

**MINUTES OF THE MEETING OF THE SALCOMBE HARBOUR BOARD  
HELD IN THE ASSEMBLY ROOM, CLIFF HOUSE, SALCOMBE  
ON TUESDAY, 29 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:  
Mr J Barrett

SH.16/05 **MINUTES**

The minutes of the meeting of the Board held on 8 November 2005 were confirmed as a correct record and signed by the Chairman.

SH.17/05 **DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST**

The Senior Member Support Officer reiterated her comments of the previous meeting (SH.10/05 refers) which noted 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. Attention was also directed to the letter which Board Members had received from the Council's Monitoring Officer which stipulated the Council's position on this issue highlighting that any breach of the Members Code of Conduct, to which all Board Members were bound, could lead to action being taken against that Member(s) by the Standards Board for England.

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

Messrs Bass, Penwill, Foale and Wheeler declared a prejudicial interest in item 5 'Review of Charges' (see minute SH.18/05 below) by virtue of their rental of moorings within the Harbour. The Members left the meeting during the discussion and vote on this item.

Although Mr J Barrett was not a Member of the Board, he also declared a prejudicial interest in item 5 'Review of Charges' (see minute SH.18/05 below) and left the meeting during discussion.

Mr Wheeler also declared a personal interest in item 7 'Topical Harbour Issues' (see minute SH.20/05 below) by virtue of his employment by the Harbour Authority for research purposes on recycling afloat. He remained in the meeting during discussion on this item.

## SH.18/05 **REVIEW OF CHARGES**

Prior to discussion on this item and before those Members who had declared a prejudicial interest left the meeting, they were invited to make a statement on their organisations stance on the review of charges. The comments re-stated support for a surcharge for High Powered Crafts along with the suggestion that, prior to the Review of Charges for 2007/2008, a comprehensive review of the charging structure should be undertaken.

A report was then considered to enable Members to set the Harbour rates and charges for 2006/2007. Members were informed that with the deferral of this item at the Boards previous meeting (min. SH.12/05 refers), the report now gave Members the opportunity to consider two options. It was anticipated that either of the options presented in the report would generate sufficient income to allow the Board to meet the budget pressures for 2006/2007. With reference to the Night Security Patrol budget, attention was drawn to paragraphs 4 to 6 of the report, as presented to Members, which noted that this issue was open for discussion. Members were advised that if they wished the Night Security Patrol budget to be increased by £15,000 this could only be accommodated by selecting option 1.

The Finance Officer informed the Board of an error in Section L of the proposed charges, as laid out in the report as presented to the Board. The charge for 'visitors per week' should be increased to £46.80 per week. This then reflected that the weekly charge should be 5.5 times the daily charge. The finance officer also explained the specific charges in the appendices where the proposed increase was more than 4%, when VAT was included, for ease of cash handling purposes. Therefore, the following amendment was then **PROPOSED** and **SECONDED** and on being put to the vote was declared **CARRIED**:-

That the charge for visitors week, as laid out in Section L of appendix A1 of the report as presented to Members, be amended to read £46.80.

A Member expressed his support for option 1, which incorporated a £20,000 income growth and a 4% increase in charges across all existing bands. The Member was satisfied with the recommendation to discontinue the half price discount for those vessels visiting between 1 October and 31 March. Furthermore, it was noted that option 1 demonstrated the Board's discouragement of high powered vessels. In response to these comments, a further Member of the Board, whilst in full support of these comments suggested that the excess £15,000 which option 1 generated should not be put back into the reserves but instead used to increase the Night Security Patrol. During discussion on this issue, it was noted that whilst the Night Security was a valued service, the Estuary Users Survey demonstrated that there was no perceived need to extend the service at this time. However, it was suggested that the Harbour Master meet with the Night Security Patrol contractor to discuss the possibility of enhancing the service within the existing budget. Furthermore, it was noted that, should it be found that more funding was needed for Night Security, that it was within the Harbour Master's remit to approach the Board for release of reserves. However, the following amendment was **PROPOSED** but not seconded and therefore a vote was not taken:-

That the excess revenue generated through Option 1 of the report as presented to the Board, be used to extend the Night Security Patrol.

#### **RECOMMENDATION**

That the Board **RECOMMENDS** to Council that the proposed charges are as set out in Appendix B1 of the report presented to the Board be approved for implementation from 1 April 2005.

#### **RESOLVED**

That the Board agrees the changes to the charging policy as set out in paragraphs 15 to 22, and amend the Salcombe Harbour Policy Document accordingly.

SH.19/05

#### **FUTURE GOVERNANCE ARRANGEMENTS**

A report was considered which sought a way forward for the future governance and management of Salcombe Harbour in light of the Department for Transport's impending report on local authority owned ports and harbours.

The report noted that protecting and maintaining Salcombe Harbour and the Estuary for the benefit of users, residents, local businesses and the community was of the utmost importance to the Council and local people. The Harbour Board was requested to give due consideration to the information contained in the report and support the development of future governance arrangements.

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

*(c) RECOMMENDED to Council to approve the review of the new Board governance arrangements for 2006/2007.*

The majority of the Board noted their support for the report and had no adverse comments. However, a Member of the Board raised a number of concerns, which were summarised as follows:-

- Concern that the Board was comparing itself to Whitstable when the ports were dissimilar. In response it was noted that Whitstable was recognised as best practice in terms of governance, it was not about the fundamental nature of the harbour. Governance arrangements were the aspect which Salcombe Harbour were pursuing;
- The importance of South Hams District Council remaining as the harbours authority. It was clarified that it was about not alternative ownership;
- The number of tourists who visited Salcombe each year and the adverse effect new governance arrangements may have on these visitors. In response it was noted that, if anything the new arrangements should enhance the user's experience.

Also noted was one Member's belief that the word 'committed' should be incorporated into the terms and reference of the new governance arrangements.

## **RESOLVED**

That the Board:-

- a) commented accordingly and supports the guiding principles for reviewing Board governance as contained in paragraph 12 of the report as presented to the Board;
- b) instructs the Strategic Director (Operations) to formally review Salcombe Harbour's Board governance and management arrangements in line with DfT's Guide to Good Governance

## Report.

**RECOMMENDED**

That Council be **RECOMMENDED** to approve the review of the new Board governance arrangements for 2006/07.

SH.20/05 **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.

**Pontoon Projects**

The Board was advised that the Project Appraisal Form was yet to be approved by the Council's Senior Management Team. The time frame for replacement of the visitor pontoons was noted to be too tight to be completed prior to the 2006 season. The project for Whitestrand was able to proceed into the 2006 season as it was of minimum disruption.

**Harbour Guide**

The Board was introduced to Mr David Newman, who had been working on the new Harbour Guide. Mr Newman gave a presentation to the Board about the new guide, highlighting the following aspects:-

- why it was felt necessary to change/update the guide;
- funding for the 2006 guide;
- new features of the guide which had included a welcome from the Chairman of the Harbour Board, a rainy day guide, beach safety, information from the South West Coast Path Association and wireless broadband services;
- timetable of publication of the guide which noted that it was due to go to print during December 2005.

**Recycling Afloat**

The Board was informed that research was underway and that the funding needed to be allocated by 31 March 2006 otherwise it could be lost.

**Environmental Issues**

The Boards representative for English Nature gave a presentation on the results of a number of surveys and investigative work undertaken during the year in the estuary. During the presentation, the following aspects

were highlighted:-

- the importance of Salcombe estuary as a Site of Special Scientific Investigation due to its marine life;
- the negative impact of running moorings on sea grass.

In conclusion, it was noted that the Board should consider addressing the management of activities on the estuary as a whole in terms of incorporating environmentally friendly policies such as 'bungee' moorings.

**RESOLVED**

That the report be noted.

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

---

Chairman