Appendix 1 to

Report on proposed change to

Mooring Allocation Policy

Moorings Policy Consultation – Conducted in summer of 2012

Q1. Do you support the principle of continuing to give priority to people ordinarily resident in the South Hams described in paragraph 6.2?

Q2. Do you support the proposal for two waiting lists as described in paragraph 6.3 and, if so, what criteria should be used to distinguish between the two lists in future?

Q3. Would you prefer there to be just one waiting list with all Council Tax payers on the same list?

Q4. In your opinion does the draft Moorings Policy require any further clarification?

Forum	Comments	Remarks
Fishermen	Our members have discussed your Consultation on Mooring Policy document & are most grateful for the opportunity to have been included in the circulation list. By in large our members who fish out of Salcombe are very happy with the existing situation. When it comes to discussing Mooring Matters we find your staff to be understanding & helpful with the problems specific to the Commercial Fleet e.g. store boxes, need for all state of the tide moorings, etc. We would hope that the division between the commercial mooring area & the leisure areas will be maintained so that if more commercial boats wish to join the fleet they can be accommodated as this is, we believe, in the best interests of Salcombe generally, due to the year round contribution that the commercial fleet makes to the economy of the Town. Being all locals our members naturally believe that the principle of priority to local full time residents should be maintained as we do not want to see a situation where Salcombe becomes	Requesting priority for moorings for commercial fishing boats, this is a current policy which should not be changed. Support for priority to local

	a ghost town in the winter. It seems to us that the two list system has worked well & in the absence of a better idea we would be happy to support its continuation & the criteria for inclusion on the "local" list should simply be that the address in the South Hams must be a rate payers principal residence.	people, ascertained by the payment of Council Tax.
The Salcombe & Kingsbridge Estuary Conservation Forum	I circulated the Moorings Policy Questionnaire to all Estuary Conservation Forum members and received the following response. Q.1 Yes. There is strong support for the two tier system. Q.2 We support the proposal for two waiting lists. Applicants should declare that they qualify to vote in General Elections in the South Hams constituency or they should sign a written statement that they are normally resident in the South Hams for the majority of the year. The Election suggestion should be able to be checked at Follaton on the Electoral Roll. It is legal for British Citizens to vote on more than one occasion for Council Elections but illegal to vote more than once in a General Election. Q.3 No. As above it is strongly felt that permanent residents should take priority Q.4 Being very familiar with SHA requirements I find the document clear and in no need of any further clarification. Whether this would apply to a newcomer I am not sure. There were no comments from Forum members. the Mooring Policy question of how to differentiate between full time and part time residents, people are only allowed to vote in one constituency in a General Election. There is therefore presumable a way of checking residential qualifications which could be used to ensure only voters in either the Totnes or S.W.Devon constituencies are given access to waiting list A. I did mention this in the reply from the Forum but it was right at the bottom (as is this) so might have been missed.	Support for priority to local people and continuance of two waiting lists. Proposal to use the electoral roll as qualification of residency.

SKEA	Q1 - 17 voted for giving priority to local people, 2 voted against it. Q2 - 15 supported the principal of two waiting lists, 4 voted against it. No comment received regarding the criteria that should be used to distinguish between the two lists. Q3 – 7 voted for one waiting list while 13 voted against it. Q4 – 11 felt the draft6 moorings policy required further clarification, 6 felt it was OK. The poll went out to 158 members of SKEA but, disappointingly and rather surprisingly there are only about 20 replies, and they require some explanation. Next to the Q1 to Q5 . there is a drop-down menu , which shows the nominal answers that I posted. SKEA members, having marked each reply as read, were asked to indicate "I agree" or "I disagree", by the 'thums-up' or 'thumbs-down' sign. But see my cautionary note at the foot of the list. Clearly there has been some confusion!	Support for priority to local residents in allocation of moorings. But seems SKEA would like to see one waiting list. Although there was a suggestion that further clarification was required, it is not clear where the clarification is required.
KEBC	At the last KEBC committee meeting it was agreed to obtain the clubs position on the Moorings Policy in 2 stages. The first was to obtain a view from the April meeting, the second to put that view to all members for comment. After the vote on the Moorings Policy questions, I believe this to be the result: Q1 Majority in favor of continuing to give priority to people ordinarily resident in the South Hams. Q2 Majority in favor of 2 lists the main criteria being residency. Q3 Majority in Favor of not having a single list with all Tax Payers on it. Q4 No clarifications have been identified yet for the Moorings Policy.	Support for priority to residents. Majority in favour of 2 waiting lists Utilisation of Council Tax as qualification criteria.

K/B & SALCOMBE MARINE BUSINESS FORUM- ANDREW TURNER-JONES	Q1 Yes, ordinary residents should have the priority and this should continue dependant on selective criteria. A permanent resident is determined in what way? Q2 My personal opinion is that a point scoring system is implemented to distinguish the priority of the waiting list. I think two lists is moreover not really relevant as the applicant would be scored against a pre-set criteria to determine their ranking and eligibility in the list. A set of questions is set and then ranked to give a total score that is fair. Fairness is determined on not just the fact you are a resident here but how long you are here, how long your family has lived here such as your parents, what the mooring is for- leisure use, business use, syndicate, length of time you have been waiting, also if you have been prepared to accept a less desirable mooring in the meantime. Some example questions with proof required- Are you a permanent resident? How long have you been a permanent resident? Is the mooring for personal/business use? Has your family been resident for 10 yrs+ Has person been prepared to accept mooring such as upper harbour/foreshore?	Support for priority to residents Points system, which would be complicated to administer
To Andrew Turner-Jones From Tim Tucker (South Sands Ferry) 26/05/2012	Comments on the proposed Mooring Policy are:- 4.0.1. There are a number of Private Moorings in South Sands Bay, a number owned by the Tides Reach Hotel and some by private individuals. 6.0.2. I think a mooring should be passable from “father to son/daughter as well, ie when next generation take over the family home and boat etc. 6.0.14 Mooring should belong to a syndicate, as long as any one or more member is a SHC rate payer.	There are no private moorings at South Sands, they are mooring licences. The transfer of moorings through the family would tie up moorings for generations and would make it more difficult for newcomers to get a mooring.

	6.0.15 Private Moorings belonging to a business, eg Tides Reach Hotel, Boat Hire Company should be transferable when that business is sold. 6.0.18 Same comment as 6.0.2. 6.2.1 What is definition of “ordinary resident”? ie someone who lives within SHDC for more that 6 months? How could this be verified? 6.3. I agree with the principle of two waiting lists but again the definition of “ordinary resident” should be clarified as many second home owners are in residence for a number of months. 6.6.1. Again, there are a number of private and commercial moorings (deep water) at South Sands which are not owned by SHA. 6.13. Is there a priority for “marine engineers” to have a pontoon berth for their work boat? 6.13.5 The South Sands Hotel (and others) own a number of private moorings; they are part of the assets when the business is sold and should pass to the new owner.	There are many boats with a mooring which are owned by a syndicate, providing one member of the syndicate has qualified for the mooring. There is provision in the policy for the transfer of business moorings when a business is sold. The definition of Ordinary resident is the exam question which is still to be resolved. There are no Deep Water moorings at South Sands which are not in SHA ownership. The transfer of business moorings is covered by 6.13.5.
Dave Halsell – Singing Paddles	Q1. Do you support the principle of continuing to give priority to people ordinarily resident in the South Hams described in paragraph 6.2? YES Q2. Do you support the proposal for two waiting lists as described in paragraph 6.3 and, if so, what criteria should be used to distinguish between the two lists in future? YES - ELECTORAL ROLE	Support for priority to residents, maintenance of 2 lists and use of electoral role.

	Q3. Would you prefer there to be just one waiting list with all Council Tax payers on the same list? NO Q4. In your opinion does the draft Moorings Policy require any further clarification? NO	