

To:

Members of Scrutiny Committee

(Councillors P H Murphy (Chairman), R Lillis (Vice Chairman), D Archer, A Behan, R Clifford, G S Dowding, B Maitland-Walker, J Parbrook, and R Woods)

Members of Cabinet

(Councillor A Trollope-Bellew (Leader), M Chilcott (Deputy Leader), M Dewdney, K J Mills, C Morgan, S J Pugsley, K H Turner, D J Westcott)

Our Ref CS

Contact Emily McGuinness emcguinness@westsomerset.gov.uk

Date 07 September 2015

**THE PRESS AND PUBLIC ARE WELCOME TO ATTEND THE MEETING
THIS DOCUMENT CAN BE MADE AVAILABLE IN LARGE PRINT, BRAILLE, TAPE FORMAT
OR IN OTHER LANGUAGES ON REQUEST**

Dear Councillor

I hereby give you notice to attend the following meeting:

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Date: Thursday 10 September 2015

Time: 3.30 pm

Venue: Council Chamber, Council Offices, Williton

There will be a pre-meeting held in the Grabbist Room at 2.30pm to which all Scrutiny Members are invited.

Please note that this meeting may be recorded. At the start of the meeting the Chairman will confirm if all or part of the meeting is being recorded.

You should be aware that the Council is a Data Controller under the Data Protection Act. Data collected during the recording will be retained in accordance with the Council's policy.

Therefore unless you advise otherwise, by entering the Council Chamber and speaking during Public Participation you are consenting to being recorded and to the possible use of the sound recording for access via the website or for training purposes. If you have any queries regarding this please contact Committee Services on 01643 703704.

Yours sincerely



BRUCE LANG

Proper Officer

WEST SOMERSET COUNCIL

West Somerset House Killick Way Williton Taunton TA4 4QA

T 01643 703704 F 01984 633022 DX 117701 WILLITON

E customerservices@westsomerset.gov.uk W www.westsomersetonline.gov.uk

RISK SCORING MATRIX

Report writers score risks in reports uses the scoring matrix below

Risk Scoring Matrix

Likelihood	5	Almost Certain	Low (5)	Medium (10)	High (15)	Very High (20)	Very High (25)
	4	Likely	Low (4)	Medium (8)	Medium (12)	High (16)	Very High (20)
	3	Possible	Low (3)	Low (6)	Medium (9)	Medium (12)	High (15)
	2	Unlikely	Low (2)	Low (4)	Low (6)	Medium (8)	Medium (10)
	1	Rare	Low (1)	Low (2)	Low (3)	Low (4)	Low (5)
			1	2	3	4	5
			Negligible	Minor	Moderate	Major	Catastrophic
Impact							

Likelihood of risk occurring	Indicator	Description (chance of occurrence)
1. Very Unlikely	May occur in exceptional circumstances	< 10%
2. Slight	Is unlikely to, but could occur at some time	10 – 25%
3. Feasible	Fairly likely to occur at same time	25 – 50%
4. Likely	Likely to occur within the next 1-2 years, or occurs occasionally	50 – 75%
5. Very Likely	Regular occurrence (daily / weekly / monthly)	> 75%

- Mitigating actions for high ('High' or above) scoring risks are to be reflected in Service Plans, managed by the Group Manager and implemented by Service Lead Officers;
- Lower scoring risks will either be accepted with no mitigating actions or included in work plans with appropriate mitigating actions that are managed by Service Lead Officers.

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Meeting to be held on Thursday 10 September 2015 at 3.30 pm

Council Chamber, Williton

AGENDA

1. Apologies for Absence

2. Minutes

Minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 6 August 2015, to be approved and signed as a correct record – **SEE ATTACHED.**

3. Declarations of Interest

To receive and record any declarations of interest in respect of any matters included on the Agenda for consideration at this Meeting.

4. Public Participation

The Chairman to advise the Committee of any items on which members of the public have requested to speak and advise those members of the public present of the details of the Council's public participation scheme.

For those members of the public wishing to speak at this meeting there are a few points you might like to note.

A three-minute time limit applies to each speaker and you will be asked to speak before Councillors debate the issue. There will be no further opportunity for comment at a later stage. Your comments should be addressed to the Chairman and any ruling made by the Chair is not open to discussion. If a response is needed it will be given either orally at the meeting or a written reply made within five working days of the meeting.

5. Notes of Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points

To review the Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points from the Cabinet Meeting held on 2 September, 2015 – **TO BE CIRCULATED AT MEETING.**

6. Cabinet Forward Plan

To review the latest Cabinet Forward Plan for the months of July onwards, published on 2 September 2015 – **TO BE CIRCULATED AT MEETING.**

7. The Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA) and Flood Action Plan – Update Report.

To consider Report No. WSC 131/15 to be presented by Brendan Cleere, Director. - **SEE ATTACHED**

The purpose of this report is to provide Council on the development of the Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA) since the report to Corporate PAG and Cabinet in November / December 2014. The report sets out progress since that date along with the ongoing discussions for future funding and governance. It seeks approval for a recommendation to Full Council, relating to WSC's preferred long term funding option for the SRA.

8. Introduction of Charges for the Street Naming & Numbering Administration Function

To consider Report No. WSC 132/15 to be presented by Martin Dewdney, Port Folio Holder - Environment. - **SEE ATTACHED**

The purpose of this report is to support the introduction of a Scale of Charges for the Administration of the Street Naming and Numbering service in accordance with the details set out in this report. It is intended that the introduction of charging will be a Portfolio Holder decision.

9. Harbour Operations

To consider Report No. WSC 133/15 to be presented by Chris Hall, Assistant Director – Operational Delivery. - **SEE ATTACHED**

The purpose of this report is to raise Member's awareness of the statutory Harbour responsibilities, to request that a Harbour Board be created and request appropriate resources be provided to deliver the statutory requirements.

10. Scrutiny Committee Work Plan

To receive items and review the Scrutiny Committee Work plan for 2014/15. - **SEE ATTACHED**

Members of the Scrutiny Committee are asked to consider the proposal to include an item in the Scrutiny Work Programme relating to Ambulance Service Provision in West Somerset as detailed in the attached document

COUNCILLORS ARE REMINDED TO CHECK THEIR POST TRAYS

The Council's Vision:

To enable people to live, work and prosper in West Somerset

The Council's Corporate Priorities:

- Local Democracy:
Securing local democracy and accountability in West Somerset, based in West Somerset, elected by the people of West Somerset and responsible to the people of West Somerset.

- New Nuclear Development at Hinkley Point
Maximising opportunities for West Somerset communities and businesses to benefit from the development whilst protecting local communities and the environment.

SCRUTINY COMMITTEE

Minutes of the Meeting held on 6 August 2015 at 3.30 pm

Present:

Councillor P H MurphyChairman
Councillor R LillisVice Chairman

Councillor D Archer
Councillor G S Dowding
Councillor J Parbrook

Councillor A Behan
Councillor R Clifford
Councillor B Maitland-Walker
Councillor R Woods

Members in Attendance:

Councillor I Aldridge
Councillor M Dewdney

Councillor M Chilcott
Councillor A Trollope-Bellew

Officers in Attendance:

Assistant Chief Executive and Monitoring Officer – (B Lang)
Democratic Services Coordinator (E McGuinness)
Finance Manager (S Plenty)
Administrative Support (A Randell)

SC94 Apologies for Absence

No Apologies were received.

SC95 Minutes

(Minutes of the Meeting of the Scrutiny Committee held on 9 July 2015 –
circulated with the Agenda.)

RESOLVED that the Minutes of the Scrutiny Committee held on 9 July 2015 be
confirmed as a correct record.

SC96 Declarations of Interest

Members present at the meeting declared the following personal interests in
their capacity as a Member of a County, Parish or Town Council:

Name	Minute No.	Description of Interest	Personal or Prejudicial or Disclosable Pecuniary	Action Taken
Cllr P H Murphy	All Items	Watchet	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr D Archer	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted
Cllr J Parbrork	All Items	Minehead	Personal	Spoke and voted

SC97 Notes of Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points

(Copy of Notes of Cabinet Decisions/Action Points, circulated with the agenda.)

RESOLVED that the Key Cabinet Decisions/Action Points from the meeting held on 5 August 2015, be noted.

SC98 Cabinet Forward Plan

(Copy of the Cabinet Forward Plan published 5 August 2015, circulated with the agenda.)

RESOLVED that the Cabinet Forward Plan published on 5 August 2015, be noted.

SC99 Revenue and Capital Outturn 2014/15.

The purpose of the report was to provide members with details of the Council's financial outturn position for both revenue and capital budgets, together with information regarding end of year reserve balances, for the financial year 2014/15.

The Council's financial performance is directly linked to the 'Local Democracy' priority in terms of local accountability and maximising government funding. Additionally, financial performance and monitoring of financial information is crucial to monitoring the progress being made in delivering all Council services.

Councillor Chilcott, as Lead Member for Resources, presented the background information to the report along with the Revenue Budget Outturn 2014/15 and Reserves. Business Rates retention along with the Capital Budget Outturn were also detailed in the report. The Lead Member corrected the figure quoted in paragraph 3.2 to read £2,183,984.

During the course of discussion the following points were made:-

- In response to a specific question it was detailed that a proposed £10,000 Health and Safety spend in relation to the Alcombe Sure Start Children's Centre building was currently under review
- The Hinkley Point business rate appeal issue was considered at length. This had a big effect on the financial outturn due to the size of the business as it accounted for 30% of the overall business rate income. In response to a question, it was explained that this was not necessarily a

one off situation as there was always the risk that other business rate appeals could be successful in the future. The Committee questioned if everything was being done in regard to lobbying Central Government about this issue which appeared to be very unfair for authorities like West Somerset. The Leader confirmed that contact had already been made with government in this respect and that the Council would work with other authorities who were facing similar challenges; nevertheless he did warn that at present there was no sign that the current business rate retention process being altered.

- In reply to a question it was agreed to provide a written response in regard to the background to an overspend in relation Townsend Farm disposal costs detailed in appendix C to the report.

Resolved that:-

- (i) that Scrutiny notes the reported General Fund Revenue Budget net overspend of £228,348.
- (ii) that Scrutiny notes the outcome of Cabinet's consideration prior to final agreement by Full Council I to transfer £2,183,984 to the Business Rates Smoothing Reserve to mitigate the deficit on the Collection Fund in 2014/15 and the estimated deficit in 2015/16 due to the outcome of the recent Hinkley Point appeal, as well as future risks in this area.
- (iii) that Scrutiny notes the outcome of Cabinet's consideration prior to final agreement by Full Council to approve a Supplementary 2015/16 Revenue Budget allocation of £40,000 for essential asset maintenance and health and safety works to be funded from the Sustainability Earmarked Reserve.
- (iv) that Scrutiny notes the transfers to and from Earmarked Reserves as set out in Table 4 and Appendix B of this report, and supports the recommended Budget Carry Forward of 2014/15 underspends for specific service costs in 2015/16 totalling £206,394 as set out in Appendix B.
- (v) that Scrutiny notes the outcome of Cabinet's consideration prior to final agreement by Full Council to approve Capital Programme Budget Carry Forwards totalling £577,719 for general schemes to be funded using capital receipts, capital grant and S106 contributions (as set out in Appendix C of this report).
- (vi) that Scrutiny notes the outcome of Cabinet's consideration prior to final agreement by Full Council to approve Capital Programme Budget Carry Forwards totalling £1,026,174 for Hinkley S106-funded schemes (as set out in Appendix C of this report).
- (vii) that Scrutiny notes the net overspend of £39,204 in relation to the Capital Programme for general schemes in the current year and that this overspend has been funded from the useable capital receipts reserve.

SC100 Medium Term Financial Plan

Considered report, WSC 123/15 previously circulated.

The purpose of the report was to share the latest Medium Term Financial Plan (MTFP) forecasts for the Council's net spending and funding and highlighting

the projected budget gap to be addressed over the immediate and short to medium term.

Councillor Chilcott, as Lead Member for Resources, presented the report and explained that the development of a realistic and deliverable MTFP forecasts for the Council's net spending and funding and highlighting the projected budget gap to be addressed over the immediate and short to medium term.

During the course of discussion the following points were made:-

- Detailed that there would be a £500,000 budget gap in the next financial year.
- Members questioned if there should be a focus on income generation instead of cuts to close the budget gap and asked what work was underway by officers relating to this. The Lead Member for Resources confirmed that this issue was already high on the Cabinet's agenda.
- Due to reserve balances being limited, there were restricted financial resources available to pursue 'spend to save' projects.
- Considered what the minimum service provision for the authority looked like and what extra services on top of this could then be afforded.
- Money diverted from repaying the debt from capital receipts could be used towards income generation projects.
- It was confirmed that projected council tax income had been taken into account income from new builds over the period.
- It was questioned if assets had been audited regularly to take into account the any added value when revisited and it was confirmed that they had..
- Increased revenues could be achieved through additional house building through council tax revenue along with attracting businesses into the area.
- Members encouraged additional collaborative working with parishes to maintain the provision of services going forward.
- Discussion took place on the possibility of holding a referendum on the possibility of levying a council tax increase over the prescribed central government capping limit and the Leader confirmed that, at this stage, this option had not been ruled out..
- The cost of services was increasing at a faster rate than council tax could be increased to comply with the current capping limit which in turn amplified the pressured on the budget gap.
- Councillors were encouraged to attend upcoming workshops relating to refreshing priorities. The invite was extended to area panel groupings. Ideas for generating income and making changes for the council to benefit financially could be put forward..

Resolved that:-

- The Scrutiny Committee note the Medium Term Financial Plan.

(Copy of the Forward Plan for 2014/15, circulated with the agenda.)

A member of the Scrutiny Committee suggested that Scrutiny should investigate a provision of a railway service from Taunton to Minehead. Following discussion, and in line with the agreed process, the committee decided that this should not be added to the Scrutiny Committee WorkPlan.

RESOLVED that the Scrutiny Forward Plan published on 1 July 2015, be noted.

The meeting closed at 4.58 pm.

Report Number: WSC 131/15
Presented by: Cllr Anthony Trollope Bellew, Leader
Author of the Report: Brendan Cleere
Contact Details:
Tel. No. Direct Line 01823 356350
Email: b.cleere@tauntondeane.gov.uk
Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny Committee
To be Held on: 10 September 2015

The Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA) and Flood Action Plan – Update Report

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

- 1.1. The report updates Council on the development of the Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA) since the report to Corporate PAG and Cabinet in November / December 2014. The report sets out progress since that date along with the ongoing discussions for future funding and governance. It seeks approval for a recommendation to Full Council, relating to WSC's preferred long term funding option for the SRA.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

- 2.1 The Flood Action Plan links closely with the vision set out within the Somerset County Council's County Plan. In particular the objectives which seek to create a thriving local economy, improving key infrastructure and creating better links by joining up with partners, to ensure that services are more effectively delivered to Somerset's residents.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

The Scrutiny Committee is **recommended** to:

- 3.1 Note progress to date in the development of the Somerset Rivers Authority and West Somerset Council's position on the way forward, as set out in the report.
- 3.2 Note progress in the delivery of the Levels & Moors 20 Year Flood Action Plan (2014).
- 3.3 Seek the formal approval of Full Council on 16 September 2015, for the creation of a separate precepting body as WSC's preferred funding option, noting that the Council's position will be confirmed to the SRA Board meeting in late September.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

- 4.1 If new collaborative arrangements for the funding, co-ordination and delivery of flood risk management in Somerset are not developed and agreed, there is a significant risk that the intensity and duration of flooding events will continue to adversely affect local communities and businesses, and the County and District Councils in the delivery of services. The Council's budgetary planning would be likely to be adversely affected, along with its reputation.
- 4.2 Key risks also apply to the support from Government, retaining the current County-wide consensus on the principles and the timescales associated with making the changes required. Unless momentum is able to be maintained in the delivery of this project, there are risks that the new funding arrangements proposed will not be in place for financial year 2016/17.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

The flooding across a wide area of Somerset in the winter of 2013-14 brought widespread distress. Many homes were flooded for long periods, and many roads were closed. The impact was therefore felt by the many Somerset residents and businesses.

The flooding attracted national government interest and Somerset partners were requested by the Defra Secretary of State to develop a Flood Action Plan and, at a later date, to form the Somerset Rivers Authority.

The Government (Defra and DCLG) have now conducted a review of the options for ongoing funding of the SRA and have asked Somerset partners to respond to them on which is their preferred option

The Levels & Moors 20 Year Flood Action Plan (2014), developed at the Government's request and signed off by the Secretary of State in March 2014, included a proposal to create a Somerset Rivers Authority to:

- Provide a renewed, co-ordinated and joined-up approach to addressing flooding and resilience issues.
- Develop new approaches to the management of the drained areas and the wider catchment, and
- Enhance local leadership.

Many of the other actions within the Flood Action Plan are completed and a review of the plan is currently underway. The plan has short and long term actions, and the review is looking at what has been achieved so far, which of the long term options identified in the plan should still be pursued and what other actions are necessary to ensure there is a sustainable plan for the future.

Some highlights of the delivery of the Flood Action Plan include:

Dredging and River Management

- The construction of the new Thorney Village Ring Bank, and construction work to improve the existing Thorney Pottery Ring Bank, are complete.
- The 8km dredge on Rivers Parrett and Tone, to the 1960's profile, has been completed.
- A project looking at 10 other potential dredging locations is complete and the next dredging location has been identified for downstream of Northmoor Pumping Station.
- A pre-flood standard of flood protection has been established at 50+ locations, in a multi-million pound programme of works. This has involved extensive repairs to flood banks on the Rivers Parrett and Tone. Spillway repairs at Middlemoor and Allermoore were

completed; flood defence works to protect properties at Aller Drove is complete; temporary pump platform and compound at Dunball, and conversion of existing pumps at Northmoor, are now complete.

- Permanent protection at Westonzoyland is complete.
- Phase 1 of river modelling work to assess the impact of the various Flood Plan actions, is complete.
- The Parrett Barrier multi-agency project team has been set up to deliver the preliminary work prior to construction, now that the SRA has secured Growth Deal funding for this phase of the project.
- Trigger documents for 10 agreed sites, explaining what, when and why certain operational decisions are undertaken in extraordinary flood conditions, have been rolled out at 30 public/partner meetings and were well received.
- Work to develop options for increasing the capacity of the Sovey/Kings Sedgemoor Drain system has been undertaken; a preferred option is now being developed further.

Land Management

Land Management involves a range of ways to encourage land use that stops or slows water entering river courses and maximises natural flood management.

- £100k has been secured to complete survey work and £550k to deliver a programme of small scale on-farm schemes in 2015/16.
- An advisory team for land management advice and support is now in place.
- Farm visits have begun and the first Capital Grant Scheme been applied for and completed.

Urban Run-Off

- An initial feasibility study for £16m flood storage upstream from Taunton has been published. Planning for the next stage of the project is underway, and a funding bid is being submitted.
- Flooding 'hotspots' identified, working with other agencies
- Work continues with partner authorities to develop Sustainable Urban Drainage Systems (SUDS) guidance for developers and planners for new developments
- Reviewed / identified sample sites to evaluate effectiveness of existing SUDs schemes

Resilient Infrastructure

- A 500m stretch of the Muchelney to Drayton road was re-opened, having been raised over a metre in places, to ensure it remains open even in flooding on the scale of 2013/14.
- Improvement scheme for Sovey/King Sedgemoor Drain: Phase I of the Beer Wall project was completed with a 60 tonne temporary bridge lowered into place on the A372, to ensure the road stayed open throughout winter. Road works were then completed, and the final phase of work started this summer.
- Deep clean of system including review and survey of gullies and culverts
- 20 of 26 minor flood alleviation management schemes have now been completed, the rest will be completed next financial year.

Building Local Resilience

- A Community Recovery and Resilience Officer was appointed and has been working with flood affected communities to develop flood plans; the first ones are now nearing completion, a second phase will be developed.
- Support meetings for flood affected communities have been held at a number of locations.
- Support given for access and take-up of grants for homes, farms and businesses.
- A Somerset community resilience website has been developed, to provide accessible resilience and flood risk information.

Business Case & Delivery of Long Term Solutions

- An Economic Impact Assessment of the 2013/14 flooding in Somerset has been undertaken, and is now being finalised.

Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA)

A key change from the early days of the Flood Action Plan is that the SRA's remit includes the whole of Somerset, not just the flooded areas of the Levels and Moors. This is to ensure that all areas have the potential to benefit from the joint working and any funding available for flood alleviation measures.

A further change is the 'hierarchy' of the SRA and the Flood Action Plan. As stated previously the setting up of the SRA was an action with the Flood Action Plan. The position now is that the work of the Somerset Levels and Moors Flood Action Plan is still carried forward but does so now as part of the SRA programme.

It is important to note that the existing flood management responsibilities, accountabilities and funding will continue unchanged for the SRA partners – the Environment Agency, the Internal Drainage Boards, Somerset County Council (the Lead Local Flood Authority), and the five county district councils of South Somerset District Council, Mendip District Council, Taunton Deane Borough Council, Sedgemoor District Council, West Somerset District Council. It also does not diminish the responsibilities of riparian owners.

More detail about the Somerset Rivers Authority can be found here <http://www.somersetiversauthority.org.uk> .

Since January 2015 the SRA has developed:

A **Common Works Programme** (2015-16) for Somerset, to plan, deliver and share information about all Flood Risk Management work in the county. This is core work for all partners but brought together and co-ordinated where possible and efficiencies developed for joint delivery. The Common Works Programme for this period is available on the Somerset Rivers Authority website here <http://www.somersetiversauthority.org.uk/our-work/common-works-programme/>

Currently, all Somerset's Flood Risk Management Authorities are discussing their future joint work programme for 2016/17.

A new **Enhanced Maintenance Programme** for 2015/16 using interim funding has also been produced and this undertakes a range of prioritised new flood risk management activity across all districts in Somerset, including maintaining the 2014 dredge on the rivers Parrett and Tone.

The detail of this programme can be seen here <http://www.somersetiversauthority.org.uk/our-work/enhanced-maintenance-programme/>

Our representative on the SRA is the Leader of the Council. The Director – Growth & Development sits on the SRA Management Group and, currently, also on the SRA Key Partners Group which focuses solely on developing the SRA, with representation from the Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs), the County and District Councils, the Department for the Environment, Food and Rural Affairs, the Department for Communities & Local Government, Natural England and the Environment Agency (EA).

Funding options

The SRA itself has been set up with interim funding for 2015-16 from a mixture of Central Government and local partners. A major area of work this year has been developing options for long-term funding, carried out through a Strategic Funding Review with the Department for Environment, Food and Rural Affairs and the Department for Communities and Local Government. This report has now been released and a stakeholder workshop has been held, to which all our councillors were invited and were able to input into the discussion.

The optimum outcome for TDBC would have been to set up the SRA with all funding from central government. However, this has never been accepted by Central Government and is not an option given to us as part of the Strategic Funding Review.

The funding review is attached as **Appendix A** to this report. The review does not recommend a particular option and we also are told that there is no presumption that any of these options will be taken forward. WSC representatives contributed to the review after discussion with the Principal Accountant, Director Growth and Development and Director Operations.

There are four options:

Option 1) Creating a new precepting body.

This requires primary legislation but gives the ability for all households in Somerset to play a part in the raising of funds. Monies raised are transparent and are ring-fenced for the SRA and its work. This option will take several years to deliver but gives long term sustainability and does not impact on existing council budgets and hence their services. All local authority partners in Somerset (including WSC) have said that this is the only acceptable funding solution.

Option 2) Creating a new levying authority.

Primary legislation is still needed and the levy could be on both the County and the District Councils. Any additional levy charge on WSC would limit our ability to raise council tax for our other services within the current 2% referendum threshold and hence puts an increasing risk on our budget setting over future years. This option is not recommended.

Option 3) Raising funds through council tax.

If agreed this could be implemented by April 2016. It is suggested that the County Council are within this funding mechanism, however this would still have an impact of £38,000 on WSC by increasing our council tax within the 2% threshold. Again, this limits our ability to raise council tax for our other services within the current referendum threshold and increases the medium to long term risk on our budgets. Although this is a quick option to implement, the funding is not ring-fenced and would be subject to annual re-negotiation which gives no sustainability to the SRA. This option is not recommended.

Option 4) Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) extend boundaries or increase levy.

Currently the Drainage Boards levy £2,739 on WSC which is equivalent to £0.06 across WSC. Levies and rates are approved by the IDB Board each year and can increase the levy if they show that their expenses have increased. The Land Drainage Act and a document known as the Medway Letter set out water levels to define the boundaries of an IDB Board, broadly that of land with the EA's Flood Zone 2. If the IDB extend their area to Flood Zone 2, they could raise £580k with £42k levied on WSC. This is not sufficient for the enhanced work programme of the IDB in future years. This would not give the SRA any ability to raise, hold or spend funds and limits the role for the Districts and County Council. In addition, it is difficult to see how the ongoing support for the important community and local flood resilience measures within the 20 year plan could be managed through this option. There are also concerns about a lack of wide accountability and representation. This option is not recommended.

More detail can be seen in the body of the funding report.

Summary of WSC position

Having looked carefully at the funding options review and heard the views of local stakeholders, the Council's preferred option is still to set up the SRA as a separate precepting body.

The IDBs would continue to set budgets for their work programmes as at present, but any additional levy would, in future, be placed on the SRA. Existing sources of capital funding for flood risk management would need to continue to be available to the individual partner organisations.

WSC has made its position clear on its preferred funding option before. Firstly through a joint letter with all other council leaders to the Defra Secretary of State on 14 October 2014 and a resolution at the Leaders Implementation Group on 6 November 2014 and at the Cabinet on 3 December 2014. The report to the Cabinet stated that

"In selecting mechanisms for implementing the Flood Action Plan, the proposal to establish the Somerset Rivers Authority as a precepting body has the advantage of raising additional funding locally in a transparent way, and one which would not be constrained by the restrictions which apply to the existing local authorities."

"The underlying principle of any precept would be "locally raised, locally administered, locally spent".

"Alternative proposals to progress a catchment-wide funding mechanism through the extension of the boundaries of the IDBs have been considered. However, with IDB levies on District Councils needing to be funded through the councils' own budgetary processes, this option would neither be deliverable, due to the constraints on councils, nor transparent."

Ministers are keen that a solution to the long-term funding be one that is not imposed from the centre but is one that works locally. They have now requested that the SRA consider the Strategic Funding Review and decide, in the light of the report, what option they wish to pursue and respond to Ministers. They indicate that they will then have discussions with the SRA about the approach to implementing that solution and what should happen in the interim, in particular next financial year.

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 At this stage there are no direct financial implications. Progress in the current financial year will be funded from resources already allocated to the SRA. Any future financial implications will be the subject of a subsequent report and decision.

7. SECTION 151 OFFICER COMMENTS

- 7.1 If a new Precepting Body is established there will be significant implications for Council Tax payers and these will need careful consideration by the respective districts

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 None directly arising from this report.

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

9.1 None identified in this report.

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

10.1 The report has been brought forward from the SCC Leaders Implementation Group which oversees the Flood Action Plan. Also represented on that group with the County Council are the Somerset District Councils and Drainage Boards, the Environment Agency, Government Departments, and other relevant organisations. County council representation on that group includes Councillors John Osman and David Hall, with West Somerset Council represented by Cllr Tim Taylor.

10.2 The Flood Action Plan draws on a wide range of evidence and feedback from the community. It also builds other relevant strategies and plans including Water Level Management Plans, and the Somerset Flood Risk Management Strategy

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

11.1 None identified in this report.

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 The aim of the project is to improve community safety and well-being, by providing a long term sustainable funding solution to flood risk management.

13. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

13.1 At this stage there are no direct legal implications as a result of this decision. However, there will be significant legal consequences associated with establishing a separate precepting body, and these will be addressed in any subsequent reports brought forward for decision.

Somerset Rivers Authority Local Funding Options

1.1 This document is a summary of potential local funding options for the Somerset Rivers Authority (SRA). It does not recommend a particular option or mechanism and there is no presumption that any of these options will be taken forward.

1.2 The funding options were identified through engagement with the SRA and other stakeholders. During that engagement some respondents raised the possibility of creating a Somerset Regional Flood and Coastal Committee, central government funding in the form of a grant or through business rates retention. As these options do not constitute a local funding solution they are not described here.

Draft

Creating a new precepting body

Mechanism

- 1.3 Under this option, the SRA would be established as a new statutory body with precepting powers using primary legislation. The body could additionally be given powers to charge landowners/land occupiers or landowners/land occupiers outside internal drainage board areas. This option would require primary legislation. Legislation could be introduced in Parliament using a public (government) bill or as a private bill sponsored by an external body like Somerset County Council.
- 1.4 The precepting authority would be able to raise funds directly through council tax, with district councils collecting the precept on the SRA's behalf. The SRA could be funded by all households in the five district council areas of Somerset. Somerset partners have proposed that one district council, Sedgemoor, be exempt from any precept on householders in recognition that the majority of the internal drainage districts fall within Sedgemoor. A charge of £12.60 per band D household (2015/16 figures) in four of the five district council areas and £3.50 per hectare for land occupiers would raise £2.7million.
- 1.5 In order to exempt Sedgemoor district council from any precept, a different rate could, in theory, be precepted to tax payers in different district council areas. This would make the SRA different to other existing precepting authorities in England, which charge the same level of precept across all the billing authorities within its area. Providing the SRA with the ability to precept at different rates would require special provision within the legislation setting up the SRA.

Discussion

- 1.6 The new charge would be identified on the council tax bill and it would be directly evident to tax payers that this element of council tax is exclusively for the SRA. Funding would be directly hypothecated for and ringfenced for the SRA. This option would have no implications for local authority budgets although it would result in increased bills for council tax payers. The SRA's funding would not be subject to annual negotiation with local authorities in Somerset.
- 1.7 The SRA would become a new tax-raising authority. Under the proposal put forward by local authorities in Somerset it would not be directly elected, relying on the local authority representation on the SRA board for its democratic accountability. It would have a power to collect directly from householders a charge it decided based on a programme of work it created.
- 1.8 If a precepting body were to be created, government would wish to consider whether a referendum seeking a mandate for the body was needed. It could be

practically and politically difficult to gain agreement to a precepting authority as it constitutes a new tax-raising body.

- 1.9 This option would require primary legislation, and may take several years to enact. Inclusion of a Bill to set up the SRA as a precepting body in a Government's programme of legislation would be subject to cross-Government agreement. In order for the bill creating this power to become law, parliamentarians in both Houses would have to be convinced of the need for a new, tax-raising power and that there was no better way to achieve the same outcome.
- 1.10 On 6th November 2014, members of the Somerset Levels and Moors Flood Action Plan Leaders' Implementation Group agreed that their preferred option was a precepting authority. During the course of the stakeholder engagement days, several partners explained that it was the only acceptable funding solution and that unless they could set up a precepting authority they could not support the SRA. Other members of the SRA Board stated that they would prefer alternative options so this option is no longer unanimously supported.

Creating a new levying body

Mechanism

- 1.11 An alternative to a precepting body is a levying body. There are existing precedents for flood risk management levies in the form of internal drainage board levies and the Environment Agency's local levy. Primary legislation would be needed to set up the SRA as a statutory body with new powers to charge all Somerset local authorities, or only the county council, a flood risk management levy. A levying body could either cover the whole of Somerset or it could be limited to areas not currently covered by internal drainage districts.
- 1.12 The levy raising powers could share many of the features of a precept, such as ring-fencing and direct hypothecation and could be set at the same rates. Unlike a precept, levies regularly raise different amounts in different areas so this feature would not be new. Levies are not currently outlined separately on council tax bills. Additional information on levies can nevertheless be provided by billing authorities in accompanying council tax documents. If a levy of £2.7m was placed on Somerset County Council this would not raise council tax above a 2% referendum threshold.
- 1.13 Unlike the precepting proposal, a levying body provides a more direct democratic accountability as the levy is taken into account by the elected council when it sets its council tax. An additional levy charge on councils would, however, limit their ability to raise their council tax for all their other services within the referendum threshold.
- 1.14 As with the precepting option, this proposal will require primary legislation. It could not be set up immediately and would require cross-Government agreement.
- 1.15 This option has not been considered by local partners as it has emerged during this review

Council Tax

Background

- 1.16 Council tax is a charge applied to households by a council to provide local services. Local authorities determine their own level of council tax. In doing so, they will have regard to the council tax referendum threshold, which is set by central government subject to approval of the House of Commons.
- 1.17 The council tax referendum threshold is determined annually, usually between December and February. The referendum threshold was set at 2.0% for 2015/16. There is no limit on the amount of council tax a local authority can raise if it obtains the approval of its local electorate in a referendum. Council tax freeze grants equivalent to a 1% council tax increase were provided by central government to local authorities in the previous Parliament. There is no commitment to provide funding for any new freeze schemes from 2016/17.

Mechanism

- 1.18 Somerset County Council and the 5 district councils could fund the SRA at the same level as in 2015/16 from council tax. The councils could use a one-off increase in council tax, within the referendum threshold (which was 2% in 2015/16), to generate additional funding for the SRA from households. This could apply from April 2016. In subsequent years the funding would be considered part of the baseline and would not require future council tax increases.
- 1.19 Table 1 below sets out the increase in council tax income ('council tax requirement') which would accrue to local authorities in Somerset in 2016-17 based on an increase of 2% and assumptions about the tax base. The figures do not assume any freeze grant in 2016/17; if there were to be a freeze grant in 2016/17, the estimated additional revenue would be less than indicated in the table.
- 1.20 Table 1 below shows an estimate of how much extra council tax revenue could be raised by councils in Somerset within a 2.0% referendum threshold.

Table 1: Somerset councils' Council Tax requirement for 2015/16 and the estimated extra revenue for 2016-17 with a 2% increase¹.

Authority	2015-16 Council Tax Requirement	Extra revenue available from a 2% rise assuming an increase in the Tax Base²	Extra revenue available from a 2% rise assuming no increase in the Tax Base³
Somerset County Council	£189.4m	£7.06m	£3.79m
Mendip District Council	£5.6m	£0.20m	£0.11m
Sedgemoor District Council	£5.3m	£0.19m	£0.11m
South Somerset District Council	£8.4m	£0.32m	£0.17m
Taunton Deane Borough Council	£5.3m	£0.21m	£0.11m
West Somerset Council	£1.9m	£0.06m	£0.04m
District Councils total	£26.5m	£0.98m	£0.54m
Combined total	£215.9m	£8.04m	£4.33m

1.21 Table 2 shows the percentage council tax increase the county and district councils could apply to collectively raise additional funding of £2.7m per year for the Somerset Rivers Authority, assuming no change in the tax base. These figures are for illustration only. The figures show that the councils would be able to increase their council tax within a 2% threshold while still allowing some scope to increase funding for other services.

¹ Department for Communities and Local Government figures

² Figures assume an average Tax Base increase in 2016-17 of the same level as in 15-16. Figures exclude parish precepts

³ Figures assume Tax Base remains constant at 2015-16 level. Figures exclude parish precepts.

Table 2: Council tax percentage increase required to raise £2.7m, assuming no increase to Tax Base

Authority	2015-16 Council Tax requirement	% increase (no Tax Base change)	Additional amount raised
Somerset County Council	£189,389,700	1.25	£2,368,389
Mendip District Council	£5,603,077	1.25	£70,069
Sedgemoor District Council	£5,255,424	1.25	£65,721
South Somerset District Council	£8,442,979	1.25	£105,583
Taunton Deane Borough Council	£5,330,400	1.25	£66,659
West Somerset Council	£1,885,584	1.25	£23,580
Total	£215,907,164	-	£2,700,000

1.22 Table 3 shows the additional revenue the authorities would raise assuming their tax base grows at the same rate as in 2015-16. It is recognised, however, that any tax base increase would lead to an increase in demand for services.

Table 3: Council tax increase assuming Tax Base grows at 2015-16 rates

Authority	Estimated percentage tax base increase⁴	Additional council tax revenue generated
Somerset County Council	1.7	£3,211,552
Mendip District Council	1.6	£89,313
Sedgemoor District Council	1.6	£86,084
South Somerset District Council	1.8	£150,825
Taunton Deane Borough Council	1.8	£97,032
West Somerset Council	1.4	£26,483
Total	-	£3,661,290

⁴ Tax based increase: Somerset County Council 1.7%, Mendip 1.6%, Sedgemoor 1.6%, South Somerset 1.8%, Taunton Deane 1.8% and West Somerset 1.4%

Discussion

- 1.23 Councils set their tax rate annually and the initial increase would then be added to the baseline for all future years meaning that further annual increases are not required. Changes could be applied at the next council tax rate setting so funding could be agreed in advance of 2016/17.
- 1.24 The tables above show the additional funding that could be raised through council tax. If this route were to be used there may have to be a process for establishing local agreement on the best way of dividing the funding between the councils. Contributions through council tax could be varied between councils to reflect the amount of work to be carried out in each district, the amount of special levy already paid to internal drainage boards or in reference to other factors, such as pressures on the existing budget.
- 1.25 Increasing council tax specifically to fund the SRA would be subject to local authorities agreeing to allocate to the SRA part of their increased budget from the higher council tax. However, it would limit their ability in 2016/17 to raise council tax for other services without a referendum. Any increased funding would not be ring-fenced or hypothecated directly for the SRA and would be subject to annual renegotiation.
- 1.26 An agreement or memorandum of understanding could be drawn up between the SRA and local authorities to ensure there is a long term funding commitment. Information about the agreement could be provided with council tax bills.
- 1.27 This option could be used in combination with other proposals outlined below to ensure that sufficient funding was raised and to include contributions from landowners/land occupiers and businesses.
- 1.28 This option is already open to local partners. There is, however, no support for this option from local partners.

Internal Drainage Boards (IDBs) extend boundaries or increase levy

Background

- 1.29 Under s36 of the Land Drainage Act, the expenses of IDBs are met by drainage rates from agricultural land and special levies issued on district and unitary authorities in internal drainage districts.
- 1.30 The two internal drainage districts in Somerset (the Axe Brue IDB and the Parrett IDB) span all of Somerset's district council areas. The drainage districts do not cover the whole of Somerset. District councils are levied by the internal drainage boards according to the total value of agricultural and non-agricultural land and buildings within those district council areas that lie in an internal drainage district. This means that each district council is levied a different amount.
- 1.31 Table 4 shows the different amounts levied on each district council and the percentage this represents in terms of each authority's council tax requirement. In practice the district councils spread the cost of paying the special levy across their whole council tax base. Table 5 shows, for illustration only, the average equivalent amount for each Band D household in each district reflecting the different amount and value of land in each district which falls within the IDB area. Table 6 outlines the different drainage rates charged to land occupiers.

Table 4: Total amount levied on each district council in 2015/16 (note the IDBs currently raise funds from North Somerset Unitary Authority as well as Somerset district councils)

District Council	Levy amount and (% of Council Tax requirement)
Mendip District Council	£100,065 (1.8%)
Sedgemoor District Council	£1,238,071 (23.6%)
South Somerset District Council	£58,215 (0.7%)
Taunton Deane Borough Council	£20,738 (0.4%)
West Somerset Council	£2,739 (0.1%)
North Somerset Unitary Authority	£12,379

Table 5: 2015/16 Special Levy charges – expressed as an average charge across all band D households in each district for illustration⁵

District Council	Charge
Mendip	£2.63
Sedgemoor	£33.15
South Somerset	£0.95
Taunton Deane	£0.52
West Somerset	£0.21

Table 6: 2015/16 Drainage rates on agricultural land for Parrett and Axe Brue Internal Drainage Boards

Internal Drainage Board	Charge (average £/hectare)
Axe Brue	7.05
Parrett	6.83

Mechanism

- 1.32 Internal drainage boards charge rates and levies to cover their annual expenses. This means that levies and rates are reviewed and approved by the Board each year. Under this option both the internal drainage boards in Somerset would have to show that their expenses had increased and would generate the additional £2.7m funds by increasing special levies and charges paid by districts and agricultural land occupiers. As the proportions collected through agricultural rates and special levies are fixed it is not possible to increase funding from one source without the other (unless land types change).
- 1.33 Any increase in special levy would have a direct impact on council's decisions on council tax and would be subject to the referendum threshold.

⁵Figures provided by Somerset Rivers Authority. Table 6 figures show, for illustrative purposes, Table 5 levies as equivalent Band D charges. These vary by district as each local authority paying Special Levy passes on the cost to all households in their area including those outside drainage board areas.

- 1.34 The existing budgets of the internal drainage boards amount to £1.762m in total (£1.432m from special levies on districts (including North Somerset) and £0.33m from agricultural charges). Increasing total funds raised by £2.7m would require a 153% increase in charges and levies. As the current Drainage Board area falls predominantly within Sedgemoor, their existing levies, as shown in Table 4, are higher, and represent a higher proportion of their total council tax requirement. This level of increase in special levy in Sedgemoor District Council would result in an increase in their council tax of 36%. Mendip District Council would also see an increase above the referendum limit, of 2.7%. The increase in other districts would remain within the referendum limit.
- 1.35 Any agreement to raise levies would be subject to the agreement of the internal drainage boards, on which district council members and land owners/land occupiers are represented.
- 1.36 Alternatively, or in addition to increasing current rates and levies, the internal drainage boards could work with the Environment Agency and Defra to seek to extend their boundaries under the Land Drainage Act.
- 1.37 The Land Drainage Act provides that Internal Drainage Districts can be in areas, or can be extended to areas, which 'derive benefit, or avoid danger, as a result of drainage⁶ operations'.
- 1.38 Guidance on identifying areas which will derive benefit or avoid danger as a result of land drainage activities was set out in the *Medway Letter*, written by Ministers in 1933. The letter sets out guideline heights above last known flood levels and high tide marks which are used to set water levels to define the boundaries of a Board. The principles set out in the *Medway Letter* have come to be seen as the benchmark on whether an area can be seen as one which will derive benefit or avoid danger as required by the Land Drainage Act. The Association of Drainage Authorities and Environment Agency produced guidance on establishing internal drainage boards⁷ which states that the broad modern interpretation of the Medway Letter is that internal drainage district boundaries can extend to land within Environment Agency's Flood Zone 2.
- 1.39 By extending their boundaries to Flood Zone 2, Somerset's internal drainage boards could extend their areas by 8954 hectares.

⁶ As defined in S72 of the Land Drainage Act 1991

⁷ http://www.ada.org.uk/downloads/other/downloads_page/Establishing%20New%20Internal%20Drainage%20Boards%20National%20Guidance.pdf

1.40 Extending the existing internal drainage district areas would mean drainage works could be undertaken over a wider area, leading to an increase in the number of landowners liable to pay drainage rates and in contributions from households and in turn leading to an increase in funds available to the internal drainage boards. If the rate for this extended area were to be set at the existing rate, it is estimated that this would raise £580k. Funds would be collected and retained by the internal drainage boards. The impact on districts would vary and is shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Impact on Districts of extending existing Internal Drainage Board boundaries

Authority	Band D households £/h'hold	Council tax increase %	Increase in levy paid £k
Mendip District Council	+£0.79	0.5%	+£30k
Sedgemoor District Council	+£2.38	1.7%	+£89k
South Somerset District Council	+£3.15	2.1%	+£178k
Taunton Deane Borough Council	+£4.36	3.1%	+£167k
West Somerset Council	+£4.96	3.6%	+£67k

Discussion

1.41 Subject to the agreement of the internal drainage board members, rates and levies could be increased before April 2016. In order to extend the drainage districts, internal drainage boards would work with the Environment Agency to draw up a scheme for altering the boundaries which would then be subject to local consultation. Assuming local agreement, an extension may be brought into effect via an Order made by Ministers which is laid before Parliament. Extensions can be approved and implemented in a couple of months, if there are no objections, meaning in theory this option could be implemented for 2016/17. In practice, the process of consultation and local agreement has taken several years.

1.42 Funds raised by internal drainage boards are directly hypothecated and ring-fenced for flood risk management and land drainage. Funding would be raised and retained by the internal drainage boards.

- 1.43 Internal drainage boards have powers to exercise supervision over land drainage issues and managing flood risk on ordinary water courses in their district. They are able to undertake works on behalf of other flood risk management authorities via Public Sector Cooperation Agreements. This arrangement would enable the drainage boards to undertake the functions of another risk management authority including works outside the internal drainage district and on main rivers. The Land Drainage Act could restrict the use of funding for some of the activities set out in the Action Plan such as community resilience work and upper catchment land management work.
- 1.44 Under the Land Drainage Act, internal drainage boards must charge their special levy to district councils with reference to values set out in 1990 ratings lists. The 1990 ratings lists for the area of Somerset beyond the existing internal drainage districts are not thought to be available. This could mean that boundary extension is not currently practically possible without a change in legislation requiring use of alternative values.
- 1.45 Under this option, the Somerset Rivers Authority would not have its own ability to raise, hold or spend funds. It would act as a coordinating body for risk management authorities in Somerset. This would limit the role for the district councils and Somerset County Council.
- 1.46 The main barrier to these options is the effect that any increase in rates and levies, or extension, would have on district council budgets. The increase in special levy will result in council tax increases far higher than a 2% referendum threshold. Local authorities have stated that they are not willing to consider any impact on their budgets.
- 1.47 In addition concerns have been expressed over an IDB led funding and spending programme, perceiving it to be too land drainage driven and lacking in wide accountability.
- 1.48 This proposal has received some support from the Association of Drainage Authorities, NFU and Country Land and Business Association, and some internal drainage board members. It is not supported by other local partners.

County Drainage District

- 1.49 A further option presented by the Association of Drainage Authorities was the creation of a new kind of internal drainage board in a county drainage district. This could cover the area inside Somerset but not currently covered by internal drainage districts. Unless it was possible to show that all of this land would derive benefit or avoid danger from land drainage activities, this would require new legislation. The option of a new kind of levying body for flood risk management is discussed on page 4.

Report Number: WSC 132/15
 Presented by: Cllr Dewdney – pfh Environment
 Author of the Report: Mark Hill / Asset Data Manager
 Contact Details:
 Tel. No. Direct Line 07500 882 400
 Email: Mark.hill@tauntondeane.gov.uk

Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny
 To be Held on: 10th September 2015
 Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: [\[Click here and type Date\]](#)

INTRODUCTION OF CHARGES FOR THE STREET NAMING & NUMBERING ADMINISTRATION FUNCTION

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

1.1 To support the introduction of a Scale of Charges for the Administration of the Street Naming and Numbering service in accordance with the details set out in this report. It is intended that the introduction of charging will be a Portfolio Holder decision.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

2.1 [\[Click here and type text\]](#)

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 To support the introduction of a Scale of Charges for the Administration of the Street Naming and Numbering service in accordance with the details set out in this report.

4. RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
[Type Description of the Risk]			
<i>[Type Description of any mitigating action in place or planned]</i>			
[Type Description of the Risk]			
<i>[Type Description of any mitigating action in place or planned]</i>			
[Type Description of the Risk]			
<i>[Type Description of any mitigating action in place or planned]</i>			
[Type Description of the Risk]			
<i>[Type Description of any mitigating action in place or planned]</i>			

The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the scoring matrix. Each risk has been assessed and scored both before and after the mitigation measures have been actioned.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 5.1 West Somerset Council has a statutory obligation for the naming and numbering of streets and buildings within its designated administrative boundary.
- 5.2 The purpose is to ensure that any new or amended street and building names and/or numbers are allocated logically and in a consistent manner to facilitate effective service delivery from both public and private sector bodies and in particular to ensure that emergency services are able to locate any address to which they may be summoned.
- 5.3 No charge is currently levied for the administration of the Street Naming and Numbering service function or the additional associated discretionary services and ancillary work undertaken which requires a significant administrative effort in terms of consultation, liaison and preparation of schedules and plans. The majority of Local Authorities in England charge for such services.
- 5.4 Responsibility for delivering Street Naming and Numbering is held within the Asset Data Team, Asset Management within Housing & Communities.
- 5.5 West Somerset Council provides a comprehensive Street Naming and Numbering service to applicants encompassing a broad spectrum of new development types, and the renaming and renumbering of existing streets and properties. The cost of providing the service is substantial, not only in terms of staff time, but also the additional costs associated with preparing schedules, layout plans, printing, stationery and postage.
- 5.6 A number of Local Authorities in England and Wales have introduced a Scale of Charges for the Street Naming and Numbering service. It has further been established that in addition to those already having implemented charges, a considerable number of authorities are in the process of preparing reports.
- 5.7 The address information from the Street Naming & Numbering function is fed into their Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) which is the Councils Corporate Address Database
- 5.8 The incorporation of the Street Naming and Numbering function alongside the Gazetteer Management function has been central to the successful implementation of the Local Land and Property Gazetteer (LLPG) in West Somerset. As a direct consequence 'address' information is produced in a more consistent and logical manner and fed directly into the LLPG ensuring faster delivery of services to citizens from both Public and Private Sector organisations.
- 5.9 The Local Land and Property Gazetteers compiled and maintained by Local Authorities in England, Wales and Scotland have now been firmly established as the most accurate and definitive address database in the United Kingdom. These locally maintained gazetteers are 'fed' to a national hub maintained by GeoPlace, a public sector limited liability partnership between the Local Government Association and Ordnance Survey. Geoplace was set up as a result of a government call for a standard index of addresses to bring together existing creators and suppliers of addressing data to one central place to build a single, definitive address database. The resulting data is made widely available through Ordnance Survey which develops the range of AddressBase® products from the National Address Gazetteer.
- 5.10 A number of Public Sector organisations have identified the value afforded by these Gazetteers and they are now used exclusively nationwide by the Emergency Services, Land

Registry, and Valuation Office Authority and will be used by the Office for National Statistics for Census.

6. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 6.1 The introduction of a scale of charges would subsidise cost of service provision thereby enabling the continuation of effective service delivery to both public and private sector bodies and in particular to ensure that emergency services are able to locate any address to which they may be summoned.
- 6.2 The charge has been calculated from the last 3 years of Street Naming & Numbering data, and from results of a benchmarking exercise conducted to compare other Local Authorities within our the geographic area.

Proposed Scale of Charges;

Category	Charge
Property Naming/Renaming	£50.00
New Individual Dwelling	£100.00
Developments (more than one plot/property)	£100.00 + £10.00 per Plot
Changes to Development Layout after Notification	£10 per Plot Affected
Street Renaming at Residents Request	£150.00 + £25.00 per Plot

This would generate approximately £3,500.00 pa.

7. COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 7.1 The introduction of charges for Street Naming and Numbering would raise an estimated £3,500 income per annum. This would cover the cost of providing the service and would contribute towards the overall financial position of the council.

8. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 **Members need to demonstrate that they have consciously thought about the three aims of the Public Sector Equality Duty as part of the decision making process.** The three aims the authority **must** have due regard for are:

- Eliminate discrimination, harassment, victimisation
- Advance equality of opportunity between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it
- Foster good relations between persons who share a relevant protected characteristic and persons who do not share it

- 8.2 NA

9. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

- 9.1 NA

10. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

- 10.1 NA

11. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

- 11.1 NA

12. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

12.1 NA

13. HEALTH & WELLBEING

Demonstrate that the authority has given due regard for:

- People, families and communities take responsibility for their own health and wellbeing;
- Families and communities are thriving and resilient; and
- Somerset people are able to live independently.

13.1 NA

14. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

14.1 [Click here and type text]

Report Number: WSC 133/15
 Presented by: Cllr Dewdney – pfh Environment
 Author of the Report: Chris Hall – AD Operational Delivery
 Contact Details:
 Tel. No. Direct Line 01823 356499
 Email: c.hall@tauntondeane.gov.uk

Report to a Meeting of: Scrutiny Committee
 To be Held on: 10th September 2015
 Date Entered on Executive Forward Plan Or Agreement for Urgency Granted: [Click here and type Date]

HARBOUR OPERATIONS

1. PURPOSE OF REPORT

To raise Member’s awareness of the statutory Harbour responsibilities, to request that a Harbour Board be created and request appropriate resources be provided to deliver the statutory requirements.

2. CONTRIBUTION TO CORPORATE PRIORITIES

2.1 Whilst there is no direct link to the delivery of a corporate priority, West Somerset Council is the Statutory Harbour Authority and must comply with the legislation.

3. RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1 Members are requested to support the recommendation to Cabinet for:

- a) The creation of the Harbour Board with Membership as set out in section 6.16 of the report.
- b) The approval of the roles set out within the report to be identified as accountable in respect of the conditions set out in the Port Marine Safety Code.
- c) Recommending that Full Council approves the following increases in funding (revenue funding to be pro rata for 15/16):
 - i) £26k pa increase in the Harbours budget to support the Harbour Master role
 - ii) £5k one off sum to update WSC Port Marine Safety Code

4. RISK ASSESSMENT (IF APPLICABLE)

Risk Matrix

Description	Likelihood	Impact	Overall
There is a risk that WSC cannot evidence the compliance of the statutory harbour or safe processes at the non-statutory harbour	Likely (4)	Major (4)	High (16)
<i>The mitigations for this are the proposed changes as set out in the report</i>	Unlikely (2)	Minor (2)	Low (4)

There is a risk of accident or serious injury as a result of the failure to adequately control the harbour operation and inspect and record the condition of harbour assets	Feasible (3)	Major (4)	Medium (12)
<i>The mitigations for this are the proposed changes as set out in the report</i>	Unlikely (2)	Minor (2)	Low (4)
There is a risk that WSC fail to ensure safe access to the national refuge area at Watchet placing vessels, crew and cargo / passengers at risk.	Feasible (3)	Major (4)	Medium (12)
<i>The mitigations for this are the proposed changes as set out in the report</i>	Feasible (3)	Major (4)	Medium (12)

The scoring of the risks identified in the above table has been based on the scoring matrix. Each risk has been assessed and scored both before the mitigation measures have been actioned and after they have.

5. BACKGROUND INFORMATION

- 5.1 This report focuses on the compliance matters only. Options around further improvements to the service or matters that are not directly related to compliance are not identified here and a further report will be brought to Members to cover these matters if appropriate once the new delivery process is in place.
- 5.2 West Somerset Council is the statutory Harbour Authority for Watchet and Minehead. The responsibility for this the operation and compliance of these harbours sits with this Council. The simplest way to assess and evidence the competent operation is through compliance with the Department for Transport's Port Marine Safety Code (The Code).
- 5.3 As a statutory Harbour Authority The Code applies to West Somerset Council. It is written to apply to ports of all sizes, irrespective of resources, cargoes handled or level of traffic. Any harbour authority with statutory powers in relation to shipping and safety of navigation will be affected to some degree. West Somerset Council must comply with the primary legislation and no allowance is made for the resources available to deliver it.
- 5.4 The Code, whilst not being the primary legislation, sets out the requirements of a Statutory Harbour Authority. Compliance with The Code will also evidence compliance with the legislation.
- 5.5 WSC have a document, the Port Marine Safety Code that evidenced compliance with the Department for Transport's code at the time it was written, however this document was created in 2002 with an anticipated revision date 3 years later. The 2002 document is the latest in existence and does not now reflect the operation of the harbours. It also identifies roles within this Authority that are not currently being fulfilled.
- 5.6 The roles identified are:
- Harbour Master
 - Duty Holder
 - Designated Person
 - Harbour Board
- 5.7 Until recently the Harbour Master role was delivered through a contracted arrangement with a local individual, the cost of this arrangement was very low but as a

result meant that the hours worked were far fewer than necessary to adequately perform the role. It would be inaccurate to lay any blame at the previous Harbour Master for the lack of compliance, the Council did not provide the resources necessary to ensure compliance.

- 5.8 This arrangement has led to the individual seeking alternative employment and ceased working on behalf of West Somerset Council in June 2015.
- 5.9 Prior to this arrangement being established the role of Harbour Master was within the West Somerset Council structure but upon becoming vacant was removed as a budget saving.
- 5.10 Investigations were already underway to review the compliance of the Harbour operation against the Department for Transport's Port Marine Safety Code when the previous Harbour Master ceased his work.
- 5.11 When looking at the possible options for delivering the Council's responsibilities consideration was given to a joined up approach with Sedgemoor District Council (SDC). As the nearest Local Authority with statutory harbour responsibilities there were some opportunities to prevent duplication of approach. SDC outsource this function and discussions were carried out with the outsource provider, CF Spencer. An external contract to deliver the entire process has been included within the options.
- 5.12 Consideration was also given to a joined up approach with the Marina Operator in Watchet but this was not considered to be a workable option due to conflicts of interest, as one of the roles of the Harbour Master is to monitor the operations of the Marina.
- 5.13 The investigations referred to as well as audits undertaken by a member of the Harbour Masters Association have identified a number of areas of non-compliance in addition to those directly linked to the roles not being fulfilled. These key areas are identified in appendix 2 of this report.
- 5.14 In consultation with the portfolio holder, and as a temporary solution whilst seeking Member approval for the longer term answer, a member of the Open Spaces team has been diverted to the role of Harbour Master (24hours per week) and has started work on rectifying some of the issues identified around the inspection of the navigation aids. This was an emergency measure and may not be considered as being a competent solution.

6. PROPOSED SOLUTION

6.1 Roles

- 6.2 The **Harbour Master** role will cover specific technical expertise for the harbour operations at Minehead and Watchet.

Options to deliver this role:

- 6.3 Option 1
Engage an external company to deliver both the technical and day to day operations in relation to the Harbour Masters functions with estimated costs of £45k per year.
- 6.4 Option 2

Employ a competent person, or train an existing person to perform this role, with ongoing costs for external challenge with an estimated cost of £42k per year.

- 6.5 Option 3
Engage an external company to deliver the off-site technical Harbour Master functions with support from an internal employee to deliver the day to day operations on site with a cost of £38k per year.
- 6.6 Following support from the Harbour Masters Association, where they conducted onsite inspections of the Harbours, the operating practice, and were involved in discussions on the proposed solution, concerns were raised that Option 2 relies on the recruitment and retention of the right person locally. It was also identified that further investment in training of that individual would be required and could have substantial costs associated with this.
- 6.7 Option 1 would ensure compliance as this would in effect outsource the arrangements, whilst WSC would still remain liable for its statutory responsibilities. The company that we had been working with to establish costs was sold during the later stages of our negotiations. The new owners have now withdrawn the offer to provide a fully managed service.
- 6.8 The proposed way forward and recommendation in this report is to follow option 3 and have key functions delivered by a competent Harbour Master off site and use an employee (**Assistant Harbour Master**) to deliver local onsite functions, this will allow flexibility in the delivery of the service and provide compliance. The division of these functions is shown in Appendix 3.
- 6.9 This split relationship is considered workable and keeps better control of the costs associated with statutory harbour operation. Furthermore by retaining a level of local control WSC will be able to directly influence the Assistant Harbour Master to support the events and activities that take place in these locations.
- 6.10 The role of Assistant Harbour Master has not previously existed within the Council's employee structure. The Kiosk owner at Watchet undertakes a function to collect slipway fees on behalf of WSC and is nominally given this title. This is not a paid role but there is a percentage taken for fee collections and administration. No change to this arrangement is proposed at this stage.
- 6.11 The role of **Duty Holder** is proposed to remain as stated in the previous documentation as the Cabinet of West Somerset Council. This report seeks to confirm and highlight this as a responsibility. It has been unclear as to the level of understanding that exists within the Cabinet that this responsibility has stayed with them. No external training for these Members has been budgeted for at this stage.
- 6.12 The role of the **Designated Person** is to be an independent person able to challenge the operation of the harbour, and if necessary the Council in its performance with The Code. Previous documentation has assigned this role to the Council's Health and Safety Manager. Advice from the Harbour Masters representative is that this function would ideally sit outside of the council and be an expert in the field of harbour / port operations. It is at this point Members should consider the scale of the operations in practice and determine if an external consultant approach is appropriate. The proposal set out in this report is to retain the challenge to operations within the council and delegate the appointment to this role to the Assistant Director Operational Delivery. It is anticipated that this would be at nil cost and would sit alongside an existing employee's responsibilities.

6.13 Harbour Board

- 6.14 It is a requirement for WSC to establish a **Harbour Board**. This is currently recorded in the WSC Port Marine Safety Code as being the Cabinet, however this is not considered to be compliant as Members are not clear that this is their responsibility and there are no clear lines of accountability.
- 6.15 The role of the Board should be to ensure the compliance of the Harbour operations and lead on decisions. The Board has responsibility for the compliance of the operation and should not be confused with the Advisory Committee that is a consultative body. It is recommended that the Board be granted delegated powers for decision making on the operation where those decisions are within the harbour budget. Decision on additional spend areas should follow the normal council decision making arrangements. The Board is proposed to meet quarterly.
- 6.16 It is recommended that WSC establish a Harbour Board with the suggested membership as follows:

Portfolio Holder for Environmental Services - Chair
3 elected Members, cross party

Attendees of The Board:

Board Members

Assistant Harbour Master - Vacant

Duty Holder – 2 member representatives of Cabinet

Designated Person – Vacant

6.17 WSC's Port Marine Safety Code

- 6.18 WSC are required to have a local management plan with a number of supporting documents such as an oil spill contingency plan, waste management plan etc. This document evidences compliance with the Department for Transport's Code. This Safety Code is out of date and requires revising. Previous revisions have been undertaken by external consultants CF Spencer.
- 6.19 The recommendation of this report is to commission external expertise to update WSC's Code of Practice and the necessary appendices.
- 6.20 Updating this document may well create further work activities for the Assistant Director and (Assistant) Harbour Master and the documentation should be seen as a starting point for compliance.

6.21 Watchet Harbour Advisory Committee

- 6.22 A Harbour Revision Order, which is a Statutory Instrument, was made in 2000:

"The Council shall establish a committee to be known as the Watchet Harbour Advisory Committee, which they shall consult (except in a case of special urgency) on all matters substantially affecting the conservation, protection, regulation, management, maintenance and improvement of the harbour and its navigation."

This Committee has been in operation since its inception with regular meetings held with minutes produced. No changes to this committee are proposed, but it should be noted that their interest relates only to the harbour at Watchet.

7. THE CORPORATE RISK REGISTER

- 7.1 West Somerset Council has statutory duties with regard to Watchet harbour that are not currently being fulfilled. This report highlights a number of those and seeks to rectify them.

8. FINANCIAL/RESOURCE IMPLICATIONS

- 8.1 The current budget is insufficient to resolve the issues that have been identified. The table below identifies the current budget in year as well as a full year comparison. A further table identifies the revenue resources necessary to deliver the statutory functions for the Harbour operations.

Current Staffing budget October '15 – march '16	
£ 2,500	Previous allocation
£ 3,500	Street cleaning savings (approved)
£ 6,000	Total

Current Staffing budget Full year	
£ 5,000	Previous allocation
£ 7,000	Street cleaning savings (approved)
£12,000	Total

Required Staffing budget 16/17	
£17,000	0.6 FTE Assistant Harbour Master
£18,000	Harbour Master Technical support
£ 3,000	Transport costs
£38,000	Total Budget Required
£12,000 -	Current budget
£26,000	Gap to be funded

The Assistant Harbour Master budget is inclusive of the costs of employment.

- 8.2 The recommendation is to uplift the Harbour budget by the £26,000 necessary supporting the work to ensure compliance with effect from October 2015 with a part year impact of £13,000 in 2015/16.

9. COMMENTS ON BEHALF OF SECTION 151 OFFICER

- 9.2 The harbour operation is a statutory requirement, however WSC has some control over the way in which it delivers this function. I am satisfied that the options have been considered and the recommendation reflects the most appropriate and cost effective delivery method.
- 9.3 Due to previous savings from the street cleaning contract being diverted to the harbour operation the cost gap is not as significant as it might have been, however Members should consider the ongoing implications of increasing the budget for this service, and the need to meet those costs from other areas of the Council. On its own this additional allocation will add to the already serious Budget Gap for 2016/17 onwards. Any allocation from capital reserves would reduce the balance below the acceptable minimum therefore it is essential that savings are identified to meet this new cost.

9.4 The Assistant Director Resources is currently leading a review of current year budgets and reserves, with a view to identifying in year savings. Members may support a redistribution of the first £13,000 of any savings to cover in year costs. Ongoing savings would need to be addressed through the Budget Setting process.

10. EQUALITY & DIVERSITY IMPLICATIONS

10.1 There are not thought to be any equality and diversity implications as a result of the recommendations.

11. CRIME AND DISORDER IMPLICATIONS

11.1 There are not thought to be any crime and disorder implications as a result of the recommendations.

12. CONSULTATION IMPLICATIONS

12.1 Due to the urgency of resolving the compliance issues this report has not been to the Watchet Harbour Advisory Committee but has been circulated and will be discussed at the next meeting.

12.2 This report was presented to Environment Policy Advisory Group who are supportive of the recommendations.

13. ASSET MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

13.1 There are not thought to be any asset management implications as a result of the recommendations.

14. ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT IMPLICATIONS

14.1 There are not thought to be any negative environmental implications as a result of the recommendations.

15. HEALTH & WELLBEING

15.1 There are no negative implications on health and wellbeing from the recommendations, but there are likely to be improvements in the operation at each location which would improve safety or reduce the risk of incidents.

16. LEGAL IMPLICATIONS

16.1 There is a lack of evidence of compliance affecting both harbours. As a statutory function this cannot be allowed to continue and this reports seeks to rectify many of the issues identified.

16.2 As there is a lack of evidence of compliance it would be difficult to defend ay case brought against this council, compliance in these areas should be considered as an urgent matter for resolution.

17. HR IMPLICATIONS

17.1 If the recommendation is approved to create the role of Assistant Harbour Master within the Council structure Taunton Deane Borough Council would be the employer, however

as there are no applicable services within Taunton Deane this post would be fully funded by WSC.

- 17.2 A job evaluation has yet to be undertaken but it is considered that the role will be graded at a D (£17,372 – £19,742)

Appendix 1

3 Sky End Lane
Hordle
Lymington S041 0HG
Tel: 01425 629625
Mobile: 07775 813263
E Mail: chris.lisher@btinternet.com

22 July 2015

Mr C Hall
Assistant Director
West Somerset Council
West Somerset House
Killick Way
Williton
Taunton TA4 4QA

Dear Chris

REVIEW OF WATCHET AND MINEHEAD HARBOURS

Thank you for your hospitality during my visit on 17 July 2015.

Following our far reaching discussion and the visits to Watchet and Minehead Harbours I can confirm that neither Harbour complies with the Port Marine Safety Code in a number of areas notably:-

- Governance
- Organisation
- Policies
- Legislation
- Risk Assessment
- Conservancy
- Enforcement
- Safety

There are a number of safety concerns at the both Harbours that could cause significant liability for the Council. These include:

- lack of warning notices
- steps at Minehead require repair
- railings at Watchet required if quay wall berth is not used
- Gates at top of ladders on Watchet quay wall need bolts or catches so they can be secured.

Continued.....

I cannot emphasise strongly enough the risk the Council currently faces if there is an accident at either Harbour. There is little evidence of compliance with the Port Marine Safety Code or maintenance of either the assets or safety equipment, and consequently it would be very difficult for a defence lawyer to justify any reduction in the blame so the Council would bear significant financial liability. It is also possible that the council's insurers would not pay any claim as it is evident that Council have not complied, in many ways, with the Port Marine Safety Code which is the industry recognised guidance.

It is also possible that the Maritime and Coastguard Agency (MCA) could at little notice audit the Harbours and demand that the Council put matters right or at the extreme, close the ports.

I have attached a table with the main items the Council needs to address in order to comply with the Port Marine Safety Code and relevant legislation.

If there is anything I can do to help you rectify the situation please let me know.

Yours sincerely

Chris Lisher

Appendix 2

MINEHEAD AND WATCHET HARBOURS AUDIT - 17 JULY 2015

No	ITEM	STATUS	ACTION REQUIRED
1.	Governance	No evidence provided of Governance structure board membership or meetings	Set up Board, presumably a mix of elected members and Council officers. Advise them of their responsibilities as "Duty Holder" which are joint and several. Arrange regular meetings.
2.	Safety	No evidence provided of the appointment of a "designated person" or their annual audits/reports.	Appoint a "Designated Person", ideally completely independent of the Council. Enable him/her to have direct access to the Board if necessary. Arrange regular audits by this person under the Port Marine Safety Code.
3.	Harbour Master	No evidence of the appointment of a Harbour Master for both Harbours or of the competence criteria for this post.	Put together a job description and required competencies for a Harbour Master, agree budget for such a person. Advertise locally (nationally if necessary).
4.	Rules	Unable to produce detail of Byelaws or General Directions to control the ports.	Locate any existing Byelaws and/or General Directions for the Harbour. Review, amend or create new appropriate regulations. Following board approval and local consultation publish both in hard copy and on website.
5.	Authority Levels	Unable to provide evidence of Board approved authority levels to enable Harbour Master or other employees to issue cautions or instigate prosecutions.	Set roles/level able to issue cautions, instigate prosecutions and have a board resolution to confirm.
6.	Organogram (Organisation Chart)	No evidence provided of the organisation within or without West Somerset Council to operate the Harbours.	Draw up organisation chart of employees involved in the running/management of the Harbour with clear reporting lines shown. Also show sub-contractors if appropriate.
7.	Fuel	No evidence of management control of fuel storage or distribution in either Harbour.	Create rules for storage and transfer of fuel in both Harbours. Approve by Board. Issue and make public.

No	ITEM	STATUS	ACTION REQUIRED
8.	Fuel Spills	No evidence of requirement to report fuel spills. No evidence of plans or equipment to cope with fuel spills.	Create fuel spill reporting mechanism and forms. Create plan for coping with fuel spills and responsibilities. Put in place support from other Harbours and sub-contractors. Rent or purchase oil spill equipment.
9.	Policies	No evidence of required policies e.g. Waste Management, Safety Management System, Safety Policy, Environmental Policy.	Write appropriate policies, all will need Board approval.
10.	Information	No evidence of "Local Notices to Mariners" or their publication either in hard copy or on the website.	Set up process for issuing Local Notices to Mariners. (these may include changes to navigation aids, temporary navigational warnings, advice about events or activities within the jurisdiction). Promulgate and record notices.
11.	Risk Assessments	No evidence of any risk assessments or their review.	Create a comprehensive set of risk assessments for each Harbour and an annual review process, as well as a procedure for the Harbour Master to create new or temporary risk assessments. Consider developing forms for hot work, diving, work at heights, within the jurisdiction.
12.	Legislation	No evidence of the current legislation (Acts of Parliament and Harbour Revision Orders) that currently apply to each Harbour.	Locate all of the existing legislation for each Harbour and review. Ensure the Council complies with all of these legislative requirements where necessary. Ensure all understand the status of each Harbour. (Statutory, Competent or other) and its consequent liabilities.
13.	Conservancy	No evidence of Hydrographic surveys at either Harbour or record of dredging.	If no recent Hydrographic surveys can be located issue contract for surveys to be conducted for each Harbour so that the Council understand the advertised depth of water and the dredging requirements.

No	ITEM	STATUS	ACTION REQUIRED
14.	Conservancy	No record of maintenance to safety equipment, navigation aids, buildings, breakwaters etc.	Create a process/procedure to record maintenance to all Harbour equipment and structures.
15.	Safety	No record of training for employees. No record of issue of personal protective equipment, nor regulations on when it should be worn. (e.g. safety helmets, safety glasses, working gloves, high visibility jackets, safety footwear).	Create standards of training for each employee involved in the Harbour, set periods for retraining. Allocate budget for this training, create training record, preferably on computer. Create standards for issue of personal protective equipment. Set up recording system.
16.	Enforcement	There appears to be no enforcement of Harbour Laws or Rules, there also appears to be a lack of clarity as to who in the Council manages the Marina Operator.	Agree who can enforce Harbour rules, and monitor sub-contractors adherence to terms and conditions of their contract.
17.	Navigation Aids	No evidence of liaison with Trinity House or use of their "Panar" recording system for navigation aids.	Contact Trinity House, arrange an inspection of navigation aids by them, and access to their "Panar" recording system.
18.	Notices	Inconsistent use of notices around the Harbours, to identify dangers and issue warnings to both Harbour users and general public.	Set up system for issuing local notices to mariners. agree where and how they are to be promulgated around the Harbours. Review safety notices and have consistent signage identifying the Harbour Board as responsible.
19.	Boundaries	No evidence of boundaries of each Harbour, either at sea or ashore. These are necessary to know where rules apply and where the Harbour has authority/responsibility. i.e. its jurisdiction.	Investigate information on jurisdiction of Harbour Authorities at sea (probably in Acts of Parliament) and on land (Land Registry). If necessary record claim to Harbour property/land with Land Registry.
20.	Licences	No evidence of process to control works within Harbours' jurisdiction.	Set up licensing process/paperwork/costs for works by anyone within Harbours' jurisdiction e.g dredging, moorings, buildings.

Chris Lisher 17th July 2015

Appendix 3

Allocation of duties

Schedule 1 to be delivered by external Harbour Master Service

Continuous review and management of:

Waste Management plan

Oil spill plan.

Berthing / Mooring plans

Event liaison

Notices to Mariners

Conservancy duties

Local Lighthouse Responsibilities (Panar Database)

Attendance on site

Port User Group liaison

Annual review of Risk Assessment

3 yearly review / update of all plans

Maintaining records on damage, repairs, dredging requirements.

Reports to council

Schedule 2 to be delivered by the in house Assistant Harbour Master

Taking and receipting of moneys

Liaison with HM

Management / Liaison with Harbour users

Monitoring of vessels arriving / departing.

Checking of day marks and Aids to Navigation.

Recording all forms of defects and forwarding to HM and Property Services.

Carrying out minor repairs / maintenance in support of Maintenance teams.

Advise HM of changes to low water drying banks.

Support local events.

Note: Members of the Scrutiny Committee and all other Members of West Somerset Council are invited to contribute items for inclusion in the work programme. Please contact Sam Rawle, Scrutiny Officer, who will assist you in submitting your item.