

## **Public meeting – Southwold Harbour Lands consultation –**

**Wednesday 6<sup>th</sup> February 2019**

**Held at St Edmunds Hall Southwold at 6.30pm.**

Approx. 120 members of public attended.

### **Panel**

Mark Bee introduced himself - Leader of WDC - and asked panel to introduce themselves too.

Panel made up of; Kerry Blair, Head of Operations for WDC, Will Windell Southwold Town Council and Chair of the Joint Cttee, Andy Jarvis Head of Strategy for WDC, Andy Gallant Project Manager for the project – employed by WDC.

### **Introduction by Mark Bee**

*‘Tonight, is an important opportunity for local people to ask questions about the future of Southwold Harbour lands and to discuss a range of matters relating to the proposals for its future operations. I understand as well as anybody that we all make ultimately the best decisions we can, and I hope that this evening will be a genuinely constructive occasion for all which puts Southwold first and that’s what we all want to do. If it’s ok, I want to start by presenting a brief summary of the activities and events to date in the recent history of Southwold harbour. As you know WDC and STC want to hear your views about how the harbour lands should be managed and going forward how we make decisions in the best interest of the area and the local people.*

*Previously in 2014 the Councils carried out a consultation about future management arrangements and the key points raised were these: Ensuring local influence over decisions, retaining the character of the harbour and the surrounding lands and ensuring that there is investment in the harbour in the future.*

*As many of you will be aware a proposal to establish a charitable trust to run the harbour was accepted in 2015. However, Waveney has voiced concerns that this model would mean that the Council could potentially lose control of the harbour whilst remaining financially liable for its upkeep and improvements. It is argued that significant investment in the harbour is required and we are currently commissioning a computer model to help us understand the scale of that investment required and to keep the harbour open to businesses and to visitors. So, in December last year a meeting of the Joint Harbour Committee requested that the councils carry out a consultation about alternative models for running the harbour and tonight’s meeting is a part of that process of consultations. Specifically, we want to consult on the proposal to set up a Harbour Management Committee an HMC to run the harbour and to manage a long-term investment programme. HMC’s are recommended by Government as being the best way to operate the harbour in the interests of a range of stakeholders. It would have representatives from the District and Town Councils but also local stakeholders which would include harbour users, business owners, and experts in harbour*

*management. HMC's are established models and work successfully in various locations around the country for example in Weymouth. If an HMC were to be established in Southwold we would ensure that a memorandum of understanding was created so that all parties may understand exactly what the committee could and would deliver. Trust really is the key word here. In summary an HMC will provide a model which will first of all meet all of the principals set out in the 2014 consultation, it will enable local influence by giving local people a voice in the committee, it will provide an opportunity for expert input into decisions affecting the harbour, it will provide an effective management structure in order to make decisions and manage investments and provide WDC with a level of control that will provide security for all future financial investments. Hearing from local people is incredibly important and this consultation has been available online in the form of a survey since the end of January with 29 responses so far. We have also staged 2 Saturday drop in events in Southwold and we are also carrying out interviews in the town to promote the consultation and seek people's views. When the consultation is complete, we will use the feedback we have received to draw up recommendations for a meeting of the joint committee on 6<sup>th</sup> March. At this meeting the Committee will consider the various governance options for running a harbour before making a recommendation to a joint meeting of WDC and STC which will be held on 15<sup>th</sup> March. I hope that provides some clarity for everybody here tonight and we are now happy to move into the question time so please feel free any points of clarification or raise any issue that you want so that we can take this matter forward.*

*Thank you very much for listening.'*

#### Questions

Q - Please explain the extent of the harbour lands that you are identifying on your map.

A – (KB) It covers essentially all of the harbour and the harbour structures out to the mouth, all the way down to Buss Creek, all the way back down to the bridge, all the way round to the boating lake and includes the caravan site. There is a section of the camping field to the right which is not covered by that area but the vast majority of that is covered within the definition of Southwold the harbour lands.

Q - Why all the way through Buss Creek.

A - (WW) Its historic, it's the area that has been defined as Southwold harbour lands. Everything you can see of the actual river until the bridge that is harbour lands. The caravan site is harbour lands. The camping fields are outside. There is a creek that runs at the top of the caravan site and that runs all the way along the Ferry Road. That is Salt Creek. If we move up river to the area where the Bailey Bridge is, you have Buss Creek and that takes it all the way round to the boating lake and that is historical.

Q - Michael Ladd STC & WDC – One of the big issues is about selling off the harbour. If there is something that could actually be written into the deeds or somewhere like that would be helpful because officers and councillors move on and its hard to remember what was agreed at that time so if there was something about the harbour and harbour lands would never be sold, in some sort of written agreement which would be there for all time that would satisfy a lot of people.

Question re the estuary a bit further up the river – are we looking at doing something there because there is no point investing or spending money on the harbour mouth or the harbour as just been described if the estuary is let go - Environment Agency have now moved out of maintaining the estuary so would like to ask whether the estuary has been included in any future investment.

A (MB) - Categorical assurance that we will not sell that land and will write that into the agreement. One of the reasons that we want to get on to this now is the creation of East Suffolk Council. Want to do this in the right way and the right process. Want to put those things right before hand over to the successor authority East Suffolk Council and thus why want that done now. Needs to be written so that it is there for the future and for the future assurance. Not without precedent in other parts of the district. This gives an opportunity for investment in the Blyth - need to ensure that there is maintenance and the proper programme for all of that estuary - this does give an opportunity for that investment.

Q - Wendy Mantin– Will the computer-generated model encompass the whole of the estuary area - Southwold harbour won't survive unless the estuary is dealt with so that would have to form a very big part of that model.

A – Yes. Scoping document is a very complicated piece of work to go out to find specialist organisations to carry out the survey that has been drafted. Hoping to go out with the full spec. within the next couple of months. Project has grown - initially wanted to answer the question of how to reduce the swell on the north dock wall but in consultation with a number of harbour users and looking at previous research it became clear that no point in doing anything at the harbour mouth if changes to the banks upstream due to the flow of the river were all silting. The survey will be extensive piece of work. Want to ensure that the harbour is a viable harbour for the next 30-40 years and to understand what investment is going to be required. Survey will go all the way back and possibly onto the other side of the A12.

Q – Re harbour management committee and mix of members. 50% of local authority elected members has been mentioned - could that increase to above 50%? Does each member of the committee have equal voting status or will some votes count higher than others?

A – (AJ) Intention is to follow the good governance guide - that's where the approximate figure comes from. Will need to be decisions made in terms of what is the appropriate way for the district council to be involved on management committee, the town council and then the stakeholders. Will be discussions about what that looks like, and who is on it. Will have advisors on it and some people will have voting rights.

Q - Can we have a reassurance that all the services raised from the harbour lands area and the caravan site - that those monies will be kept within the harbour operation and will be used for the proper maintenance. If there is a surplus how it is to be used in the future?

A - Yes. There is a requirement that that's the case - there is a Scrutiny Committee meeting at WDC tomorrow which asks that question. Look on WDC's website to see a series of papers - will see the response to that - will see some details of the accounts which establish position with regards to the harbour money over number of years. The money raised within the harbour lands the surplus will be used to fund work in the harbour. Don't know what the cost of that investment is going to be - it could be from £10million to £20million. The survey will give answer - will be using the money that is generated from the harbour to be able to finance and fund that work.

Q – from local resident – know the area very well and treasure the harbour. Particular concerns about governance - important before go much further that there are really clear ideas about governance' and 'approx.'. 50% of councillors. Summary document says one way is the harbour management committee - would like to know what the other ways might have been. Concerned about the percentage membership by councillors - need people to want to be on it and when they are on the harbour management council.

A - people have got to take role seriously. Up to the future leader of East Suffolk or the local representatives and the Town Council to make sure that happens. If had turned up with an all singing all dancing product then the feeling would be that all made up our minds. Want to have genuine consultations and have genuine buy in of people. Got to get governance right which can happen if get the consultation right, so people can understand what is involved. Goes forward from the consultation and from tonight's meeting to the meeting in March.

A - meeting held in December where WDC set the case as to why from Waveney's perspective a charitable trust model wasn't workable any more - came down to the control issue. Likely that the results of that survey will show that there is a considerable investment required - could be millions - highly likely that borrowing is going to be needed in order to be able to achieve that. The issue with a charitable trust is that ultimately WDC will lose control over that body because it will be open to elections and new trustees could be elected. Wouldn't be any control from Waveney and that becomes an issue if WDC still have the responsibility for the asset. If the charitable trust were to go under ultimately it would come back to Waveney. The issue would be that WDC would have all of the liabilities but none of the control. The harbour management committee is an attempt to have local influence and say whilst we accept that Waveney is going to need to finance these works on the harbour.

Q - define control

A - From Waveney District Council's point of view haven't come with a fully determined answer for that. Will need to be written into the terms of the memorandum of understanding.

Q - Ownership of the harbour lands - not universally accepted that WDC actually owns the harbour lands? Have WDC taken legal advice to form an opinion on ownership, and if so, is the council is prepared to make that available to the public.

A (MB) This has come up a lot. First became leader of WDC in 2003 and had this issue then. Have been told by the lawyers that it is one of the things that we have looked at as part of the scrutiny tomorrow. While will never satisfy everybody's view on that as far as WDC are concerned and with the responsibility that WDC have held with the harbour undertaking over these 40 years as a district council WDC are confident of ownership of that land.

Q - David Beavan – Concerned about the caravan site - the harbour was built on the herring fleet - without the caravan site the harbour is not really sustainable. Need the caravan site and the profits from that to keep the harbour going. Concerned that Waveney are taking the profits from the caravan site from the harbour when need so much investment.

A - Lots of comment about the caravan site - the harbour lands and harbour are not being sold. The caravan site is integral to the whole management of the harbour - part of it is the harbour lands with the campsite just outside. The caravan site itself requires investment and that will need to happen, and that money has got to be found. That is one of the reasons why the District Council is saying that it has to have that ultimate say of control over it in order to put the money in and not just take

the liability. If the District Council has to find the money - there can be local management, but it has got to have that interest in it. There is an intention to invest in the caravan site and there is an intention to then use the money raised from that to invest in a local infrastructure around the harbour. Will be for the harbour management committee to have the influence on exactly how that works. Two things need to come together - Investment in the caravan site, investment in the harbour.

Another rumour that is out there is that the investment in the caravan site and the investment in the harbour is going to be something akin to Great Yarmouth or Cleethorpes i.e. there is going to be amusement parks etc - absolutely not the intention. The intention is to invest in the harbour and to keep it in the spirit of Southwold. Needs investment - if don't invest in it it won't be there for that much longer. It is about investing in the harbour.

Q - Simon Flunder – Pick up on the point of the governance - the government department have ports good governance guidance and they have three categories (a) which is for the main harbours (b) which is for trust ports and (c) which is for the local authority ports. Feel that the harbour management committee idea is main idea for going forward. Would hope WDC would still consider the trust port option - there is Littlehampton port which is a trust port system and works very well. There are parent councillors on the trust along with local councillors and there are experts and it seems to work very well. They seem to be able to invest money into harbour and into the lands - would hope that ears are not closed for the idea of a trust port proposal.

A - WDC haven't decided more detail because these are comments and concerns that WDC want to hear.

A - The government website has lists of trust ports and lists of municipal ports and Southwold harbour is down as a municipal port - it is not on the list of trust ports. Is not a trust port - the government views it as a municipal port. Model that WDC are looking for as per the good governance guide is absolutely right. There are different models – may go forward under the municipal port arrangement. Open to getting multi-disciplinary representation on the harbour management committee. Yes, there will need to be District Council representation. Thinking that there should be strong representation from the Town Council because need to work together. District Council working with the Town Council. Needs to be representation from the users, from the businesses and there needs to be expert advice. District Council need to be confident that if it is going to put the investment in it has a say in the way it works.

A (KB) Looked at Littlehampton website and - it is a trust port. Southwold is a municipal port. But on their website was the availability of information - that has been a source of real frustration over the years - lots of different groups; there's the harbour management group, there's the harbour users' group, there's a harbour authority group, none of them provide local people with the opportunity for much input. None of them seem to provide a great deal of information. That has led to a feeling that there is a lack of transparency. Good thing about the Littlehampton example was that all the minutes were there- can see when they had public meetings, can see who people were, can see what their background was. Reports and accounts were published, the business plan was published, the investment plan. Let's have that as a model - is an opportunity to do things far more openly and transparently than done in the past.

A - Whole idea of the good governance guidance is to try and provide some consistency across all three of those models - the private, the trust ports and the municipal ports. Idea of an HMC has

come from trust ports which have run in that way for ever since they were first thought. PGGG is set out is to try and have some consistency.

Q - Simon Flunder - charitable link would obviously benefit the harbour because you obviously get the benefit and revenue and tax benefits. Having it as a charity - because in 1933 the harbour was identified as a charity and that's the order on which the current harbour is running.

A (WW) - In the early 20<sup>th</sup> century the harbour was owned by a private company. The borough council bought it back for 10 shillings, it was a municipal port. All the correspondence since then talks of it as a municipal port. There is no mention between the borough council and the department of transport that it was a trust port. It has always been a municipal port – start from there - part of the consultation. It is a municipal port and not a trust port.

Q - the river banks up and beyond the bailey bridge - concerned about those as they are beyond the jurisdiction of the harbour lands and are maintained by the Environment Agency. 2007/2008 when we had a surge tide - there were 11 breaches in the bank up beyond the bailey bridge. Need some assurance from the Environment Agency themselves that they are going to continue to maintain those banks because at the time those breaches occurred, they said that they weren't going to repair them.

A - the Environment Agency need to give that assurance and WDC would support that.

Q - Southwold resident –question for Cllrs Bee and Windell. Can you give us an assurance that the memorandum of understanding and the selection process for the new proposed harbour management committee will be in line with Southwold Town Council's stated aim of taking the harbour back under local control?

A (WW) Yes this is our intention. People have complained about two major problems about the harbour. Lack of financial investment. Lack of local control, local input - this is the opportunity for the Town Council to have the influence being demanded. See that as reassurance that its not going to be sold. If Southwold Town Council is a part of a management team as part of the process, the Town Council would want to see it kept in local control but also more importantly local influence.

Q - Want to make sure that all of the wildlife on both sides be considered when any works get going.

A - will be under the undertaking of that management committee to preserve the environment because the environment is the most valued valuable thing here and clearly the wildlife would be a part of that. Would not want to see destruction or anything that would destruct or damage that environment in any way. Got to get the governance right, get the people right, get the local involvement right.

A (WW) Town Council at the moment has commissioned a management plan from the Suffolk Wildlife Trust to look at the marshes, the common and what STC are trying to do is work with other bodies like the Suffolk Wildlife Trust and the AONB to make sure that everything is approached in a holistic way. Want the ditches to be looked after. Would want the marshes to be looked after. As the chairman of the common trust want the common to be the best it can be, and we are working on that and it is improving it all the time.

Q - Does that go to the bit beyond the bailey bridge, tinker's marsh going up, the bit behind the sailing club.

A - Yes – we would want to work with our partners and other organisations on this.

Q - Seems to be a great deal of scepticism about Waveney. There was an agreement to make a charitable trust back in 2015 there has been a great deal of inactivity on Waveney's part since then. Re governance - On the management committee is there going to be an overall majority of the people of Southwold or is there going to be an overall majority of Waveney or the successors of Waveney. Re the income from the harbour, the income from the caravan park is the combined income from those going to be ringfenced so it's going to be spent on the harbour on the caravan site.

A – (MB) yes to local involvement and local engagement. Its why need involvement in consultation and why we are going through this process. Frustration that it taken so long - when I first was leader this was an issue, I thought we had got to the point of taking this to a step where it could be concluded. Couldn't believe when then came back as leader that it was still all going on. I felt we needed to get around the table to start sorting this out and getting it done properly and right before we turn into an East Suffolk Council.

A – (KB) want to give an assurance about finances. The surpluses from the harbour lands are ringfenced for the harbour and that will be the case going forwards. Sit on the harbour management group with Cllr Beavan, Cllr Flunder and Graham Hay Davison previously and the harbour master Pete Simmons and it feels like a generally joint endeavour. The conversations in those meetings are about the running of the harbour. i.e. what do we invest in the dilapidated fender at the end of the north trading arm, when do we do it, shall we do it before the winter storms or after, it is about the running of the harbour. Relationship has been so dysfunctional and – it is about the decision of running the harbour - there needs to be a degree of control over things like the budget and the money but there is a shared objective which is that we need to invest enough money to keep this harbour operational for another 30/40 years whatever it takes and we need to find that money. We will need to develop a business plan jointly. The harbour management group will need to deliver that business plan, to monitor it and to report on it - those are shared endeavours. Going to have a business plan that is jointly written, and it is going to be delivered by that group.

Q - If it is not the issue then why can't Southwold own it why can't Southwold have it.

Q - If Southwold borough council bought the land for 10 shillings many, many years ago Southwold borough council then owned the lands until the 70s and then it was transferred presumably to Waveney. Waveney itself is going to disappear. In the circumstances if concerned about the liability falling on the shoulder of Waveney and therefore for Suffolk District Council would it therefore not be sensible for you to sell the land back to Southwold Town Council for 10 shillings.

A - No.

Q - There is a lot of mistrust going around at the moment and would help a lot if WDC could publish the minutes of meetings and the accounts, the income and expenditure accounts in the East Anglian and preferably in the local magazine.

A – (MB) from the example that Kerry gave in Littlehampton and others similar, all of this can go online, can be transparent and this is part of how hopefully in the future we can move forward.

Q - Are any minutes being taken of this meeting.

A - Taking comments. Town Clerk of Southwold Town Council is taking a report of all of the comments that have been made.

Q - James Darkins Acting Chairman of BEP - aim is to bring together stakeholders to provide a consensus that secures a long-term viable estuary. Pleased to hear that WDC recognises the need to find a holistic solution for the entire estuary. Environment Agency commitment is another eleven years of maintenance, but it is not at all clear what would happen in the event of a major breach and if they would actually step in and repair it during the eleven years. Principle concern is one of time. Sea levels rising - doesn't sound very much but the reality is that developing strategies and finding consensus is a luxury that the next harbour surge might take away. Hope that WDC not only obviously have to resolve this issue but have to work contemporaneously on developing a strategy for the entire estuary because if we don't do that, we may not have a harbour to worry about at all.

Q - seems very clear that EA are not going to be taking any responsibility - have got sea level rise the east coast is sinking as well so there is more and more risk of flooding.

Q - Deni Fischer - represent the harbour users sailing club. Wonder why you are setting up a board without a business plan. Usually the other way around you have a business plan which the board controls and administers. Who at this particular point is Waveney and who and in what form the control would take place?

A - (KB) accept that if setting up a commercial venture and trying to identify the fact that you had a viable business proposition you would sign the business case. WDC don't know the scale of the financial challenge that the harbour represents and won't know that until have the work that's going to be carried out as part of the survey. It may be that no investment is required at all. It may be that a very modest amount of investment is required. It may be that the £20million may be the answer. Local concern that the nature of the harbour would be changed if WDC were to do anything with the caravan site, so anything that we do has to be in the context of what that survey says. It will be the role of the harbour management committee to draw up the business plan and it would be based on that survey.

A - re governance issue - need to look at the various models that there are. Waveney and the successor authority will have the harbour undertaking. So therefore, will need to manage it in the light of that. There will need to be representation that WDC will have direct access to fulfil undertaking as the harbour authority.

Q - Cath Pickles, Chair of Southwold Port Stakeholders Group - started the petition which ended up with 7,000 signatures on it asking WDC to stop creating a trading company with WDC as single shareholder. One of the big issues started off as a matter of trust - moving forward need ultimately transparency. Panel should acknowledge what happened back in the summer and the reason why petition/campaign. Wasn't until the DfT got involved that got some movement. Brought the attention to the media and made sure that WDC weren't able to create that trading company with a single shareholder.

A - The local authority trading company was consulted on. There were a number of consultation events. Last January we held a number of events where we talked about it - clear as a result of these that it was not winning heart and minds locally. WDC referred to that in the paper that went to the public meeting of the joint committee in December last year. Acknowledges the fact that the model did not win local support. Charitable trust model was felt to be not appropriate for reasons already discussed. WDC came forward with an alternative and came out and talked to people in Southwold.

A (AG) - The district council actually went to talk to the DfT and talk about the issues with the harbour and possible approaches and it was the DfT that said "look if you are currently looking into



transfers and everything else you are going to run into trouble because of the archaic nature of the 1933 Act". So there has been a dialogue going on with the DfT and one that will continue as part of this.

Q - Peter Byatt - opposition leader of WDC. See it's a sensitive issue in Southwold. The port good governance guide is just guidance- is there opportunity for creating a Southwold model of how a port could be run. Is there enough time between end of consultation and creation of East Suffolk?

A - (MB) - Trying to create a Southwold model - want to create something which the people of Southwold are comfortable with and then rebuild that trust. Don't want it to be restricted by the creation of East Suffolk Council which has got to happen on 29<sup>th</sup> March – but need to get it right and if get it right wont then be back here talking about it next year or in fifteen years' time. Would be a really good legacy from Waveney to have handed over something which is sorted.

Q - Would the opening balance sheet of the new company be free from debt from previous trading company at the harbour or will alleged accounting irregularities be brought forward into the new company.

A - direct question to the comprehensive report of the Overview & Scrutiny tomorrow where alleged accounting irregularities are on there. It has been accepted by the district auditor, all of the auditors who have looked at the accounts (and possibly starting to be accepted by the people who brought the questions to the Scrutiny Committee). There is an acceptance that the accounting standards that have been applied have been transparent and correct. In terms of Waveney the north dock wall project wall has been funded. The revenues for the north dock wall come from the overall harbour revenues. Need to knock on the head the idea that there have been any irregularities in the accounting. Will pick matter up in more detail in Scrutiny Committee - there in report for anyone to read.

A - District report is published online - there are no irregularities - been dealt with properly and that balance is there, and it is continuing to be used by funds generated by the harbour and the caravan site.

Q - Jessica Jeans Southwold resident, Southwold Town Councillor. Have heard lots of different versions of the history of Southwold harbour. Think that we have to look at what our situation is now and think what is best for the future and how we can deliver an effective solution for the harbour. Noted that one of the questions which got the strongest favourable response was the idea of selling the harbour for a pittance back to STC. Does everyone understand what the Town Council is today as opposed to what it was when it was a borough council. Consider average age and that all councillors are volunteers, with one officer. Waveney has scores of officers. STC has a small budget. Idea that STC could run such a big enterprise as this with all the investment and issues is not realistic. Please attend STC meetings they are open to the public to see whether its realistic.

Q – Jessica Jeans - The joint committee got advice from DfT, - what was that advice about the merits of a charitable trust.

A - There is concern on the part of the DfT that the charitable trust would present a risk of loss of control of the harbour just as a general functional harbour. One of their concerns was around this asset lock principle which was if a charity collapses then the asset any assets that it holds may be transferred to another charitable undertaking. Which would really limit the kind of organisation that could step in in the event of financial distress of a charity. It wasn't desirable in the view of the DfT

that a charitable trust was set up. They were looking for financial robustness, resilience and stability that an organisation that holds responsibility was likely to be able to run the harbour in the future.

Q - Does the estuary belong to the Department of the Environment or they are responsible for it.

A - The Environment Agency has been responsible historically for flood defences.

Q - So if the Environment Agency is no longer acting on the plan you come up with does that not make the harbour plan null and void.

A – need to work on the basis that need to find a way potentially to finance that work if the Environment Agency doesn't continue to fund upstream beyond 11 years. One of the issues with the charitable trust, is that a charitable trust will only be able to use those monies raised in the Southwold harbour undertaking, within the Southwold harbour undertaking. Which doesn't include all of that upstream work. Need to include some way of releasing money potentially to fund that work.

Q - most of the discussion has been about the harbour management committee which is being presented as the best model. Who will that committee be answerable to and should any interested parties or then stakeholders feel that any decisions or actions are questionable and are perhaps outside of the original remit will there be built in any kind of challenge or appeals procedure so that the committee doesn't have a free hand?

A - It would be open to the public as committees are. If it was a charitable trust there is no reason for anybody to be allowed into that trust. A committee would be open and transparent. A trust doesn't have to be.

A - HMC model would be answerable to the people, it would be answerable to Town Council. It would also be answerable to the district council. There would be the mechanism of scrutiny if it was concerned that things were not being run as they should be. The scrutiny committee is there to do that and can be very effective in the way that it can look at matters. There are mechanisms that are built in.

Q - will the caravan site profits be ringfenced for the harbour

A - Yes.

A – (KB) monies from caravan site may be accounted for separately from the general fund but they are ringfenced and will be used within the harbour. Need to be clear that the way they are treated from an accounting perspective and the commitments - that they are used in line with the harbour order within the harbour. Not been helped by the fact that it has not been easy for people to understand where the money has gone and that's why scrutiny cttee are going to be looking at spreadsheets tomorrow and why it's part of pack of scrutiny cttee documents.

Q - David Palmer Town Councillor –What are the controls that control a trust. What are their liabilities, their responsibilities? The trustees are the board. In the same way with the harbour mgt committee would have people from both councils and it would have members of the public with the appropriate qualifications on it. They would be the responsible people the only difference is they wouldn't actually be personally liable for any losses that happens if the whole thing went wrong.

Q – Michael Ladd - been a Southwold Town Councillor since 1999 - has a very wide brief. It is about the whole of the town, not just about one aspect of the town like the harbour. If it is HMC and membership came to the Town Council – may be difficult - because the Town Council don't all have

the knowledge and experience to be involved to that degree. One or two have but not everyone. Town Council - everyone has different strengths which complement each other. Instead of having all Town Councillors on it - could consider having nominated town people nominated by the Town Council - opens it up actually to people with experience. Potential Trustees who were involved felt a little bit disappointed that that trust suggestion was broken up. STC is a parish council, has the powers of a parish council- hasn't got the resources nor the money to invest as needed in the harbour. It has a lot of experience and knowledge. Rather than having all Town Councillors, having Town Council nominated people on there would bring bigger, wider experience than perhaps some Town Councillors would have. Wouldn't lose the control from the Town Council because they would actually have to agree and nominate the people with the right skills.

A - (MB) good idea. It's the point of having something like this process. Can bring people who can enrich the committee then you are going to have that expertise. It is actually a shared role, working as a partnership, as a team. But it is not putting all responsibility on the local community. The cost of the repair to the wall which Waveney got grant from Europe for was nearly £2million. Huge undertaking if had been the responsibility of the Town Council to do. Would need WDC officers and expertise to do it. HMC can give local involvement and aspiration. Can have got the best of both worlds.

Q – There is necessary investment and future investment. Been discussed about the necessary investment. Need the business plan to consider the future investment for the interest of the port for the people using it and the people enjoying it. Important to have the business plan.

A – Yes. Simplest thing is to set it up the first place, then get the business plan.

Q - remind the panel that the income from the harbour and the caravan site currently runs between 1/3 and 1/2 million per year.

Q - As a local resident. Heard about the fiscal pressures, will those fiscal pressures make commercial and residential development necessary.

A - (WW) as a Town Councillor - am accountable to the residents of Southwold. Every four years have to stand for election the same as colleagues on STC. Would never want anything like that to happen. Can give an assurance that Southwold Town Council which would not like anything to happen like that. That's why a management body to incorporate local elected control is the way forward.

A – (MB) There is a flood risk there and it would be fool hardy.

Conclusion – (MB) - Thanked everyone for coming. Don't want to be talking about this again in 15 years' time - want to get on and do this and want to build trust.