

Can I first say that this is not the result of a personal plea for a change. I have been a resident of Salcombe for over 25 years, albeit as a second home owner, and have for over 17 years had access to both a residents mooring and a pontoon space.

However, had the current waiting list arrangements have been in place at the time when we were allocated the moorings we would now have virtually no chance of ever having a Harbour authority space. Despite having paid rates at various levels over the last 25 years, and despite having my predecessors buried near Dartmouth for 350 years at least to my knowledge, I would just not be able to get a mooring under the current terms.

I know many 90% ratepayers who are in a similar position, and who will never have the chance of a Harbour authority mooring. Given the very high weighting of 90% ratepayers in the town this seems grossly unfair.

I know of one owner of a Westerly 33 who bought his house at the same time as us, and who like us now has children and grandchildren spending a lot of time in Salcombe. He bought his Westerly in Spain about 15 years ago and when trying to move it to Salcombe put his name on the waiting list some 10 years ago. He seems to only go up the B Waiting list when those ahead of him take their names off in frustration - or when they die! He has to moor the yacht on a Harbour mooring in Dartmouth and drive there whenever he wants to sail. Given that he is a former transatlantic sailor this is a very regular thing - unlike a number of the current holders of moorings in the estuary.

The current system is therefore not equitable and in my view justifies some revision to take account of the majority of local ratepayers, while at the same time giving reasonable protection to genuine 100% ratepayers.

My proposal is to consider two options:-

1. Either, to allocate vacant berths from both list A and list B in a fixed proportion - say one in three or one in four to be allocated from list B instead of all being only allocated from list A.
2. Or, to add 90% ratepayers to the A list after (say) 10 years on the waiting list, or possibly after 10 years as ratepayers.

Either one of these approaches would at least give a limited possibility of the 90% ratepayers getting access to the water through the Harbour authority and restore some balance to the waiting list policy.

In addition, I would suggest that there is an opportunity for an increase in harbour dues as a result of any change. It would seem only fair that, in return, 90% ratepayers might be asked to pay a slightly higher harbour due - say plus 20% in order to recognise that they are not paying full local rates. This could also be applied across all moorings and significantly help the income line.

A second comment on the operation of the Mooring Policy is to ask for some leeway to be given in the case of syndicate boat moorings. I know of a few cases where a mooring is in the name of one ratepayer only, yet the boat is owned by two or more residents. In some cases the co-owners took their names off the list when buying the boat in joint names. Should anything happen to the named person, or if he should move away, the others are in real difficulty over continuing with the mooring. I would propose that the Harbourmaster should be given discretion to continue the mooring in the name of another of the joint owners in this situation. They would have to qualify as ratepayers, etc. but the mooring should not necessarily be forfeited.

I hope that you will give due consideration to these points.

Geoff Matthews
5 Lakeside, Salcombe
01548842985 or 01934862702

I understand that the Estuary Moorings Policy is currently under review. I last wrote expressing my concern at the unfairness of the present system on 20th November 2003.

We bought our house on Coronation Road in 1984, at which time we paid 100% rates, and have had a Batson Pontoon Mooring since 1985. We have been on the Deep Water Moorings Waiting List since 20 January 1997 Ref: 953.

In 1997, shortly before I became an O.A.P., I was told that there should not be a problem in letting me have a deep water mooring when I bought our boat back to the UK which I did in 2002. Prior to 1997 I had been told that there was no need to put my name on the waiting list until my mooring requirement was imminent.

We would be fully prepared to pay 100% rates, as we did in the early years of our residence in Salcombe, and have the same obligations and receive the same privileges as we used to instead of the current arrangement where we have 90% of the cost and almost no privileges. I am sure you will agree that the present position is grossly unfair.

Salcombe is where we have come for nearly 25 years and where our children and grandchildren come and where we need to be able to keep our boat when she is not abroad.

I hope for your sympathetic consideration of our position and others like us.

F.A.Beresford.

Glenleigh, Coronation Road and North End House, Luckington, Wiltshire.

Kingsbridge Estuary Boat Club. KEBC

- Response to Consultation Paper on Salcombe Harbour Moorings Policy.

Ref. page 9. Review of Policy

Since the Harbour Authority is intending to move the management of the estuary forward, it is important that they have some flexibility for doing this. It is KEBC's view that moorings policy be reviewed as appropriate, on an arising basis rather than quote a timescale.

General comment under item 6.0

The Harbour authority should take steps to ensure that owners of vessels are appropriately insured, (Will this be done annually from now?) Their boats are in a safe and seaworthy condition and moored correctly with all equipment on board securely stored. Exposed and unsecured fuel tanks left on board moored boats is an ongoing safety concern. Additionally, boats are being left on moorings for long term storage and never move or receive any maintenance, thus depriving potential genuine keen boat owners of a mooring.

- Having no clear policy to address some of these issues has resulted in many boats, particularly at Kingsbridge looking abandoned and tatty.
- It is believed that the Harbour Authority should take steps to enforce more control to manage moorings discipline. To take the view that 'if the customer pays the mooring fee, nothing else matters', is not acceptable

Para. 6.03

Moorings left unused for two years before being reallocated is too long. They should not be left for more than one year.

Please note that this comment does not apply to deep water moorings where the larger boats could be away cruising for longer periods.

Para. 6.3.1

It is recognised that waiting lists for moorings is a sensitive issue but the mechanics of how A&B categories interact is not totally clear.

The transfer process from cat. B to cat.A appears to be well defined.

How are the moorings for cat. B people defined in terms of numbers compared to cat.A?

It would be wrong to allocate a disproportionate number Cat. B people moorings at the expense of cat.A

In general terms the moorings policy looks to be acceptable.

Graham Price, Chairman
Kingsbridge Estuary Boat Club

I am emailing you regarding the consultation which is currently taking place re the moorings policy.

To give you some background, I am a 90% ratepayer in Salcombe and my family has owned a property in Salcombe for 25+ years. My wife and I spend the majority of our weekends and holidays in Salcombe and it would be fair to say that for both of us Salcombe is more of a home than our main residence in Bristol. My wife's mother is also planning to retire to the area later this year.

We currently use both a deep water mooring and also a mooring on Batson pontoon which is held in my father's name. Our concern is that under the current waiting list priorities, I believe we have no chance of ever getting a mooring in our own name.

We would like our children to enjoy the same access to the lovely estuary at Salcombe that we have had and are worried about how we can achieve this for them. We know there is a B Waiting list, but believe under the current set up there is no likelihood of us getting a mooring through this. This seems unfair given the fact that we pay 90% tax. It would be such a shame if future generations of people were put off the area because of the moorings policy.

We understand fully that 100% rate tax payers who genuinely live in the area should get priority, but feel it must be possible to also provide some kind of regular allocation to 90% tax payers, possibly through moving them onto the A list after a particular length of waiting time, or otherwise giving them their own list with a much smaller % of the allocation.

I hope this information will be of use to you in your consultation – I believe there are plenty of other young couples in the same position as us who want to continue to visit Salcombe to use the estuary as often as we do, but are deeply concerned about the current moorings policy.

Regards,

Adrian Justin Garland
St Malo
Forster Road
Salcombe

RESPONSE TO DRAFT MOORINGS POLICY DOCUMENT

I have been asked to collate and submit the views of Salcombe's town councillors to the policy proposals set out in the 1st draft of this document. On the whole, councillors feel that the document is a comprehensive and useful restatement of mooring policies, which is to be welcomed. There are a number of detailed comments which you may find helpful and some issues on which we would welcome clarification. For ease of reference these are listed using the paragraph numbers in the document.

1.0.1

Salcombe Harbour might well be a strategic asset to the South Hams as a whole, but its performance is of primary importance to the economic and cultural well being of the riparian towns and villages of the estuary and of Salcombe in particular. The residents and business community of Salcombe would welcome this being made clear in the preamble to this document.

1.0.5

This paragraph sets out a number of desirable "developmental" objectives but gives no indication that these are strictly constrained by the physical limits of the harbour. The number of permitted moorings are and should remain limited to the present number and the object of this policy document is to set out the means by which they shall be allocated and managed to ensure the continuing viability of the harbour (ie para should refer readers to para 6.1.1 as an overriding constraint on developmental objectives).

4.0.1

Is there any reason why there should be a small "recognised anchorage" at Splats Cove – at least for small vessels – given that the public right of way to this foreshore is likely to remain closed for safety reasons for some time to come?

6.0.2

Can it be confirmed that this stricture applies to all berths specified in para 6.1.3, including pontoon berths.

6.1

Para 6.1.1 clearly sets out the policy on the number of moorings in the harbour. The remaining sub-paras merely supply detailed information which could, perhaps, be better set in an Appendix.

6.2

The sub paras in this section set out the Authority's policies on "qualification" for moorings and its policy for the "allocation" of available moorings to those meeting the qualification criteria – perhaps the most contentious issues in the document. It may be advisable to amend the paragraph heading accordingly.

6.3

This section does not explicitly state a "policy" as regards waiting lists. It describes categories into which those waiting will be separated, but does not explain how those falling into each category will be treated. Nor does it explain how those falling outside these categories will be dealt with.

6.4

The latter part of this section (6.4.6 to 6.4.12) explains practice rather than policy. Any promotional exercises are at best speculative and may need to be evaluated and amended to achieve the desired results. Hence they should not be enshrined as "policy" in this document. It would be better to state that the harbour board/master will be empowered to introduce and evaluate such waivers and discounts on charges and fees as may be deemed necessary to maintain and promote harbour usage outside peak periods, for the purpose of maximising revenues. In particular the Board should carefully consider the surcharges to be imposed on catamarans, so as not to deter such craft from visiting Salcombe Harbour.

6.7.1

It is not usual practice to state a “negative” policy (ie what will not be permitted). For the avoidance of doubt, the policies/rules set out in this document should apply to all berths owned/managed by the Board.

6.9.1

Once again, operational “prescription” has crept into a policy document. Specific hours of operation are not a matter of policy. The policy of the Authority should be to delegate to the harbour Board/Master (as appropriate) discretion to vary the time limits for berthing at Normandy by visiting yachts to enable them to manage & control usage so as to minimise congestion and maximise income.

6.11.2

This is not a policy; it is a factual footnote. It should be noted that, from hereon, the document seems to interchange the “ownership” and accountability of the stated policies between the Harbour Authority, Board and Master without any clear explanation of the shift from one to another. Any policy should be set/owned by the Authority, which has ultimate accountability. This document should make clear the delegated authority to discharge such policy – ie the Harbour Board and/or Master (as necessary).

6.12

This section does not make clear that if a local fisherman wishes to sell his vessel(s) as a going concern, the transfer of moorings to the new owner of the business should be automatic. To put this another way, the operation of the fishing business (which SHDC is committed to promote) is dependent on the availability of moorings; ie the entitlement to such moorings is an asset which is integral to the value and viability of that business.

6.13

A core objective of the Board is to promote business activity in the harbour. It is not clear how this is to be achieved if businesses are required to submit business plans supporting the demand for a specific number of moorings. Who will assess these plans and evaluate the practicability of their objectives? Who will monitor the implementation/achievement of these plans? Will businesses be required to submit annual reports and accounts (identifying turnover & pre and post tax profits) to substantiate their achievement of the approved plan. Will the Board have the power to veto amendments to that plan in the light of market changes? One of SHDC’s core principles is to act as a catalyst to economic development rather than a deterrent. Hence, it would seem that the Authority’s stated policy should be to ensure that sustainable businesses requiring extra moorings to develop their business opportunities and economic growth are given top priority in the allocation of vacant berths.

6.13.5

As a subset of the above, the viability and value of any business operating from the harbour will depend upon its moorings. If such a business is sold as a going concern, it is not clear why its putative assets, including its mooring rights, should not be included in the sale and transferred to the new business on completion.

6.17

Is this not a restatement of para 6.2.5 (b. & c.)?

I hope that these comments have been helpful. Salcombe Town Council will of course make itself available to discuss any of the issues raised above if it would be helpful to the Authority or Board.

Cllr Paul Coulson

Salcombe and Kingsbridge Estuary Association

Response to Moorings Policy

Q1 Yes

Q2 Yes

Q3 We have received the following from one of our members and submit it for your consideration:

"The Strategic Business Plan appears to recognise only two sorts of Harbour user- residents and visitors. There is no attempt to recognise that there are in fact three categories - 100% Council Tax payers, 90% Council Tax payers and visitors.

The draft Moorings Policy does draw this distinction under section 6.3, but does not admit, that, in the way that the system currently operates, there is very little chance that a 90% Council Tax payer will ever be allocated a mooring.

The Strategic Business Plan gives evidence for this by showing that even 100% Council Tax payers have years of waiting before being allocated.

I believe this to be patently unfair. Many 90% Council Tax payers have had a house in the Town for one or two generations, have paid Council Tax at varying levels over this period and yet are not being given any chance of obtaining a foot on the ladder.

There are several ways in which this can be tackled in a more equitable manner.

1. The 90% Council Tax payers could be added to the 100% resident waiting lists after a certain period, as Council Tax payers, or after a certain period on the waiting list.
2. To protect the interests of the 100% payers the 90% payers could be allocated on a strict percentage basis. This could be say 1 in 5, or 1 in 4, of the allocations being made.
3. It would also be feasible to consider a slightly higher rate to be paid by the 90%'ers compared with the full Council Tax payers. A premium of 20-30% would be possible and would achieve the objective of gaining additional income as well as recognising that the 90%'ers are not full Council Tax payers."

From: Clerk at Kingsbridge Town Council [mailto:clerk@kingsbridge.gov.uk]

Sent: 01 August 2007 16:43

To: Salcombe Harbour

Subject: Moorings Policy Consultation Paper

Attn: Harbour Master

The town council's Planning Committee reviewed the above consultation paper at its meeting on 17th July and fully support all the proposals. Apologies for the delay in responding.

Regards
Martin

Martin Johnson
Town Clerk
Kingsbridge Town Council
01548.857073
www.kingsbridge.gov.uk