

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
123.	The existing Harbour Board as the managing body governing the Southwold Harbour Lands is sufficient with possibly the inclusion of representative from Southwold Town Council and a representative from Southwold Town Council and a representative from the Harbour Users	Submitted directly to STH
124.	The existing Harbour Board and proposed HMC should be combined and the body should be responsible for the Harbour, Caravan Site, Camping site. It should compromise of 2 WDC Councillors, 2 WDC Councillors and 4 independent members with necessary skills	Submitted directly to STH
125.	I would like to see WDC and STC Honour the <u>BINDING</u> March 2015 Trust model agreement. This agreement has not yet been rescinded and according to the original business plan promulgated in response to this agreement, is economically viable	Submitted directly to STH
126.	<p>Whilst I welcome the proposal to use the Ports Good Governance Guidance as a basis for the future governance of Southwold Harbour Lands (SHL), I am not in favour of the specific proposal of a Harbour Management Committee as the way forward for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• there is not enough information from Waveney regarding the constitution of the Committee, so that there is no guarantee of an acceptable level of local involvement going forward</li> <li>• the Harbour Management Committee model is set out in Part C of the PGGG as a way for a Local Authority to incorporate good governance principles in governing a Local Authority owned port – this immediately raises the contentious issue of the ownership of SHL. It is by no means agreed that Waveney own the SHL. There is a very good argument that the SHL, as property held for charitable purposes under the Southwold Harbour Order 1933 (still the governing legislation for the SHL) could not pass under Article 16 of the Local Authorities (England) (Property etc.) Order 1973 as property held for charitable purposes is expressly excluded from Article 16, being property transferred by Section 210 of the Local Government Act 1972. To make ownership an issue, as the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee does, is to risk alienating local support for what are good principles for harbour management under the PGGG.</li> <li>• further, the Harbour Management Committee under the PGGG is very much envisaged as a committee within the current local authority system, with its Chair ‘ideally being an elected representative of the local authority’ and 50% local authority elected members. Without any detailed information about the proposed governance structure, there is</li> </ul>	Submitted directly to SHL, Handed to JC Member for submission and Emailed to WDC

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	<p>obvious concern that insufficient Southwold Town Councillors and independent members will be appointed to the Committee. How can its independence be guaranteed?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• it cannot be agreed that the existing Joint Committee, which is still the strategic board for the governance of the SHL, be dissolved in advance of the formation of any new governance structure, while the constitution of that structure is so uncertain. The Joint Committee should continue and run alongside any future governance structure, until the latter is properly constituted and agreed.</li> <li>• without more information, we cannot be sure that the Committee will be vested with the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL, nor can we be sure that it will be in a position to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy, both of which are essential prerequisites to any future governance model.</li> <li>• there is insufficient time being allowed for proper consideration of future governance and local views on the proposals if everything is to be rushed through in time for the 6<sup>th</sup> March meeting. The issues around the SHL are too complex and important to be decided in such a short period of time.</li> </ul>	
127.	I am happy as long as all parties agree and WDC "ring-fences" funds made in the harbour for the harbour's future.	Online Survey
128.	The current proposals are somewhat vague and we require details of who will be appointed, by whom, their suitability, their level of authority and will they be volunteers and is any payment proposed. The new HMC must operate within PG3 and the 1933 Harbour Order as regards the ring fencing and spending of monies raised by the harbour undertaking. The Harbour Master must be member of the committee as should stakeholders. The Caravan Site is on the harbour lands and must be included as part of the Harbour Operations not treated as a separate entity.	Online Survey
129.	I am happy as long as all parties agree and WDC "ring-fences" funds made in the harbour for the harbour's future.	Online Survey
130.	The current proposals are somewhat vague and we require details of who will be appointed, by whom, their suitability, their level of authority and will they be volunteers and is any payment proposed. The new HMC must operate within PG3 and the 1933 Harbour Order as regards the ring fencing and spending of monies raised by the harbour undertaking. The Harbour Master must	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	be member of the committee as should stakeholders. The Caravan Site is on the harbour lands and must be included as part of the Harbour Operations not treated as a separate entity.	
131.	I am not in favour of the specific proposal of a Harbour Management Committee as there is not enough information from Waveney regarding the constitution of the Committee: there is no guarantee of an acceptable level of local involvement. There is insufficient time being allowed for proper consideration. The issues around the SHL are too complex and important to be decided in such a short period of time.	Online Survey
132.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Not enough information from Waveney regarding the constitution of the Committee, so that there is no guarantee of an acceptable level of local involvement going forward</li> <li>• There is the contentious issue of the ownership of SHL. It is by no means agreed that Waveney own the SHL.</li> <li>• further, the Harbour Management Committee under the PGGG is very much envisaged as a committee within the current local authority system, with its Chair 'ideally being an elected representative of the local authority' and 50% local authority elected members. Without any detailed information about the proposed governance structure, there is obvious concern that insufficient Southwold Town Councillors and independent members will be appointed to the Committee.</li> <li>• the existing Joint Committee, must not be dissolved in advance of the formation of any new governance structure, while the constitution of that structure is so uncertain. The Joint Committee should continue and run alongside any future governance structure, until the latter is properly constituted and agreed.</li> <li>• without more information, we cannot be sure that the Committee will be vested with the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL, nor can we be sure that it will be in a position to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy,.</li> <li>• there is insufficient time being allowed for proper consideration of future governance and local views on the proposals if everything is to be rushed through in time for the 6th March meeting. The issues around the SHL are too complex and important to be decided in such a short period of time.</li> </ul>	Online Survey
133.	The proposals do not give enough detail and no reassurance that this will be binding	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
134.	To be honest, I do not understand the problem, and so cannot comment on the proposed solution. Please explain the problem.	Online Survey
135.	The proposals are not specific and lack clarity so it is impossible to form an opinion as to their adequacy. It might be fine but how are we to judge? There is insufficient information to form an informed opinion on what is proposed. Who will constitute the HMC and will they be paid? Will the HMC be an autonomous body or will it be the subject to the approval of a higher committee like the Southwold Harbour Board? If the HMC is subject to a higher authority, what is its purpose other than a talking shop with no authority? Where does the existing Harbour Management Committee fit in with your proposals? The existing committee includes unpaid volunteers. What do your proposals include? Should there be a conflict between your proposals and the 1933 Harbour Order which will take precedence? Do your proposals ring-fence the Harbour Revenues as required by Article 39 of the Order? Should there be a conflict between your proposals and the Port Good Governance Guide (PG3) which will take precedence? Will you be seeking exemption from any part of PG3? PG3 stipulates that the Harbourmaster should be on the Management Committee. Can you confirm that such will be the case? If not, why not? PG3 stipulates that the Stakeholders should be on the Management Committee. Can you confirm that such will be the case? If not, why not? Your proposals omit any reference to the caravan site which is on Harbour Land and no proposal can be complete without clarifying your proposals for the caravan site.	Online Survey
136.	Whilst we welcome the proposal to use the Ports Good Governance Guidance as a basis for the future governance of Southwold Harbour Lands (SHL), we are not in favour of the specific proposal of a Harbour Management Committee as the way forward for the following reasons: there is not enough information from Waveney regarding the constitution of the Committee, so that there is no guarantee of an acceptable level of local involvement going forward the Harbour Management Committee model is set out in Part C of the PGGG as a way for a Local Authority to incorporate good governance principles in governing a Local Authority owned port – this immediately raises the contentious issue of the ownership of SHL. It is by no means agreed that	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	<p>Waveney own the SHL. There is a very good argument that the SHL, as property held for charitable purposes under the Southwold Harbour Order 1933 (still the governing legislation for the SHL) could not pass under Article 16 of the Local Authorities (England) (Property etc.) Order 1973 as property held for charitable purposes is expressly excluded from Article 16, being property transferred by Section 210 of the Local Government Act 1972. To make ownership an issue, as the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee does, is to risk alienating local support for what are good principles for harbour management under the PGGG. further, the Harbour Management Committee under the PGGG is very much envisaged as a committee within the current local authority system, with its Chair 'ideally being an elected representative of the local authority' and 50% local authority elected members. Without any detailed information about the proposed governance structure, there is obvious concern that insufficient Southwold Town Councillors and independent members will be appointed to the Committee. How can its independence be guaranteed? it cannot be agreed that the existing Joint Committee, which is still the strategic board for the governance of the SHL, be dissolved in advance of the formation of any new governance structure, while the constitution of that structure is so uncertain. The Joint Committee should continue and run alongside any future governance structure, until the latter is properly constituted and agreed. without more information, we cannot be sure that the Committee will be vested with the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL, nor can we be sure that it will be in a position to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy, both of which are essential prerequisites to any future governance model. there is insufficient time being allowed for proper consideration of future governance and local views on the proposals if everything is to be rushed through in time for the 6th March meeting. The issues around the SHL are too complex and important to be decided in such a short period of time.</p>	
137.	<p>The establishment of an HMC, based on the Ports Good Governance Guidance, appears to be the best solution. However, the success of such a body will be reliant on the quality, breadth of knowledge and commintment of its appointed members.</p>	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
138.	not enough information, to convoluted.	Online Survey
139.	As much local involvement as possible	Online Survey
140.	My views are well expressed by the secretary of the Southwold and Reydon society.	Online Survey
141.	The lack of detail and clarity in the documents relating to this consultation make constructive comment very difficult. The HMC should be autonomous and able to determine strategy for the future of the harbour without political interference. All harbour income should be ring fenced to make it available for improvements to the infrastructure and in maintaining the facilities. This includes income from the camping/caravan site.	Online Survey
142.	We welcome the proposal to use the Ports Good Governance Guidance as the basis for future governance, but we are not in favour of the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee because: - there is not enough information regarding the constitution of the Committee, so there is no guarantee of the level of local involvement - the Harbour Management Committee is a model for good governance of a Local Authority owned port, which raises the contentious issue of ownership of the harbour lands. This risks alienating local support for what are good principles for harbour management under the PGGG, because it is by no means universally agreed that WDC own the harbour lands - the Harbour Management Committee under the PGGG seems to be very much a committee within the current local authority system; without detailed information about the proposed governance structure there is obvious concern that insufficient STC and independent members will be appointed - the current Joint Committee should not be dissolved until any new governance structure is fully constituted and agreed - can proper time be given to the complex issues of future governance, and all the responses to the Consultation, if everything is to be done in time for the 6th March meeting?	Online Survey
143.	I think it essential that local Southwold harbour users have proper representation on the committee	Online

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	and there is an independent chair who is appointed in agreement of all the representatives of the committee and not someone appointed by Waveney	Survey
144.	1. Would prefer a Trust Port structure because it ensures independence and focus solely on the long term interests of the Harbour Lands (HL). 2. Any committee should have as a chair someone who is independent both of the Council and of any of the bodies with a direct interest in the harbour. They could, but don't have to be, resident in Southwold or Walberswick. 3. The council should be represented on the committee as should the business interests which operate on the HL. 4. The committee should also seek to recruit members who have specific relevant knowledge of port management, leisure, fundraising and statutory requirements. 5. Create a system of accountability for the committee which is not just to the District Council but includes effective accountability to the locality ( a Trust model is good in this regard).	Online Survey
145.	Do not accept WCD's proposal's	Online Survey
146.	I fully support the Southwold & Reydon Society detailed response to this questionnaire. In particular I am concerned that the management committee should not be controlled by WDC but should have an INDEPENDENT CHAIRMAN who does not represent either WDC or STC	Online Survey
147.	There isn't enough detail on the proposed committee and management structure to answer this question. eg Throughout this document the caravan site is never mentioned yet it is the major financial contributor. The document says the new management board is short term. So what could it turn into? The harbour lands belong to the people of Southwold. Instead of fighting over ownership, I think they should become a charity, or be protected by a covenant, for posterity. After all councils can go bust and many have sold off the family silver. The proposals in the Port document are good, but this consultation should have more clarity about the representation on the board, the aims of the new board, scope and restrictions on its activities and powers, what would be in its MoU, . It should be an autonomous body, not controlled or responsible to WDC. The preamble to this survey talks about 'councillors and experts'. What about local people and	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q1. What are your views on the specific proposal for a Harbour Management Committee and the proposed governance structure?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	stakeholders? The harbour Lands must be governed by people who already have a stake in them, not outside experts unless they are really needed for a short term task. And crucially the members of the board must have voting rights and decision making power, it must NOT be just advisory. In addition the consultation should have explained why the charitable model agreed in 2015 (and agreed by many stakeholders) is not now appropriate. There is no detail on this in the consultation document, nor why the new proposal would be better. It may be better, indeed the Port document is good on governance, but the consultation document is vague. In particular there must be absolute, and publicised, clarity (in MoU etc) that no part of the harbour lands, nor the entirety of the harbour lands can be sold or leased out, the lands must be retained for posterity	

	<b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
122.	Waveney District Council should return the ownership of the Southwold Harbour Lands to Southwold Town Council and ensure that it receives proper funding and management	Submitted directly to STH
123.	WDC should ensure that there is an agreement/lease that ensures SHL cannot be sold off to any third party without 70% approval of residents in a referendum. The money earned by SHL to be ring fenced and invested in the Harbour Estuary	Submitted directly to STH
124.	A return to the March 2015 agreement	Submitted directly to STH
125.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a written, legally binding undertaking that all revenues generated by the Harbour, Caravan Site and the rest of the Harbour Lands are ring-fenced and all surpluses will be used for the maintenance and improvement of the SHL and the</li> </ul>	Submitted directly to

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<p>Blyth Estuary and not for any other purpose, in accordance with the terms of the 1933 Order</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a written, legally binding undertaking that no part of the SHL (and particularly with regard to the Caravan site) shall be sold and agreeing a form of lease arrangement that would ensure that the SHL are protected from sale in perpetuity</li> <li>• consider and consult upon adopting a Trust Port model for the SHL, with the district council continuing in its strategic role. This model has many advantages, for example:               <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. would still be able to adopt the guidance of the PGGG for the future management of the SHL, using Part B</li> <li>2. could provide a model that avoids the contentious issue of ownership, a trust port being an independent body, governed by its own unique statute (the 1933 Order) and controlled by a local independent board with no shareholders or owners</li> <li>3. all surpluses would be re-invested in the harbour for the benefit of stakeholders, and the SHL would be treated as ‘a valuable asset presently safeguarded by the existing board whose duty it is to hand it on in the same or better condition to succeeding generations’. (DfT definition of a Trust Port). This would answer a great many local concerns as to the future of the harbour.</li> <li>4. a Harbour Management Board could be set up to govern the SHL which properly takes into account local involvement and independence. For example, the Board could comprise two WDC Councillors or their appointees (including the CEO of WDC), plus two STC Councillors or their appointees, plus four independent members appointed on the basis of their skills and expertise to represent stakeholders (businesses, harbour users, the Environment Agency). The constitution should provide for a rolling re-selection process, with a minimum three- year term for continuity.</li> <li>5. the Board would be responsible for generating a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment is secured not only for the SHL but also for the Blyth Estuary.</li> <li>6. the Board would be responsible for an agreed budget and ensure the financial position of the SHL is properly and transparently accounted for, and reported to the DfT. The Board would be able to raise necessary investment funds to improve the infrastructure.</li> <li>7. one management structure for the whole of the SHL would be responsible to the Board for all operational and financial matters.</li> </ol> </li> </ul>	<p>SHL, Handed to JC Member for submission and Emailed to WDC</p>
126.	Work closely with STC, The Stake holders and DfT to find a solution, ring fence the harbour	Online

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b>	
	income to re-invest in the Harbour, stop pulling the plug on Harbour management, Produce a realistic plan and map for the future of the Harbour. Finally produce a report with STC in "layman's" terms the community will understand!	Survey
127.	A positive move would be presenting a Business Plan for the future under the PG3 and 1933 order including the Harbour Master in overall charge. Administration to be Southwold based employing local staff as far as is practical. Build trust by engaging with caravan owners and harbour users by attending their meetings. Keep separate accounts to fund future requirements for repairs, improvements and rebuilding.	Online Survey
128.	There should be a written, legally binding undertaking that all revenues generated by the Harbour, Caravan Site and the rest of the Harbour Lands are ring-fenced and all surpluses will be used for the maintenance and improvement of the SHL and the Blyth Estuary and not for any other purpose. Also there should be a written, legally binding undertaking that no part of the SHL (and particularly with regard to the Caravan site) can be sold and agreeing a form of lease arrangement that would ensure that the SHL are protected from sale.	Online Survey
129.	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• a written, legally binding undertaking that all revenues generated by the Harbour, Caravan Site and the rest of the Harbour Lands are ring-fenced and all surpluses will be used for the maintenance and improvement of the SHL and the Blyth Estuary</li> <li>• a written, legally binding undertaking that no part of the SHL shall be sold. an assurance is required that the SHL are protected from sale in perpetuity</li> <li>• consider and consult upon adopting a Trust Port model for the SHL, with the district council continuing in its strategic role. This model has many advantages, for example: 1. would still be able to adopt the guidance of the PGGG for the future management of the SHL, using Part B 2. could provide a model that avoids the contentious issue of ownership, a trust port being an independent body, governed by its own unique statute (the 1933 Order) and controlled by a local independent board with no shareholders or owners 3. all surpluses would be re-invested in the harbour for the benefit of stakeholders, and the SHL would be treated as 'a valuable asset presently safeguarded by the existing board whose duty it is to hand it on in the</li> </ul>	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<p><b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b></p> <p>same or better condition to succeeding generations'. (DfT definition of a Trust Port). This would answer a great many local concerns as to the future of the harbour. 4. a Harbour Management Board could be set up to govern the SHL which properly takes into account local involvement and independence. For example, the Board could comprise two WDC Councillors or their appointees (including the CEO of WDC), plus two STC Councillors or their appointees, plus four independent members appointed on the basis of their skills and expertise to represent stakeholders (businesses, harbour users, the Environment Agency). The constitution should provide for a rolling re-selection process, with a minimum three- year term for continuity. 5. the Board would be responsible for generating a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment is secured not only for the SHL but also for the Blyth Estuary. 6. the Board would be responsible for an agreed budget and ensure the financial position of the SHL is properly and transparently accounted for, and reported to the DfT. The Board would be able to raise necessary investment funds to improve the infrastructure. one management structure for the whole of the SHL would be responsible to the Board for all operational and financial matters</p>	
130.	Ensure that the rules are applied from the agreements reached.	Online Survey
131.	What is a "positive future"? - What are your ambitions? It seems OK as it is.	Online Survey
132.	Start honouring prior agreements would be a good beginning.	Online Survey
133.	We should like to see a written, legally binding undertaking that all revenues generated by the Harbour, Caravan Site and the rest of the Harbour Lands are ring-fenced and all surpluses will be used for the maintenance and improvement of the SHL and the Blyth Estuary and not for any other purpose, in accordance with the terms of the 1933 Order a written, legally binding undertaking that no part of the SHL (and particularly with regard to the Caravan site) shall be sold and agreeing a form of lease arrangement that would ensure that the SHL are protected from sale in perpetuity	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<p><b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b></p>	
	<p>consider and consult upon adopting a Trust Port model for the SHL, with the district council continuing in its strategic role. This model has many advantages, for example: would still be able to adopt the guidance of the PGGG for the future management of the SHL, using Part B could provide a model that avoids the contentious issue of ownership, a trust port being an independent body, governed by its own unique statute (the 1933 Order) and controlled by a local independent board with no shareholders or owners all surpluses would be re-invested in the harbour for the benefit of stakeholders, and the SHL would be treated as 'a valuable asset presently safeguarded by the existing board whose duty it is to hand it on in the same or better condition to succeeding generations'. (DfT definition of a Trust Port). This would answer a great many local concerns as to the future of the harbour. a Harbour Management Board could be set up to govern the SHL which properly takes into account local involvement and independence. For example, the Board could comprise two WDC Councillors or their appointees (including the CEO of WDC), plus two STC Councillors or their appointees, plus four independent members appointed on the basis of their skills and expertise to represent stakeholders (businesses, harbour users, the Environment Agency). The constitution should provide for a rolling re-selection process, with a minimum threeyear term for continuity. the Board would be responsible for generating a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment is secured not only for the SHL but also for the Blyth Estuary. the Board would be responsible for an agreed budget and ensure the financial position of the SHL is properly and transparently accounted for, and reported to the DfT. The Board would be able to raise necessary investment funds to improve the infrastructure. one management structure for the whole of the SHL would be responsible to the Board for all operational and financial matters.</p>	
134.	<p>The issue has always been due to poor communication and lack of transparency in motivation. The disconnect between WDC and local harbour stakeholders/visitors/users needs to be addressed. Not on a one off basis such as during an official consultation but rather on an ongoing, regular conversation. It is vital that this conversaion is 2 way .</p>	Online Survey
135.	<p>ring fence all revenue from the harbour &amp; caravan site.&amp; use the revenues to maintain &amp; improve</p>	Online

## Consultation Responses -Additional

<b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b>		
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	the harbour.	Survey
136.	To ensure the voice of Southwold residents and Southwold Harbour users are properly heard	Online Survey
137.	To implement the suggestions of the Southwold nd Reydon society	Online Survey
138.	Maintain separate accounts that enable the council to be held to account regarding the use of harbour income. Support the creation of a harbour management committee that is free from political interference by the council. Listen to and act on views of harbour users and other interested parties rather than imposing poorly informed governance from the council.	Online Survey
139.	We would like to see - a written legally binding undertaking that all revenues generated by the harbour and caravan site are ring-fenced and all surpluses used for the maintenance and improvement of the harbour lands and the estuary, and not for any other purpose - a written legally binding undertaking that no part of the harbour lands and caravan site shall be sold, perhaps agreeing a form of lease arrangement that would ensure that the harbour lands are protected from sale in perpetuity - consultation on and consideration of the adoption of a Trust Port model, with the district council continuing in its strategic role - the Trust Port model seems to have many advantages e.g. would still adopt the guidance of the PGGG; would avoid the contentious issue of ownership; all surpluses would be reinvested in the harbour for the benefit of stakeholders; a Harbour Management Board could be set up that takes into account local involvement and independence (two WDC, two STC, four independent members appointed for their skills and expertise) and which would be responsible for generating a strategic and financial plan for both the harbour lands and also the estuary. It seems to answer many of the local concerns about the harbour's future.	Online Survey
140.	They should make sure that the committee is truly representative of the harbour users. They should ensure that all the money raised is put back into the harbour lands and both Waveney and East Suffolk provide an undertaking never to all off any of the harbour lands	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q2. What action would you like Waveney District Council to take, to demonstrate its commitment to a positive future for the Southwold Harbour Lands?</b>	
141.	1. Develop, through the committee, a long term business and financial plan which demonstrates how the harbour can be managed sustainably. 2. Pledge that income generated from activities at the HL will be ring fenced and used only for the purpose of furthering the sustainability of the HL and that assets cannot be sold without widespread local consent (again, a Trust model would help with this). 3. Explicitly vest responsibility for the management of HL in the committee	Online Survey
142.	Agree to STC's ownership	Online Survey
143.	As for Q1, in particular a binding commitment to ring- fencing the revenues and any surplus arising from the Harbour Lands activities, and a commitment not to sell or otherwise dispose of the assets of the Harbour Lands	Online Survey
144.	Very quickly do this and publicise it: A legal guarantee that that the harbour lands cannot in part or in entirety be sold. Ideally put the lands in trust or a covenant or some way to tie it up in perpetuity for posterity. Publicise the document widely. I know some elected councillors have said the lands will not be sold, but further down the line others might. Don't leave it in local government hands - local government has been known to sell off the family silver! Ownership would be better put in trust for posterity. Local councils can go bust. Clarify what is meant by the Board only being short term, and what would/could happen to it under the new council. Why the rush? What would be the advantages/disadvantages of waiting until the new council is in place? Repay some of the enormous sums that WDC has taken out of the harbour revenue over the last 40 years, and write off the harbour wall debt Move the management of the caravan site and harbour to Southwold - at present very distant in council offices in Lowestoft Start consultations with local stakeholders now on the vision and embryo business plan Ensure all local stakeholders are represented on the new board and that the board have equal voting and decision making powers and is not just advisory, and that no one council or stakeholder has unequal power see also my answers to Q4	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q3. Funding for future investment in Southwold Harbour Lands is critical to its future. How should any future management arrangement best prioritise improvements to the harbour?</b>	
122.	Improvements to the harbour must be prioritised in respect of its maritime facilities, particularly the piling at the entrance to the harbour, as without this it would cease to be a working harbour. Cosmetic improvements particularly to the access road are not necessary and would detract from the distinct character of this unique environment	Submitted directly to STH
123.	The board/HMC should have a constitution to develop a strategic business plan for SHL. There should only be one organisation that supports the Harbour Manager and his team to meet the strategic and budget objectives, repairing the harbour structures and improving the caravan site	Submitted directly to STH
124.	WDC should either write off £540k of the supposed harbour debt or pay the harbour all owed for the missing 42yrs of rental for the caravan park. If WDC's intransigence on this matter were to continue then WDC should fund the 2015 Trust agreement until such time it becomes self funding from Harbour Lands Profit	Submitted directly to STH
125.	<p>With a change of status to that of Trust Port, the Board would be responsible for drafting a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment in the SHL and also in the Blyth Estuary.</p> <p>With the income from the harbour, the caravan site and the rest of the Harbour Lands ring-fenced, all surpluses would be applied in the maintenance and improvement of the SHL, in accordance with the trust port model, the business plan and taking into account the detailed survey commissioned by WDC when those results are known.</p> <p>The Board, consisting as it would of a combination of Councillors and independent experts, would be best placed to take decisions over the prioritising of future improvements to the harbour.</p>	Submitted directly to SHL, Handed to JC Member for submission and Emailed to WDC
126.	WDC should publicly pledge to follow any decisions made by the JC	
127.	A Business Plan has to be produced commencing with the very urgent requirement to rebuild the South Training Arm of the harbour which was stated to have a remaining structural life of 5 years some 20 years ago. Sufficient funds for this project could have been accrued from harbour operations had they been ringfenced and retained. Prudent future operation of the undertaking could service any loans required to bring the harbour and caravan up to necessary standard.	Online Survey
128.	With the income from the harbour, the caravan site and the rest of the Harbour Lands ring-fenced, all surpluses would be applied in the maintenance and improvement of the SHL.	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q3. Funding for future investment in Southwold Harbour Lands is critical to its future. How should any future management arrangement best prioritise improvements to the harbour?</b>	
129.	With a change of status to that of Trust Port, the Board would be responsible for drafting a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment in the SHL and also in the Blyth Estuary. With the income from the harbour, the caravan site and the rest of the Harbour Lands ring-fenced, all surpluses would be applied in the maintenance and improvement of the SHL, in accordance with the trust port model, the business plan and taking into account the detailed survey commissioned by WDC when those results are known. The Board, consisting as it would of a combination of Councillors and independent experts, would be best placed to take decisions over the prioritising of future improvements to the harbour.	Online Survey
130.	All Income from the Harbour Area must be set aside and re-invested in the Harbour Area under all the Acts of law in place. Any money generated by the Harbour remains	Online Survey
131.	Why - what are you actually wanting to invest in? - It currently works OK as a harbour for visiting yachts and fishing boats. What else do you want to do? Please specify the propose improvements.	Online Survey
132.	Harbour revenues must be ring-fenced as required by the 1933 Order which will provide funding from income. Without a business plan it is impossible to respond to this question. Waveney District Council should cease siphoning off revenues from Southwold Harbour Lands.	Online Survey
133.	With a change of status to that of Trust Port, the Board would be responsible for drafting a strategic and financial business plan to ensure investment in the SHL and also in the Blyth Estuary. With the income from the harbour, the caravan site and the rest of the Harbour Lands ring-fenced, all surpluses would be applied in the maintenance and improvement of the SHL, in accordance with the trust port model, the business plan and taking into account the detailed survey commissioned by WDC when those results are known. The Board, consisting as it would of a combination of Councillors and independent experts, would be best placed to take decisions over the prioritising of future improvements to the harbour.	Online Survey
134.	Priority 1. Anything that effects day to day running of the harbour. (action required within 12 months) P2. Facilities, roads, access, marketing. P3. Medium term repairs projects on South peir, harbour wall improvement. P4. Long term - Flood protection	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q3. Funding for future investment in Southwold Harbour Lands is critical to its future. How should any future management arrangement best prioritise improvements to the harbour?</b>	
135.	put to gather a spending commitment, that is reviewed 6 monthly. & any short fall, re-adjust the priorities & increase/decrease budget as necessary.	Online Survey
136.	Again - local knowledge and involvement is essential	Online Survey
137.	income from the assets should be ring fenced to be spent on the land and the facilities. In addition the relevant statutory authorities must be held to account for funding the services for which they are responsible eg flood defence from their general funds	Online Survey
138.	Work with the harbour users and the town council to construct a prioritised maintenance and improvement plan with clear costings, timescales and success criteria. Ensure that all harbour revenues are made available for this purpose.	Online Survey
139.	A Harbour Management Board should ensure that all surpluses from the harbour and caravan site are applied for the maintenance and improvement of both the harbour and the estuary, with one management structure responsible for all operational and financial matters, with proper and transparent accounts, and in accordance with the business plan that would be drafted and taking into account the results of the survey currently being commissioned.	Online Survey
140.	Much of the funding proposals made by Waveney appear to be loaning money at a high rate of interest which is not necessary. Surveys by professionals of the Harbour needs should be undertaken and a plan executed. The plucking of figures out of the air by unqualified consultants is not the way forward	Online Survey
141.	1. The key is a comprehensive business plan which takes account of all future needs relevant to the HL and a committee which is tasked with managing the HL to optimise their long term viability. In that way, the committee is forced to consider and take balanced decisions as to possibly competing demands for resources/interests of say users of the river, users of the caravan site, traders on Blackshore etc. 2. The committee should be able to borrow from the Council to fund capital works as needed	Online Survey
142.	Not IMPROVEMENTs but repairs	Online

## Consultation Responses -Additional

<b>Q3. Funding for future investment in Southwold Harbour Lands is critical to its future. How should any future management arrangement best prioritise improvements to the harbour?</b>		
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
		Survey
143.	Ensuring that there is a long term strategic and expenditure plan together with a funding plan for all Expenditures	Online Survey
144.	No money to be taken out of the harbour lands account without the new Board's agreement. A costed business plan to be in place very quickly Prioritise developments that will make the lands and businesses and activities on the lands carbon neutral. Given the recent report on climate change, commission urgent expert advice on how to achieve carbon neutrality in next five years, and integrate it into all items in the business plan. Keep the un-manicured nature of the lands, while improving things for local businesses, harbour users and residents, caravan owners etc and the visiting public. Consult with all of these stakeholders Address flood and erosion issues, including prevention up the Blyth valley, and repair/replace the South Training Arm (take advice from local people who have experiential and technical knowledge of the river and the river mouth) Stop through traffic except that needed for businesses and the local bus Don't let WDC run any contracts or developments - its track record is v poor (see q4 answer)	Online Survey

<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>		
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
124.	Transparency and openness can only be maintained by holding regular public meetings in which all aspects of future investment can be discussed and agreed	Submitted directly to STH
125.	(illegible) the constitution (illegible) should be a transparent process for selecting board members. The members should have a minimum term. Board meetings should be held in public on a monthly basis to cover all topics except confidentiality. Local capable people should be on the board.	Submitted directly to STH

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>	
126.	At the meeting of 06/02/19 at St Edmunds Hall attendees were assured that all profits from the harbour lands would be ring fenced for the harbour. WDCs medium term financial strategy plans to extract £112,000 annually from the caravan park for the next 4 years WDC should drop this strategy as a demonstration of transparency and openness	Submitted directly to STH
127.	<p>Adopting a Trust Port Harbour Management Board model would go a long way towards re-establishing local trust in the future management of the harbour.</p> <p>As Mark Bee stated at the meeting on 6<sup>th</sup> February “trust is the key word here”, and I think it is fair to say that some sectors of the local community have lost trust in WDC’s management of the SHL.</p> <p>Trust Port Boards are required to carry out their functions and tasks in the interest of all stakeholders and in a transparent and accountable way. The guidance of the PGGG should be followed, with its emphasis on good governance including stakeholder engagement.</p> <p>There should be absolute transparency and openness on these fundamental issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• local involvement and independence in the future management of the harbour</li> <li>• the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL and its ability to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy to be vested in the future management arrangement, including the allocation of funds for works needed to ensure the future of the harbour</li> <li>• guarantees that there will be no sale of the SHL, including the caravan site and that all surplus income generated from the SHL will be reinvested back into the SHL</li> </ul>	Submitted directly to SHL, Handed to JC Member for submission and Emailed to WDC
128.	By having public meetings not just consultation periods and almost running it as a local authority giving time for the public to speak!	Online Survey
129.	Openness, Transparency and Stakeholder Engagement was promised in 2015 this has not happened, only W D C can build the trust that currently does not exist. Any future proposals have to have agreed objectives with transparency to gain local support	Online Survey
130.	Adopting a Trust Port Harbour Management Board model would go a long way towards reestablishing local trust in the future management of the harbour. Trust Port Boards are required to carry out their functions and tasks in the interest of all stakeholders and in a transparent and	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<p><b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b></p> <p>accountable way. The guidance of the PGGG should be followed, with its emphasis on good governance including stakeholder engagement. There should be absolute transparency and openness on these fundamental issues –</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• local involvement and independence in the future management of the harbour</li> <li>• the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL and its ability to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy to be vested in the future management arrangement, including the allocation of funds for works needed to ensure the future of the harbour</li> <li>• guarantees that there will be no sale of the SHL, including the caravan site and that all surplus income generated from the SHL will be reinvested back into the SHL</li> </ul> <p>Adopting a Trust Port Harbour Management Board model would go a long way towards reestablishing local trust in the future management of the harbour. There should be absolute transparency and openness on these fundamental issues – local involvement and independence in the future management of the harbour the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL and its ability to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy to be vested in the future management arrangement, including the allocation of funds for works needed to ensure the future of the harbour guarantees that there will be no sale of the SHL, including the caravan site and that all surplus income generated from the SHL will be reinvested back into the SHL</p>	
131.	Can we be assured that if any Trust is formed the people elected should have total unassociated connections with WDC or SCC or STC? It is imperative there is no association with any of the council officials or their advisors. To ensure there will not be a Conflict of Interest. The bodies voted to join the group must be Independent. We need to ensure that WDC/SCCor STC cannot overrule any law to suit their budget needs. The money generated must be re-invested in the harbour lands.	Online Survey
132.	By being transparent about what you are trying to achieve.	Online Survey
133.	We were promised openness, transparency and stakeholder involvement by Arthur Chavonia in March 2015. WDC failed to deliver.	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

Response Number	Text	Origin
	<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>	
134.	Adopting a Trust Port Harbour Management Board model would go a long way towards reestablishing local trust in the future management of the harbour. As Mark Bee stated at the meeting on 6th February “trust is the key word here”, and I think it is fair to say that some sectors of the local community have lost trust in WDC’s management of the SHL. Trust Port Boards are required to carry out their functions and tasks in the interest of all stakeholders and in a transparent and accountable way. The guidance of the PGGG should be followed, with its emphasis on good governance including stakeholder engagement. There should be absolute transparency and openness on these fundamental issues – local involvement and independence in the future management of the harbour the fullest possible strategic and operational control of the SHL and its ability to contribute to the Blyth Estuary strategy to be vested in the future management arrangement, including the allocation of funds for works needed to ensure the future of the harbour guarantees that there will be no sale of the SHL, including the caravan site and that all surplus income generated from the SHL will be reinvested back into the SHL.	Online Survey
135.	See section 3 of Section 4, Provision of information - within the Ports Good Governance Guidance. A requirement of an effective HMC.	Online Survey
136.	have the harbour, caravan park & lands held in trust & weighted to the nominees from Southwold.	Online Survey
137.	Open meetings. Published minutes etc	Online Survey
138.	Having an open structure, with the lands management being accountable to the local community. making sure that those managing these resources can be dismissed if needed	Online Survey
139.	If WDC (or its successor) is to regain credibility with stakeholders, it will be necessary to not only listen to local views but to act on them without the tiresome ‘we are here to govern, and we know best’ attitude that has been central to the council’s culture and that has been too apparent in recent years. Stop telling – start listening and demonstrating that what is said will be truly considered. Make the effort to communicate the rationale for decisions taken.	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>		
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
140.	The adoption of a Trust Port Harbour Management Board model would go a long way towards reestablishing local trust in the future management of the harbour, because of the clear requirement to carry out its functions and tasks in the interest of all stakeholders and in a transparent and accountable way. The harbour lands would be treated as 'a valuable asset presently safeguarded by the existing board whose duty it is to hand it on in the same or better condition to succeeding generations' (DfT definition of a trust port). Surely this is the very essence of the future working relationship we would all want to see?	Online Survey
141.	There has been a complete lack of trust between the harbour users and Waveney and it has been made worse by the attitude of some of the elected members of Southwold TC. An independent chairman should be appointed by the Committee who has the confidence of all parties and not a person appointed by Waveney alone. Minutes of the meetings should be publicly available (except for confidential areas)	Online Survey
142.	1. A clear charter for the committee which sets out its purpose, obligations and reporting responsibilities. 2. A requirement for semi annual reports of the committee's activities to be submitted to the Council, to the Town Council and to be published, whether on a website or otherwise. 3. A requirement that all major investments be put out to local public consultation before being undertaken	Online Survey
143.	Put people in who you already believe in	Online Survey
144.	I would favour a Trust Port model which should allow for maximum transparency	
145.	MY impression is that local people including caravan owners like myself have lost faith in WDC because of its incompetence and cackhandedness and lack of transparency in the past, viz -The Joint Committee met frequently on an informal basis without minutes and with no published agenda It held 'open' meetings at which the public and stakeholders were not allowed to speak - WDC have taken an enormous amount of money out of the harbour revenue for the last 40 years and not submitted accounts to the appropriate bodies -10 years ago WDC tried to sell the caravan	Online Survey

## Consultation Responses -Additional

	<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	<p>site. 5 years ago it tried to contract out the site to Tingdene (which submitted a glossy proposal for the site which had not been discussed with caravan owners at all . We were all horrified at what was being proposed). -WDC management of the Harbour Wall contract, both construction and finances, which resulted in the need for expensive repairs to a new structure and it is still not fit for purpose. The contractors have gone bust and I understand there is some question that they were paid twice (error? incompetence? or what?), WDC is charging the harbour account a huge rate of interest on the outstanding 'loan' which was made from its own funds -Despite requests over many years for this to happen, the Harbour revenues were only ringfenced after WDC's appointed solicitor stated publicly in the 2015 consultation that WDC was acting illegally in not keeping separate accounts for the harbour lands. -the caravan site is managed from council offices in Lowestoft, on-site managers are given a pitiful budget to do basic repairs and maintenance, yet the caravan site is returning about £300,000 in revenue each year. And there's lots more. So are you surprised that people don't trust WDC? SO, to answer your question no4: -Make it legally and crystal clear that the harbour lands cannot be sold or leased and will be kept for future generations. Do this via a trust, or a covenant, or MoU, but do it and publicise the document. - Recognise and admit publicly the failings of the past (see list above) The new Board must be permanent, not a short term arrangement State clearly and publicly, together with East Suffolk, how the harbour lands will go forward in the new merged council The new Board must be permanent, not short term (as stated in the consultation document), or if short term, then there must be a public statement NOW about what it will morph into, or how this process will be achieved. The new board members must represent local communities, businesses on the harbour, caravan owners and other key stakeholders, and have voting rights and decision-making powers, NOT be advisory or answerable to or dominated by WDC or the new Council. The Port doc is good on governance, accountability, and transparency of management. All meetings should be in line with real democracy ,have papers and minutes and be open to the public. Proper two way discussion should be facilitated, using public meetings where appropriate. No proposals should be</p>	

## Consultation Responses -Additional

---

	<b>Q4. Transparency and openness is critical to any successful future working relationship. How best can this be demonstrated by any future management arrangement?</b>	
<b>Response Number</b>	<b>Text</b>	<b>Origin</b>
	<p>published without explanations (viz this consultation doesn't say why the 2015 agreement is now no good. There may be good reasons but they are not stated.) There is nothing in the consultation document about a vision for the future. The charm of Southwold Harbour is that it is not a plush upmarket, manicured tourist trap. Some statement is required about vision. In addition, and most important, given the recent report on climate change and the need to reduce our carbon footprint rapidly in the next few years, if we are not all to roast and have nothing to eat, there must urgently be a survey by a reputable specialist company on how developments on the caravan site and harbour could be done in such a way as to achieve carbon neutral status within 5 years. I.e. take a new radical approach, to help future generations.</p>	