

NEWLYN PIER AND HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS**MEETING OF THE ADVISORY BOARD HELD AT 5.00 P.M. ON THURSDAY 12 MARCH 2015 IN THE NEWLYN CENTRE, NEWLYN.**

In attendance: Father Keith Owen – Chairman Community Leader (KO)
 Simon Cadman – Cornwall Inshore Fisheries & Conservation Authority (SC)
 Joe Clive – Fish Merchants’ Sector (JC)
 Tom McClure – Inshore Fisheries Sector (10m+) (TMcC)
 Cllr John Moreland – Penzance Town Council (JM) - arrived at 17.25
 Laurence Hartwell – Community (LH)
 Paul Trebilcock – Catching Sector (PT)
 Sam Winters – Community (SW)

Also in attendance: Rob Parsons, Harbour Master (RP)
 Elaine Baker Commission Administrator (EB)

AB.17	<u>Apologies for Absence</u> An apology for absence was received from Len Smith, Cornwall Council.	
AB.18	<u>Declarations of Interest</u> None received.	
AB.19	<u>Minutes</u> <u>RESOLVED:</u> That the minutes, as amended below, of the meeting of the Advisory Board held on 3 December 2014 2014 be approved as an accurate record and signed by the Chairman. Minute no. AB15/14 amend “ <i>Eustace</i> ” to read “ <i>Eustice</i> ” and on page 3, sixth line from the top amend “ <i>boars</i> ” to read “ <i>boats</i> ”.	EB
AB.20	<u>Matter Arising</u> On minute no. AB15/14 (Strategic Matters), SC reported that the latest information was that the new EMF funding was not likely to come on stream until January 2016.	
AB.21	<u>Year End Accounts</u> The Advisory Board (AB) received the year end accounts for financial years 2011/ 12, 2012 / 13 and 2013 / 14 which had been accepted by the Board of Commissioners.	

<p>AB. 21 cont.</p>	<p>RP explained that the accounts for 2011 / 12 and 2012 /13 had been approved but that the audit of the accounts for 2013 / 14 would not take place until April 2015. It was hoped that further improvements would be seen in the accounts in future years.</p> <p>PT stated that the figures were encouraging as he had been expecting bigger financial losses than what had been reported. RP responded by saying that he anticipated the trend to improve but that the legacy debts had had a significant effect on the accounts.</p> <p>PT asked why there was a £100,000 reduction in landing dues between 2011 / 12 and 2012 / 13. RP agreed to look into the figures and provide PT with a full explanation, but it was likely due to previous accounting practices and non-declared landings.</p> <p>The Chairman commented that the accounts portrayed as balanced a view as was possible across the three year period.</p> <p>Following detailed discussion the AB RESOLVED to formally receive the accounts.</p>	<p>RP</p>
<p>AB.22</p>	<p><u>Operational Budget 2015 / 16</u></p> <p>The AB received the Operational Budget 2015 / 16 which had been approved by the Board of Commissioners at its meeting on 4 March 2015.</p> <p>RP commented that improvements would continue to be made to the budget process and that in future nominal costs centre codes would be aligned with the management accounts produced for the Board of Commissioners which would in future be brought to the AB for information.</p> <p>RP outlined the main points in the budget: the manpower budget included financial allocations in respect of employer contributions to the Local Government Pension Scheme and a 3.5% pay award.</p> <p>Under Maintenance, RP explained that in subsequent years, the heading “General Repairs” would fall under on Establishment Costs heading.</p> <p>RP went on to explain that the Board had requested a full review of the Fish Market operation, including the provision of market consumables (fish boxes). RP also referred to skip hire costs and the continuing problem of fly tipping. The AB commented on the problems of fly tipping and asked if the Board had considered implementing measures to control access to skips, possibly by means of enclosure. Currently skip hire was costing the harbour £39,000 p.a. and it would be beneficial to understand how much of that figure related to fly tipping costs. RP AGREED to put the suggestion of restricting access to the skips to the Board.</p>	<p>RP</p>

<p>AB. 22 cont.</p>	<p>RP also commented that harbour CCTV needed to be improved and that he was looking into the possibility of making an application for EMFF funding towards the project.</p> <p>The AB discussed the use of the fish grading machine. PT commented that the grader had brought benefits to both fishermen and buyers and fish prices were now more consistent. RP stated it was important that more harbour users were encouraged to use the equipment. The harbour's role was to provide the necessary infrastructure to support the business, and that to achieve "value for money" the fish grader needed to be used by as many harbour users as possible.</p> <p>The AB also discussed the issue of accountancy fees and RP explained the background to the budget provision and a potential legal claim.</p> <p>Income trends were difficult to predict, but with the introduction of the new harbour charges as from 1 April 2015 it was anticipated that income would increase during 2015 / 16. RP commented that the Guide to Good Governance placed a duty on all a trust ports to generate income to be reinvested back into the harbour. The budget for 2015 / 16 provided for a conservative surplus which it was hoped would be greater in future years.</p> <p>The AB also discussed the issue of bad debts and RP reported that the figure had reduced significantly from £349,000 to £7,000 in 2015 and that robust processes were now in place to deal with bad debts. The AB welcomed the improved situation.</p> <p>PT suggested that for future budget preparations fish headings should be limited to "<i>White, Pelagic and Shellfish</i>". RP noted the comment.</p> <p>Following a full discussion the AB RESOLVED to receive the Operational Budget 2015 / 16.</p>	<p>RP</p>
<p>AB.23</p>	<p><u>Exclusion of Press & Public</u></p> <p>The meeting RESOLVED to exclude the press and public at this point in the proceedings as matters of a confidential and personal nature were to be discussed.</p>	
<p>AB.24</p>	<p><u>Charges Review</u></p> <p>The AB received a confidential report by the Harbour Master which set out recommendations in respect of new harbour charges with effect from 1 April 2015, and which had been considered by the Board of Commissioners at its meeting on 4 March 2015. Final approval of the recommendations had been delegated to the Harbour Master, in consultation with the Chairman and Vice-Chairman of NPHC.</p>	

<p>AB.24 cont.</p>	<p>The AB was advised that all trust ports had a duty to review charges annually but it was acknowledged that such reviews had not taken place in recent years. RP outlined 13 recommendations contained in the report and commented that the new scheme was being introduced to make charges more transparent and equitable.</p> <p>RP commented that electricity was one of the biggest expenditures for the harbour. However, with improvements to the quayside, installation of new electrical boxes for vessels, together with the introduction of more robust maintenance methods it was hoped that this cost would be reduced in the future.</p> <p>The AB asked for clarification as to what the 2.5% landing dues contributed towards. RP stated that he could not provide a definitive answer, other than decisions on significant expenditure lay with the Board. RP commented that charges needed to be fluid and that it would be beneficial to develop a clear formula on how the level of charges were determined. At present the 2.5% levy subsidised other charges such as water.</p> <p>Major changes in the charges were that in future contributory vessel charges would be calculated on meterage and would provide a modest increase. Charges for the pontoons would also be based on meterage, (subject to Harbour Master discretion as the harbour was also a designated port of refuge).</p> <p>The AB sought clarification on charges for the landing of cargo. RP stated that the figure was £5.00 per tonne.</p> <p>The charge for the box wash was being increased to 0.17p as it had been operating at a loss. This was consistent with charges at other ports.</p> <p>The AB commented that charges for the slipway should be increased for larger vessels in view of increased wear and tear. It was PROPOSED that the figure be increase to £400.00 for larger vessels and the word <i>thereafter</i> be removed and <i>“£40.00 for each 24 hours</i> inserted. An annual slippage charge for all vessels was also being introduced as a contribution towards maintenance costs. RP confirmed that costs could be waived if a vessel could demonstrate that it was not using the facility (such as boxes etc.).</p> <p>RP commented that water charges were likely to be revisited once necessary maintenance had been completed on the water tanks. RP AGREED to revisit the water charge for non-fishing vessels to ensure that non fishing vessels weren’t being charged less.</p> <p>Regarding car parking charges, RP confirmed that there would be no increase for fishermen. Increases were only being applied to residents’ permits and charges for lorry’s parking on the harbour were being introduced. There would be a 20 minute market “drop off” concession.</p>	<p>RP</p> <p>RP</p> <p>RP</p>
---------------------------	---	-------------------------------

<p>AB.24 cont.</p>	<p>In response to a question, RP confirmed that there were no plans at present for parking on Sandy Cove.</p> <p>The AB welcomed the report, but PT made a general comment that the Board of Commissioners could not continue to increase the financial burden on the fishing industry and the local community it supported as they were not self-sustainable. RP noted the comment but stated that there had been no increase for a number of years and that unfortunately the increases had not been gradual as a result and that it was not prudent for the harbour to continue to rely on grant funding opportunities. In summing up, RP said that it was important for the harbour to make a profit for reinvestment to protect the long term viability of the port.</p> <p>RP also outlined the process for informing all harbour users of the new charges.</p> <p>The AB gave its SUPPORT to the report and looked forward to receiving details on future investment in the harbour’s infrastructure.</p>	
	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>None.</p>	
	<p>The meeting closed at 6.45 p.m.</p>	
<p>Date:</p>	<p style="text-align: right;">_____</p> <p style="text-align: right;">Chairman</p>	