	Other projects					
	England					
1	Ancholme Navigation	EA	0.06	Local	Lock restoration for access to upper navigation	East Midlands
4	Anderton Boat Lift	BW	6.9	National	Restoration of historic lift	North West
5	Ashby Canal		10.0	Regional	Catalyst for regeneration	East Midlands
8	Basingstoke Canal - post restoration projects	BCA (LAs)	1.70	Regional	Improve water supply to locks 1-6, lock gate workshop and visitor facilities	South East
15	Bugsworth Basin	BW	0.75	National	New facilities for boaters, new museum/interpretative centre for unique canal/tramway interchange	East Midlands
18	Chichester Ship Canal	LA	2.50	Local	Preservation of line and structures, recreation	South East
19	Cotswold Canals Stroudwater Navigation	Company of Propr	10.0	Regional (National with Thames & Severn)	Navigation, heritage, environment and new facilities	South West
22	Derby Canal		30.0	Regional	New cruising ring, maximise employment, tourism, heritage, nature,	East Midlands

	Table 3 continued					
65	Wendover Arm	BW	8.0	Local	Navigation, local environment and eliminate use/cost of electric pumping for another BW waterway	South East
72	Monmouthshire Canal	LAs	32.0	Regional	Restoration for navigation, heritage preservation, environment enhancement and sub-regional tourist network for SE Wales	Wales
73	Montgomery Canal (in Wales)	BW	28.2	National	Extension of navigaton, only possible connection in Wales with national system, regeneration, Conservation of built heritage and natural environment	Wales (also West Midlands)
74	Neath Canal	Co of Propr	5.0	Regional with 76	Recreation and leisure, urban regeneration, regional waterway system	Wales
76	Tennant Canal	Private co	5.0	Regional with 74	See above - Neath Canal	Wales
	Northern Ireland					
79	Lower Lagan Navigation	RA (NI) proposed	7.5	National	Recreation, preservation of heritage structures, industrial heritage promotion, enhancing access to countryside and economic regeneration in corridor	Northern Ireland
80	Newry Canal	RA(NI) proposed	15.0	National	Strategic link to Irish waterways, preservation of working heritage structures, recreation, amenity, economic regeneration in corridor	Northern Ireland

Table 4 Projects for main funding in medium term

Ref Annex A	Project	Waterway authority	Cost £m	Status	Project objectives	Region
	England					
16	Burslem Branch		c. 0.5	Local	Restoration plus some limited new construction to create boaters' facilities, using city canals and reusing wharf buildings to stimulate local regeneration	West Midlands
20	Cotswold Canals Thames & Severn Canal		45-60.0	Regional (National with Stroudwater Nav)	Major cross-country link, extensive opportunities for heritage, environmental enhancement, rural development and regeneration etc	South West
23	Dorset & Somerset Canal		Not yet costed	Local	Conservation of canal line and structures, and interpretation	South West
37	Ipswich & Stowmarket Navigation (River Gipping)		10.0	Local	Restoration of structures to working order followed by navigation	Eastern
42	Lichfield Canal	Part BW	9.0 (excl land)	Regional	Reconnection of BCN to Coventry Canal, revitalise BCN, encourage tourism in Lichfield, help regeneration of northern West Midlands	West Midlands
49	Northern Reaches (Lancaster Canal)	BW	c 20.0	Regional	Extend northern limit of national system, recreation, preserving/re-using industrial heritage, new recreation/economic resources for Kendal /rural corridor	North West
50	North Walsham & Dilham Canal	Canal Co/Private Co	1.1	Regional	Restoration of only locked waterway on Broads, walking, angling, environmental benefits	Eastern
56	Sleaford Navigation		4.3	Regional	Complete restoration of navigation into Sleaford, increasing boating and mooring facilities, improving public access, local prosperity, preservation of historic waterway and buildings as local resources	East Midlands
58	Somersetshire Coal Canal		Not yet costed	Regional	Protection of remaining structures and line of canal from decay. No aim to restore navigation	South West
70	Worsley Delph & Underground	Coal Auth	4.0	National	Restore navigation to Worsley Delph plus restoration/preservation of	North West

Table 5 Projects for main funding in longer term

Ref Annex A	Project	Waterway authority	Cost £m	Status	Project objective	Region
	England					
2	Ancholme – Rase Link		Not yet costed	Local	New navigation, expand leisure potential, improve local economy	East Midlands
3	Ancholme-Witham Link		Not yet costed	Regional	Improvement/new construction to create new leisure navigation link to national network	East Midlands
6	Aylsham Navigation		Not yet costed	Local	Restoration of full navigation, on R Bure, to former riverhead extending Broads navigations	Eastern
7	Barnsley Dearne & Dove Canals and branches		40.0	Regional	Create cruising ring in South and West Yorkshire, promote investment, economic revitalisation and environmental gains for blighted industrial area	Yorks & Humber
8	Basingstoke Canal Western End	LAs	Not yet costed	Local	Restore navigation including Greywell Tunnel and two listed structures	South East
10	Blyth Navigation		Not yet costed	Local	Extend head of historic river navigation back to former terminus	Eastern
11	Bottisham Lode		Not yet costed	Local	Restore navigation to Lode village	Eastern
12	Bourne Eau		Not yet costed	Local	Create natural riverhead and focal point for under-utilised RiverGlen	Eastern
13	Buckingham Canal		Not yet costed	Local	Fullest use of water related activities and educational resource	South East
14	Bude Canal	Part LA/Trust	Not yet costed	National	Proposals awaiting consultants' study-about to be commissioned	South West
17	Chesterfield Canal – West of Norwood Tunnel		c25.0	Regional	Restore 4 km west of tunnel to link with restored length into Chesterfield (or possible River Rother link to SSY Nav). Conserving built and natural heritage, employment, regeneration and environmental improvements	East Midlands
21	Cromford Canal-Southern Section	Part BW	6.0	Local	Reach Butterly Tunnel, join small gauge railway, promote area regeneration	East Midlands

	Table 5 contd					
31	Hatherton Canal	Part BW	12.0	Regional	New canal link to Cannock extension. Recreate through route-open up cruising rings, revitalise BCN, help improve local economy	West Midlands
32	Herefordshire and Gloucestershire		Not yet costed	Regional	Important extension of system to promote economic revitalisation, including tourism, enhanced recreation corridor	South West
33	Higher Avon Navigation Phase II		16.5	Local (National with 34)	New navigation to link with Grand Union, creating direct route from Severn to Trent and broad link Severn to Grand Union	West Midlands
34	Higher Avon-Leam Link		6.0	Local (National with 33)	New navigation connecting Grand Union to navigable Avon, improving access to Warwick and Leamington to boost tourism	West Midlands
35	Horncastle Navigation		8.0	Local	Refurbish old loops and water meadows to increase biodiversity, long distance walk, tourism and job gains	East Midlands
38	Ivel Navigation (Bedfordshire)		Not yet costed	Local	Through navigation	Eastern
39	Lapal Canal	Part BW	c25.0	Local	Restore canal and tunnel to provide lock-free cruising ring. Alternative through navigation additional development opportunities for urban regeneration	West Midlands
40	Lark Navigation		Not yet costed	Local	Extend from present limit to Mildenhall	Eastern
41	Leven Canal	Private co	0.6	Local	Restore for navigation, preserve beauty, improve access, additional moorings	Yorks & Humber
43	Liskeard & Looe Canal	Railtrack	Not yet costed	Local	Restore and conserve surviving features, interpret industrial heritage, enhance biodiversity, improve recreation and local services	South West
44	Little Ouse Navigation		Not yet costed	Local	Restore historic navigation to former head at Thetford	Eastern
45	Louth Canal		Not yet costed	Local	Sustainable economic and recreational development. preserving built heritage and natural environment. Stimulate rural regeneration	East Midlands
46	Manchester Bolton & Bury Canal	Part BW	est 25.0	Regional	Multi-user recreation. Nob End site for heritage interpretation, green route in heavily urban area	North West

Table 5 contd						
57	Sleaford to Grantham Link		Not yet costed	Regional	New navigation to connect Slea Navigation and (BW) Grantham Canal to create new cruising ring	East Midlands
59	South Forty Foot Drain (Witham - Nene Link)	EA	Not yet costed	Regional	Restore Drain and small new connection to River glen and Welland navigations to national system via Witham	Eastern
60	Stafford Branch (Sow Navigation)		1.5	Local	Remaining 50% historic river/canal linking Stafford centre to main system for benefit of whole community	West Midlands
61	Stamford Canal (Welland system)	EA?	Not yet costed	Local	Extend present head of navigation from near Deeping to Stamford	Eastern & East Midlands
62	Stour Navigation (Essex/Suffolk)	EA	c 3.7	National	Restore navigation along last stretch of one of earliest river navigations for recreation, sport, amenity, conservation, industrial archaeology	Eastern
63	Swaffham Bulbeck Lode	EA	Not yet costed	Local	Restore navigation to Swaffham Bulbeck	Eastern
64	Waveney Navigation		Not yet costed	Local	Restore historic river navigation as extension to Broads	Eastern
66	Wey & Arun Canal		17.9	National	Restore remaining 60% of historic route from R Wey to R Arun ("London's lost route to Sea"). Sustainable, low-cost heritage and tourism amenity in populated area with few inland waterways and amenity benefit for local people	South East
67	Whitchurch Arm	Part Trust	2.5	Local	Construction of unique new inclined plane to take canal into Whitchurch to regenerate small market town, improve recreation, preserve green wedge	West Midlands
68	Wilts & Berks Canal/North Wilts Canal		103.0	Regional	Through navigation, with diversions where necessary, promote fullest use for transport, recreation (multiple cruising rings) local amenity, and tourism, environmental enhancement	South West & South East
69	Witham Navigable Drains: East Fen Lock	Internal Drainage Board	0.006	Local	Restore derelict lock to reopen 20 km of Hobhole and other Drains	East Midlands
	Wales					
75	Swansea Canal	East DM	c 15.0	Regional	Create regional coast navigation	Wales

