

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SALCOMBE HARBOUR BOARD
HELD IN THE ASSEMBLY ROOM, CLIFF HOUSE, SALCOMBE
ON TUESDAY, 8 NOVEMBER 2005**

MEMBERS

* Cllr J S Beer - Chairman

* Mr R Wheeler - Vice-Chairman

∅ Cllr H D Bastone	* Mr T Bass
* Cllr J Brazil	* Mr G Foale
∅ Cllr R J Carter	* Mr R Gilbert
∅ Cllr P H Cook	∅ Dr P Goldsworthy
* Cllr C M Pannell	∅ Ms L Heape
* Cllr S L Rankin	* Mr D Penwill
* Cllr G Rothwell	* Mr E Johnson
* Cllr D W S Thorning	
∅ Cllr A R Vale	

* Denotes attendance

∅ Denotes apology for absence

Also in attendance and participating:
Cllr R Rowe and Mr J Barrett

SH.09/05 MINUTES

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 4 October 2005 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

SH.10/05 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

The Senior Member Support Officer reminded the Members that, given that the meeting was to consider the percentage increase for harbour charges including moorings, any Member with a rental mooring within the Harbour should declare a prejudicial interest and leave the meeting during the debate and vote on this item.

Members were invited to declare any interests in the items of business to be considered during the course of the meeting. These were recorded as follows:-

Notwithstanding the advice given, Messrs Bass, Penwill, Foale and Wheeler declared a personal interest in item 5 'Review of Charges' (see minute SH.12/05 below) by virtue of their rental of moorings within the Harbour. The Members remained and took part in the discussion and vote on this item.

Mr J Barrett also declared a personal interest in item 5 'Review of Charges' (see minute SH.12/05 below) and remained during discussion on the item. However, as Mr Barrett was not a Member of the Board he did not participate in the vote.

SH.11/05 **OUTCOME OF ESTUARY USERS' COMMUNITY SAFETY SURVEY**

A report was considered which informed the Board of the outcome of the recent safety survey undertaken between 8 August and 16 September 2005 in conjunction with the Council's Community Safety Officer, working with the Safer South Hams Community Safety Partnership, the Police Research Officer and the Harbour Team.

The report outlined the importance of a users' survey, noting that the aim was to provide the Board with a baseline level of information to enable better assessment of any current and future marine safety and/or anti-social behaviour related issues on the estuary.

It was highlighted that approximately 80% of respondents were full time residents in Salcombe, which was deemed an encouraging sign. The outcome of the survey demonstrated that, compared to similar estuaries, Salcombe was viewed as a safe place to visit. Furthermore, it was noted that people were keen to visit Salcombe Harbour and it was important to maintain and improve this safe environment. Three main areas of concern were identified from the results of the survey, these were indicated as:-

- Speeding and wash;
- Nuisance and alcohol; and,
- Inexperienced boat users.

Although only 7% of respondents felt they had benefited from the Night Security Patrol directly, 79% had noted their belief that having some form of Security Patrol contributed to the feeling of safety. With this evidence to hand it was noted that extending this service at the present time may not be the most cost effective way forward.

A Member of the Board conveyed his appreciation for the report and the reassurances it gave. Thanks were extended to the Harbour Master and his staff for the work carried out. Furthermore, the Member felt that the Board should also recognise the use of CCTV cameras in the promotion of harbour safety and noted his support for widening the use of CCTV. In response, it was noted that CCTV did aid harbour safety and the possibility of extending the initiative to the surrounding area was to be discussed in consultation with the Devon and Cornwall Police Constabulary, the Council's Community Safety and Emergency Planning Officer and the Night Security Team.

Following a query regarding reducing the speed limit in the estuary, it was noted that the harbour byelaws were currently being reviewed by the Department for Transport (DfT) and it was intended for a byelaw to deal with excessive wash from speeding boats to be incorporated.

RESOLVED

That the Board:-

1. notes the user feedback received;
2. requests the Harbour Master to investigate ways of addressing the main issues raised from the outcome of the users' community safety survey with key partner organisations where appropriate.

SH.12/05 REVIEW OF CHARGES

Consideration was given to a report which had been prepared to assist Members in setting the Harbour rates and charges for 2006/2007. Following the meeting of the Harbour Board of 4 October 2005 (minute reference SH.05/05), the Harbour Master reviewed the charges which required an average increase of 4%. The proposed increase in charges, as set out in appendices A and B of the presented report, together with the suggested income growth would allow the Board to meet budget pressures faced in the forthcoming year.

A Member of the Board enquired about any gaps that would be generated if certain contractors increased their charges by say 40% per annum. In response it was noted that contracts could not be discussed in an open session due to their sensitive nature.

During discussion, attention was directed to paragraph 3 of the report, as presented to the Board, which stated;

“Having considered the results of the Estuary User’s Survey, should Members not wish to proceed with the increase to the night security patrol budget of £15,000 it is recommended that the 2006/2007 contribution to the renewals reserves is uplifted by this amount to balance the budget.”

The Trainee Member Support Officer advised the Board that, as in principle agreement for the extension of the night security patrol at the previous Board meeting as part of the budget framework (minute reference SH. 05/05 refers), this decision could not be revisited for six months as set out in the Council’s constitution. In response, the Strategic Director (Operations) noted her discomfort with this advice and recalled that, at the previous meeting, this issue had been raised. Following discussion it was noted that, irrelevant of whether the principle

had been agreed for the extension of the night security patrol, the 4% increase in charges could still be set during the course of the meeting. Therefore, officers agreed to discuss the advice given upon closure of the meeting and report back to the 29 November 2005 meeting of the Board.

A Member believed there to be an anomaly in Band 2, as set out in appendix A of the presented report. It was noted that vessels without engines should be categorised irrespective of length, especially in light of the Board's promotion of the use of environmentally friendly vessels. Therefore, the following amendment was then **PROPOSED**, and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

That Band 2 should read "Sailboards, canoes, sailing dinghies and any vessel without an engine."

Concerns were prevalent amongst Board Member over the wash from powered vessels, noting that the length of the boat did not dictate the power it could create. A Member noted that a disincentive to prohibit powered vessels should be incorporated into the review of charges, especially in terms of land launching charges. Whilst the principle of this was agreed by a further Board Member, he was concerned that if the charges were raised too high there was a possibility of removing the high powered vessels further up the coast.

The Board noted their unease with some of the proposed rates for 2006/07 as set out in Appendix A of the presented report, after noting that a number of the proposals were set above the agreed 4% increase. Following discussions the following motion was **PROPOSED**, and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

RESOLVED

That the review of charges item be deferred for consideration at the next meeting of the Board to be held on 29 November 2005 to allow for further clarification of the rates proposed.

SH.13/05 REPLACEMENT OF HOUSEBOATS

Consideration was given to a report which informed Members that the Harbour Master had received a proposal to replace the current fleet of houseboats located in the Bag from the Salcombe Houseboat Company. The Salcombe Houseboat Company had been providing a unique holiday experience in the Bag for many years and replacement with the preferred vessel was to secure this experience for years to come.

During discussion, the following points were made:-

- a) Concern over inexperienced holiday makers using power boats was aired;
- b) In relation to environmental concerns over sewage disposal it was noted that, treatment plants were linked with Harbour Boats;
- c) Concern over the aesthetic nature of the houseboats was noted. Although, it was agreed that the design was a vast improvement on current houseboats;
- d) The disposal of the existing houseboats was to be incorporated into the contract for the Houseboat Company to dispose of prior to new ones being installed;
- e) Confirmation that the public liability of the Houseboats lay with the Houseboat Company as the owners.

RESOLVED

That the Board:-

1. approves the replacement of the Houseboat Fleet with the type of vessel requested;
2. agrees the maximum number of Houseboats owned by the Salcombe Houseboat Company moored in the Estuary as seven;
3. amends the Salcombe Harbour Board Policy Document accordingly.

SH.14/05 **PROVISIONING AFLOAT**

A report was considered for Members to invite expressions of interest from local businesses which wished to be considered for a short list of tenders to provide a provisioning service to vessels afloat.

The Harbour Master informed the Board of recent articles in local news papers which referred to the lack of provision outlets in the Salcombe area. Currently the Salcombe Harbour Kingsbridge Estuary Byelaw no. 53 prohibited unauthorised trading. However, through the development of new technologies it was felt that the customer experience could be enhanced by provisioning vessels afloat from suitable local businesses. It was stressed that it would not be about touting for business, but for the customer to approach the contractor.

There was concern over any negative effects this initiative would have on local business. A Member demonstrated the need for the proposal to first be considered by to the Town Council for consultation purposes to gain its understanding and support. Furthermore, it was felt that there would be strong objections from local businesses. In response, the Board were informed that this was about getting local businesses involved in the process. Whilst a Member of the Board fully supported this initiative, he had empathy with the Town Councillors' views and

stressed that local businesses would be looked on favourably.

Following discussion, the following amendment to the recommendation was then **PROPOSED**, and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

“That the Board instructs the Harbour Master to explore further the options and potential extent of services to provide provisioning services to vessels afloat and report back with greater detail at a future meeting.”

RESOLVED

That the Board instructs the Harbour Master to explore further the options and potential extent of services to provide provisioning services to vessels afloat and report back with greater detail at a future meeting.

SH.15/05 **TOPICAL HARBOUR ISSUES**

A report was considered which informed Members of any interesting current or future issues that might affect the Salcombe Harbour Board or Salcombe Harbour/Kingsbridge Estuary.

RESOLVED

That the report be noted.

(Meeting commenced at 2.30 pm and concluded at 4.20 pm).

Chairman