

Agenda Supplement 1

COUNCIL MEETING

Thursday
25 April 2019
7.00 pm

Lord Mayor: Councillor Colin Spooner
Chief Executive: Colin Carmichael

Agenda Supplement

7 RECOMMENDATIONS TO THE FULL COUNCIL

Councillors must read the reports to the [Governance Committee](#) and [Policy and Resources Committee](#) as appropriate for the items below, these can be viewed on the Council's website.

TO CONSIDER the following recommendations to **Full Council**:

(d) Revisions to the Constitution (minute 778)

Recommended by the [Governance Committee on 3 April 2019](#):

That the proposed revisions to the Constitution set out in the report be accepted and that option B (the appointment of chairmen and vice-chairmen by full Council) on page 49 of the agenda be adopted as the method for appointing the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the committees.

A version of the Constitution with changes highlighted is [available online here](#).

13 TO RECEIVE THE FOLLOWING MINUTES OF THE MEETINGS SPECIFIED AND TO RECEIVE QUESTIONS AND ANSWERS ON ANY OF THE MINUTES

(Note: By virtue of Article 17.03 of the Council Procedure Rules there shall be no amendment to resolved minutes, save on the written advice from the Monitoring Officer and/or the Chief Financial Officer).

Some minutes will follow in an agenda supplement.

(g) Governance Committee - 3 April 2019 (Pages 3 - 9)

(l) Whitstable Harbour Board - 1 February 2019 (Pages 10 - 17)

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL**GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE**

**Minutes of a meeting held on Wednesday, 3rd April, 2019
at 9.30 am in The Guildhall, St Peter's Place, Westgate, Canterbury**

Present: Councillor S Cook (Chairman)
Councillor Todd
Councillor N Baker
Councillor Eden-Green
Councillor Fisher
Councillor R Jones
Councillor A Taylor
Councillor Westgate
Councillor B Baker (In place of Councillor Fitter-Harding)

In attendance Councillor Baldock

Officers: Matthew Archer - Head of Corporate Governance
Colin Carmichael - Chief Executive
Michaela Hupe - Principal Solicitor - Contract and
Procurement
Maria Short - Democratic Services Officer

(*present for part of the meeting)

770 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies were received from Councillor Fitter-Harding.

771 SUBSTITUTE COUNCILLORS

Councillor B Baker was present as a substitute for Councillor Fitter-Harding.

772 DECLARATIONS OF INTERESTS BY MEMBERS OR OFFICERS

Several members of the committee were on the working group.

773 PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

There was one member of the public registered to speak to item 7 who would be heard prior to the consideration of that item.

774 MINUTES OF MEETING MONDAY, 2 JULY 2018 OF GOVERNANCE COMMITTEE

The minutes were agreed as a true record.

775 **REVIEW OF THE COUNCIL'S COMMITTEE SYSTEM**

The Head of Corporate Governance introduced the report which reviewed how the committee system had operated in practice in the four years since it was introduced at the beginning of the council term.

The Committee discussed the report, where necessary the Head of Corporate Governance gave points of clarification. Points including the following were made:

1. Though the review of the councillors scheme of allowances should be undertaken by an independent panel, an increase to the overall councilor allowance would not be welcomed by Councillors. It was confirmed that there was a requirement for the review to be undertaken by an independent panel and for the council to acknowledge the results of the review, however the council could choose whether or not to accept an increase.
2. The committee system had been considered to be successful.
3. The recommendation to increase the threshold for the Regeneration and Property Committee was welcomed by members due to the inflation of property prices.
4. There had been an increase in public participation due to attendance at the committees, through consultation processes, participation at the area forums, social media, petitions and generous public speaking at the council's committee meetings.
5. Concerns were raised regarding the abolition of the Urgency Sub-Committees, however it was confirmed that the sub-committees had never convened during the council term and that they created issues with the political balance of committees which led to seats being allocated to political parties which were never used.

The officer recommendations were proposed and seconded and when put to a vote agreed.

The options set out in the report were as follows:

- i. To accept or reject the recommendations set out in the report.
- ii. In addition, to add any additional recommendations that it wishes to make to Council.

RECOMMENDED (to Full Council): That this council commends this committee structure to its successor council and agrees to the following:

1. Continuation of the three service committees outlined in the report, based on the terms of reference set out in the Constitution.
2. To raise the financial threshold applied to the Regeneration and Property Committee for property disposals from £400,000 to £1 million.
3. That the Urgency Sub-Committees be abolished and, where it is not possible to convene a special meeting of the committee, that the Chief Executive use his powers to make all urgent decisions.
4. That the East Kent Independent Remuneration Panel is asked to review the councillors scheme of allowances during the first year of the new council.

Reason for decision: The present council's term of office ends in May 2019 and would be an appropriate time to reflect on the governance arrangements to inform any amendments to the Constitution and/or advice to the new council.

Record of the vote:

For the proposal: Councillors B Baker, N Baker, S Cook, Eden-Green, Fisher, R Jones, A Taylor, Todd and Westgate (9)

Against the proposal: none

Abstained from voting: none

776 **REVIEW OF AREA FORUM ARRANGEMENTS**

(Councillor Baldock spoke prior to the consideration of this item)

The Head of Corporate Governance introduced the report which reviewed the pilot arrangements for the Forums introduced in September 2018, following the community governance review.

The working group had made recommendations about changes to the area forums. These recommendations were intended to improve the public participation and publicity of the forums.

The Committee discussed the report, and where necessary the Head of Corporate Governance gave points of clarification. Points including the following were made:

1. The request for an increase to the frequency of the forum meetings would not be without cost in terms of finance, resource and time, although additional meetings can be requested and must be agreed by the Chairman of the Forum and the Chief Executive, with each request being considered on its own merit.
2. The 'meet and greet' session would require Councillors to arrive at 6.30pm in order for it to be a success. To facilitate this, the meet and greet start time would be publicised on the agenda and via the Communications Team.
3. Concerns were raised that the forum recommendations should be considered appropriately and that if the committee chose to go against the recommendation of the forum, a committee member or officer should provide an explanation to the forum. It was confirmed that, where recommendations were made by a Forum, the full minute of that recommendation would be included in the report to committees and the full committee minute would be included within the monitoring sheet of the Forum. This would hopefully to avoid repetition of debates, and the need for a formal report to the Forum to explain why a recommendation had been refused.
4. A request was made that a question and answer session be reinstated to the forums should they be requested by the Chairman and that the questions be answered only by councillors to alleviate the concerns raised regarding fairness to officers. It was recommended by officers that a question and answer session could be requested but it was advised against prescribing this in the terms of reference for the forums to maintain flexibility of an informal meeting style, however guidance would be available to officers and could be incorporated into the forum handouts at the meetings.
5. A member of the Committee highlighted that the ward councillors for Herne & Broomfield and Reculver were invited to attend both the Herne Bay and Rural forums. Although it was understood that certain areas of these wards were considered to be rural rather than urban, it was confirmed that this would be a

matter for the next council to consider and in all cases councillors could attend other forums where they felt necessary.

The working group recommendations were proposed, seconded and when put to a vote agreed that the working group recommendations, with the exception of the question and answer session recommendations, be recommended to Full Council.

RECOMMENDED (to Full Council): That the terms of reference set out in the report be incorporated into the constitution for 2019/20, along with the working group recommendations, with the exception of the question and answer session recommendations where the committee requested that guidance be made available to officers that points A1 and A2 within the forum terms of reference shall encompass a reasonable question and answer session between the public and councillors only if the forum wishes to do so.

Reason for decision: To improve community engagement, better local democracy and provide more effective and convenient delivery of local services.

Record of the vote:

For the proposal: Councillors B Baker, N Baker, S Cook, Eden-Green, Fisher, R Jones, A Taylor and Westgate (8)

Against the proposal: none

Abstained from voting: Councillor Todd (1)

777 **REVIEW OF OUTSIDE BODIES**

The Head of Corporate Governance introduced the report which set out the conclusions and recommendations of the outside bodies review which had been overseen by the community governance working group.

The Committee discussed the report, where necessary the Head of Corporate Governance gave points of clarification. Points including the following were made:

1. Members welcomed the outcome of the review due to the confidential information being disclosed at meetings of certain outside bodies which would prevent them from participating in certain items at committee meetings.
2. Concerns were raised that the connection between the council and outside bodies would be lost if the council did not appoint members to the outside bodies where the council owned the buildings the outside bodies, however it was confirmed that there would be nothing to preclude the outside bodies from appointing council members as trustees and there would still be a connection to the council.
3. It was highlighted to members that certain outside bodies did not want councillors as trustees, as it could prefer to have a councillor, who is independent of the body, present to represent them at a committee where they would be unable to do so if they were a trustee.
4. By allowing outside bodies to make their own appointments, the councillors are then able to participate in meetings more often than if they were appointed to a body by the council as a trustee.

The officer recommendations were proposed, seconded and when put to a vote agreed that the recommendations within the report be referred to Full Council for consideration and adoption.

RECOMMENDED (to Full Council): That the following recommendations be adopted.

1. That council appointments to outside bodies are made only when the criteria outlined in the report applies.
2. That councillors continue to be representatives on other outside bodies on a voluntary basis.
3. That where possible councillor appointments will be that of 'observer', or where appropriate committee member, and not a position of Trustee or equivalent management role. Officers will work with outside bodies over the coming months to review their constitutional requirements to rationalise the number requiring a trustee.
4. That the Chief Executive will appoint a liaison officer for the councillor to work with, if the organisation and issues warrant it.
5. That the length of term for all appointments be for a minimum period of two years and a maximum of eight, after which it will only be extended if no other nominees are put forward.
6. That no further non-councillor appointments are made once the existing appointees stand down from their roles or there is a reduction in the number of council appointees.
7. That no more than one formal appointment is made to an outside body. The outside body can make additional appointments directly with councillors on a voluntary basis.

Reason for decision: The recommendations contained within the report are designed to eliminate risks to the council and its representatives for the reasons outlined in the report.

Record of the vote:

For the proposal: Councillors B Baker, N Baker, S Cook, Fisher, R Jones, A Taylor, Todd and Westgate (8)

Against the proposal: none

Abstained from voting: Councillor Eden-Green (1)

778 REVISIONS TO THE CONSTITUTION

The Head of Corporate Governance introduced the report which detailed the proposed amendments following the restructure and proposed additions to the Constitution, which, if approved, would come into effect at the end of April.

The Committee discussed the report, where necessary the Head of Corporate Governance gave points of clarification. Points including the following were made:

1. Members felt that appointing the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen at the annual Full Council meeting (option B) would be preferable to the current arrangements and the committee could appoint a new Chairman if need be.
2. The appointment of the Decision Review Committee Chairman should be included in the report to Full Council.

3. One member of the committee felt that the current arrangements (option A) would be the better option for continuity purposes.
4. Members enquired as to whether the existing Chairmen would be able to continue in their role to the first Committee meeting of the new cycle, so that the election of Chairmen at the annual meeting would only happen post-election.
5. An amendment was requested to option B to allow the first annual Full Council meeting of a new term to appoint the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the committees and that the appointments remain for the council term. Officers would be delegated to investigate this amendment request.

The officer recommendations were proposed, seconded and when put to a vote agreed that the recommendations within the report be referred to Full Council for acceptance.

The options set out in the report were as follows:

1. To accept the changes recommended in full or in part. The changes recommended are intended to keep the constitution up to date and to allow the smooth operation of some newly adopted policies or other existing practices.
2. To reject the proposed amendments. A rejection of all of the proposals would result in the retention of some out of date information and slowing down the council's ability to implement its own policies.
3. To defer the proposed amendments for further consideration. The changes proposed are intended to facilitate the smooth running of council business a deferral will delay this.

RECOMMENDED (to Full Council): That the proposed revisions to the Constitution set out in the report be accepted and that option B on page 49 of the agenda be adopted as the method for appointing the Chairmen and Vice-Chairmen of the committees.

Reason for decision: The changes proposed were intended to facilitate the smooth running of council business by bringing the constitution up to date with policy or other changes.

Record of the vote:

For the proposal: Councillors B Baker, N Baker, S Cook, Eden-Green, Fisher, R Jones, A Taylor, Todd and Westgate (9)

Against the proposal: none

Abstained from voting: none

779 ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC

There was no other urgent business to be dealt with in public, however the Chairman wanted to acknowledge that the committee system had worked well over the last four years and that this was due to the efforts of the Democratic Services Team with the work they did to facilitate the committee meetings. The Committee members were in agreement with this and thanked the Democratic Services Team for their work.

780 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

781 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF EITHER SCHEDULE 12A OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

There was no other urgent business which fell under the exempt provisions of either Schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 or the Freedom of Information Act 2000 or both.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 11.50 am

CANTERBURY CITY COUNCIL

WHITSTABLE HARBOUR BOARD

**Minutes of a meeting held on Friday, 1st February, 2019
at 3.00 pm in Mallandain Room, Whitstable Castle, Tower Hill, Whitstable**

Present: Councillor R Jones (Chairman)
Councillor Todd
Councillor B Baker
Sue Budden
Councillor Dixey
Councillor Fisher
Paul Moore
Peter Steen
Councillor I Thomas *
Councillor N Baker

In attendance

Officers: Owen Croft - Principal Property Asset Surveyor
John Davison - Principal Maritime Engineer (Harbour
Development Officer)
Robbie Higgins - Principal Solicitor (Property)
Tricia Marshall - Deputy Chief Executive
Mike Wier - Port Manager and Harbour Master
Vanessa - Democratic Services Officer
Montgomery

(*present for part of the meeting)

642 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for lateness were received from Councillor Ian Thomas.

643 SUBSTITUTE MEMBERS (COUNCILLORS)

There were no substitute members.

644 DECLARATION OF INTERESTS BY BOARD MEMBERS AND OFFICERS

Councillors Brian Baker, Robert Jones, Ian Thomas made voluntary announcements they were members of the Planning Committee (Planning applications on Harbour land item).

Councillor Ian Thomas made a voluntary announcement he was a Kent County Councillor.

Councillor B Baker made a voluntary announcement he was a member of Whitstable Maritime.

Councillor N Baker made a voluntary announcement he was a trustee of the Whitstable Castle. (Landlord consent for a music festival in the harbour and planning applications on harbour land items)

Peter Steen made a voluntary announcement he was employed by the Port of London Authority and declared an other significant interest that he was a member of the Management Board of Whitstable Maritime.

Paul Moore made a voluntary announcement he was an ordinary member of the yacht club (Landlord consent for a music festival in the harbour and planning applications on harbour land items)

Councillor Pat Todd made a voluntary announcement he was a member of the Canoe Club (Property Action Plan Updates)

645 **PUBLIC PARTICIPATION**

There was one member of public registered to speak in regards to landlord consent for a music festival in the Harbour.

646 **MINUTES OF THE MEETING HELD ON 16 NOVEMBER 2019**

The minutes were confirmed as a true record.

647 **WHITSTABLE HARBOUR DREDGING REPORT**

The Principal Maritime Engineer introduced the report that outlined the dredging works that had been carried out in Whitstable Harbour. He then introduced Rob Thomas, the Coastal Process Scientist to the Committee who explained that a new laser scanner had been used to collect data of the seabed in the harbour. The laser improved accuracy and additionally had cost saving and health and safety benefits.

Images of the harbour before and after dredging were shared with the Forum to evidence the positive impact of the dredging on the Harbour and Harbour entrance. He explained the next scan of the beds would be in March with the next dredge due in April, this would then continue annually.

It was suggested by a Councillor and agreed by general assent that the dredging report be added to the Whitstable Harbour Board website.

The committee NOTED the report.

648 **LANDLORD CONSENT FOR A MUSIC FESTIVAL IN THE HARBOUR**

(Councillor N Baker made a voluntary announcement that he was a trustee of Whitstable Castle and this could be relevant to this item regarding noise levels impacting on the Castle.)

(Prior to the consideration of the report one public speaker, Joanne Asquith, was heard.)

The Chairman introduced the item that requested the Board to consider whether to give support for a music festival to take place in the Harbour and to authorise the Head of Property and Regeneration and Head of Legal Services to issue the relevant

consent to Whitstable Yacht club, and to allow the event to take place on the land outlined.

The Chairman invited Joanne Asquith, the event organiser to speak, who outlined the plans contained in her report.

The Board members discussed the proposal and asked questions, covering matters that included the following:

- 1) Concerns were raised regarding the noise levels from the proposed festival and the impact this would have on the local residents.
- 2) The Shuck during the Oyster Festival, erected on the same piece of land, resulted in numerous noise complaints from nearby residents.
- 3) The fisherman had been leased land in the harbour compound for storage and the festival would impact upon this area.
- 4) The proposed event walkway would intrude on the access used by the Harbour fisherman.
- 5) The event is proposed to be held during the Waverley season and passengers embark and disembark in the compound, the two events would not be compatible.
- 6) Discussions were held regarding the possibility of the festival being held in a different area of Whitstable, and these discussions should be carried on with the council Events team.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote agreed that the proposed music Festival to take place in the Harbour is not given support.

RESOLVED: That the proposed music Festival to take place in the Harbour is not given support, and that the Head of Property and Regeneration and Head of Legal Services does not issue the relevant consent to Whitstable Yacht Club and other tenants.

Reason for the decision: The proposed festival does not support the Whitstable Harbour Strategic Plan. The noise would have a negative impact on nearby residents and would impact the operating capability of the Harbour.

Record of the voting:

For: B.Baker, N.Baker, Fisher, R.Jones, Todd, Budden, Steen (7)

Against: None

Abstain/Did not vote: Dixey, Moore, (2)

Not present for the vote: Councillor I Thomas (1)

649 **PLANNING APPLICATIONS ON HARBOUR LAND**

(Councillor Ian Thomas arrived late to the meeting at the start of this item)

(Councillors Brian Baker, Robert Jones, Ian Thomas made voluntary announcements they were members of the Planning Committee.)

(Councillor Ian Thomas made a voluntary announcement he was a Kent County Councillor.)

(Councillor N. Baker made a voluntary announcement that he was a trustee of Whitstable Castle who had a refreshment stand nearby so would not participate in the discussions)

The Principal Valuer introduced the report that outlined a planning application that had been received by the council to renew consent at the former engine shed site.

There were two further sites that the Board was being asked to consider if planning applications should be submitted. One was for renewal of the former welfare building, and another to erect a new chalet type building on a hard standing on part of the Beach Walk car park.

He explained the details of the Beach Walk proposal within the report, the board then discussed the proposal and the following points were made:

- 1) Expressions of interest had been sought for an annual ice cream concession on the site but received little responses.
- 2) The wellbeing of staff and working conditions should be considered if they were to work in an ice cream van rather than a more permanent structure.
- 3) A more permanent structure is more likely to yield greater income via a lease than an ice cream van concession.

It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote FELL that a planning application should not be submitted by the development officer in respect of the Beach Walk car park for a new chalet.

Record of voting:

For: Dixey, R. Jones, Todd and Moore (4)

Against: B.Baker, Fisher, I.Thomas, Budden and Steen (5)

Abstain: N. Baker (1)

It was then proposed, seconded and when put to vote AGREED that a planning application should be submitted in respect of part of the Beach Walk car park for a new building.

Record of voting:

For: B.Baker, Fisher, I.Thomas, Budden and Steen (5)

Against: Dixey, R.Jones, Todd and Moore (4)

Abstain: N.Baker (1)

RESOLVED: That a planning application should be submitted by the Development Officer in respect of part of the Beach Walk car park for a new building.

Reason for the decision: The potential extra income from a permanent building would justify the investment. The plan is consistent with the Strategic plan for economic growth.

The Principal Valuer introduced the request for the extension of temporary planning consent for the former engine shed site. This ended on 31 October 2018 pending construction of a larger more permanent building.

The Board considered the report and had no comments to make and agreed by general assent to support the application for temporary planning consent.

The Principal Valuer then explained that a request had also being made to extend the temporary planning consent for office use at the Former Welfare Building.

The Board agreed by general assent that a planning application be submitted by the Development Officer for the renewal of office use for the former welfare centre.

650 **SOUTH QUAY SHED DEVELOPMENT**

The Principal Maritime Engineer introduced the report that set out the next stages in the proposed redevelopment of the South Quay Shed.

The Board were being asked to consider if engineering services can proceed with the refurbishment, based on the estimated costings. Also to consider the next steps regarding the management options, and whether or not to consent to Property and Regeneration negotiating and completing leases for the units within the South Quay Shed.

He explained there were various management options detailed in the report post construction, which had been considered by the South Quay Shed Working Group. He outlined three management models, external, internal and the harbour management model.

The Board discussed these options, the financial implications and risks, and the Principal Maritime Engineer gave clarification where required, the following points were raised:

1. Only three responses were received from external companies interested in managing the complete facility on a lease of circa 15 years. This would offer returns of £35-45k.
2. The Council had the proven expertise to run all aspects in-house and deliver the project.
3. The external fabric of the current building was in poor condition since it has reached the end of its service life, and would soon require replacement at a cost of £120,000, therefore doing nothing had cost implications.
4. The Harbour team and council had the greatest knowledge and expertise of the Harbour and this building, and it should be utilised in the management of the development.
5. Financial implications contained in the report were examined and clarification was given that the original budget for construction of £550,000 was allocated in 2017/18, this had been reduced to £400,000.
6. The Harbour Management Option would require a specific South Quay Shed business plan which could be reviewed in the future once returns were evidenced.
7. There is an increased risk with internal management due to the uncertainty for demand for the units in the current economic climate.
8. Internal management allowed the Board the opportunity to ensure the aims and objectives of the Strategic plan are consistent and offered flexibility to resolve any issues in the early stages.
9. The Board thanked the officers for all their hard work.
10. It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote unanimously agreed that Engineering Services proceed with the refurbishment of the South Quay Shed

Record of voting: For: B.Baker, N.Naker, Dixey, Fisher, R.Jones,I.Thomas, Todd, Budden, Steen, Moore (10)
Against: (0)
Abstain: (0)

11. It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote unanimously agreed that the ongoing management of the new facility is dealt with by the Council rather than leasing the site to an external operator.

Record of the voting:

For: B.Baker, N.Naker, Dixey, Fisher, R.Jones,I.Thomas, Todd, Budden, Steen, Moore (10)
Against: (0)
Abstain: (0)

12. It was proposed, seconded and when put to vote unanimously agreed that The Harbour Board consent to Property and regeneration negotiating and completing leases for the units within the South Quay Shed.

For: B.Baker, N.Naker, Dixey, Fisher, R.Jones,I.Thomas, Todd, Budden, Steen, Moore (10)
Against: (0)
Abstain: (0)

13. It was then proposed, seconded and when put to vote agreed to continue to pursue the potential for a small scale/boutique cinema adjacent to the South Quay Shed and report back.

Record of the voting:

For: B.Baker, N.Naker, Dixey, Fisher, R.Jones,, Budden, Steen, Moore (8)
Against: (0)
Abstain: I.Thomas, Todd (2)

RESOLVED

- a) That Engineering Services proceed with the refurbishment of the South Quay Shed based on the estimated costing. Construction works are managed on a sequential basis, procuring separate contractors for various elements in the refurbishment project all in accordance with the Council Standing Orders.
- b) That the ongoing management of the new facility is dealt with by the Council rather than leasing the site to an external operator, with the allocation of resources using existing staff from the Harbour, Property and regeneration, Legal, Finance and Community Services for event management whilst engaging with external agents for specialist services if required. Such arrangements are reviewed by the Board after 2 years of operation.
- c) That The Harbour Board consent to Property and regeneration negotiating and completing leases for the units within the South Quay Shed in accordance with delegated authority D34.
- d) To continue to pursue the potential for a small scale/boutique cinema adjacent to the South Quay Shed and report back.

Reason for decisions: That Engineering services and harbour resources have the expertise to manage complex maritime and building projects. The risk of managing the operation internally is acceptable and sufficiently awarded by potential additional income. It offers the Board the opportunity to ensure the aims and objectives of the Strategic plan are consistent. To investigate the market demand and feasibility for a small scale/boutique cinema adjacent to the South Quay Shed.

651 **VARIATION IN THE ORDER OF BUSINESS**

With the agreement of the committee, the Chairman varied the order of business of the meeting.

652 **HARBOUR LEASE RENEWALS**

The Principal Valuer introduced the report that asked the Board to consider whether to grant consent for the proposed lease renewals in order to enable delegated authority D34 to be exercised by the Director of Development for the grant of the leases.

He explained the details were contained in the confidential annex and discussions therefore took place under minute item (659).

653 **PORT MANAGER AND HARBOUR MASTER'S REPORT**

The Harbour Master introduced the report which updated the Board on matters related to legislation and general harbour operations. The Board discussed the report and the following matters were raised:

- 1) The Harbour Master is working with the communications and web team to promote positive stories from the Harbour.
- 2) A concern was raised regarding the monitoring of animals coming in on ships. The Harbour Master explained only one ship comes in from abroad and they must have a rat certificate. He would check the procedure in place and notify the Board at the next Harbour meeting.
- 3) A question was raised regarding the pilot boat that was currently in storage. The Harbour Master confirmed the boat was not in working order and was over ten years old, but it could be valued. It was agreed by general assent that the Harbour master be delegated authority to sell or dispose of the pilot boats as seen fit.

The Board NOTED the report.

654 **HARBOUR ACTION PLAN**

The Chairman introduced the action plan which updated the Board on ongoing matters and asked for any comments or questions.

It was raised that Mike Wier was spelt incorrectly in the report, this would be amended in time for the next meeting.

The Board NOTED the report by general assent.

655 **DATE OF NEXT MEETING**

3pm, Friday 12 April 2019

656 **ANY OTHER URGENT BUSINESS TO BE DEALT WITH IN PUBLIC**

None received.

657 **EXCLUSION OF THE PRESS AND PUBLIC**

RESOLVED: That under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public and press be excluded from the meeting during consideration of the following items of business on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Part 1 of Schedule 12A of the Act or the Freedom of Information

658 **PROPERTY ACTION PLAN UPDATES**

(The information contained in this annex was exempt from being published because its disclosure was likely to prejudice the commercial interest of both the Council and third parties. The council considers that at present the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. Both section 43 Freedom of Information Act 2000 and paragraph 3 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 apply.) The Principal Valuer gave his updates. The Board members asked question and where appropriate the Principal Valuer gave points of clarification.

The Board NOTED the report.

659 **EXEMPT ANNEX: HARBOUR LEASE UPDATES**

(The information contained in this annex was exempt from being published because its disclosure was likely to prejudice the commercial interest of both the Council and third parties. The council considers that at present the public interest in maintaining the exemption outweighs the public interest in disclosing it. Both section 43 Freedom of Information Act 2000 and paragraph 3 of schedule 12A of the Local Government Act 1972 apply.)

The Principal Valuer gave his updates. The Board members discussed the lease updates and agreed by general assent that the proposed lease renewals set out in the report on such final terms negotiated by Heads of Property and Regeneration in order to delegate authority D34 to be exercised by the Director of Development, be granted.

660 **ANY OTHER BUSINESS WHICH FALLS UNDER THE EXEMPT PROVISIONS OF THE LOCAL GOVERNMENT ACT 1972 OR THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT 2000 OR BOTH**

None received.

There being no other business the meeting closed at 5.46 pm