

# Navigation Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 07 November 2024

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Declarations of interest	2
3.	Matters of urgent business	2
4.	Minutes of last meeting	2
5.	Summary of actions and outstanding issues following discussions at previous meetings	3
6.	Chief Executive's report and current issues	3
7.	Proposed navigation charges for 2025/26 in the navigation area and adjacent waters	4
8.	Construction, Maintenance and Ecology work programme – progress update	11
9.	Broads Authority 2009 Provision – Removal of wrecks	11
10.	Principal and effectiveness of body worn cameras	12
11.	Date of next meeting	13
	Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests: Navigation Committee, 07 November 2024	14

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

## Present

Alan Goodchild – in the Chair, Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Mark Collins, Peter Dixon, Tony Grayling, Leslie Mogford, Bob Neate, Michael Scott, Simon Sparrow, Paul Thomas, and Daniel Thwaites.

## In attendance

Emma Krelle – Director of Finance, John Packman - Chief Executive, Rob Rogers - Director of Operations, Marie-Pierre Tighe – Director of Strategic Services (items 1 to 7), Sara Utting – Senior Governance Officer, Lorraine Taylor – Governance Officer.

## Others in attendance

Jonathan Goolden –Monitoring Officer

## 1. Apologies and welcome

The Chair welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Apologies** were received from Remus Sawyerr.

### Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

The Chair explained that the meeting was being audio-recorded. All recordings remained the copyright of the Broads Authority and anyone wishing to receive a copy should contact the Governance Team. The minutes remained the formal record of the meeting. He added that the law permitted any person to film, record, photograph or use social media in order to report on the proceedings of public meetings of the Authority. This did not extend to live verbal commentary. The Chair needed to be informed if anyone intended to photograph, record or film so that any person under the age of 18 or members of the public not wishing to be filmed or photographed could be accommodated.

## 2. Declarations of interest

Members expressed their declarations of interest as set out in Appendix 1 of these minutes.

Following Simon Sparrow and Daniel Thwaites both having declared a Disclosable Pecuniary Interest in agenda item 7, the Monitoring Officer advised that he had granted them a dispensation to participate/speak and vote on that item.

## 3. Matters of urgent business

No items were proposed as a matter of urgent business.

## 4. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 5 September 2024 were signed by the Chair as a correct record of the meeting.

## 5. Summary of actions and outstanding issues following discussions at previous meetings

Members received a report summarising the progress on issues that had recently been presented to the Committee. The Chief Executive (CE) said that all items were up to date, except for the item in relation to Haven Bridge. He advised that, together with the Broads Authority Chair, he had recently attended a meeting with the Chair and Vice-Chair of the Norfolk and Suffolk Boating Association (NSBA) who advised that there was to be a 'Haven Bridge Lifting Arrangements' meeting held by Peel Ports on 14 November 2024. The CE confirmed that the Broads Authority had not received an invitation to that meeting, however, he had asked the Head of Ranger Services (HRS) to make contact with Peel Ports so that the Authority was present at the meeting. The CE added that this was an important issue for the Broads Authority in terms of the effect the opening of the bridge had on the toll payers and would therefore continue to follow up this issue. The Monitoring Officer (MO) added that he had corresponded with the Clerk to the Port Authority in relation to this matter.

In response to questions to why the meeting differed from the normal leisure group users' meetings and why the Broads Authority was not invited to the meeting, the CE said that the HRS would follow this up on behalf of the Authority. The CE added that he had thought the Authority had some success in that, after the MO wrote to the Port Authority, a meeting had been set up, however, this was subsequently cancelled.

A Member asked whether there had been any update in relation to the letter on Funding the Waterways of the Broads National Park sent to the Minister. The CE said that the Authority had not yet received a reply or acknowledgement of the latest letter sent by the Chair of the Authority, however, he and the Chair were keen to fix a meeting with the new Minister to discuss the issue face-to-face.

A Member asked whether there was any indication on the Government's view on the way that waterways should be funded. The CE said that there was a national campaign, led by the Inland Waterways Association, but in light of the budget and reduction in Defra's funding things were likely to be tight, however, the Authority still needed to press the point.

## 6. Chief Executive's report and current issues

Members received the report of the Chief Executive (CE) who drew members' attention to two items in particular. The first was a summary of the result of the modelling of flood risk on the River Bure by the Environment Agency's consultants. The second was the General Direction and the CE wanted to alert Members that there would be a formal consultation in due course.

A Member commented that the General Direction section of the report referred to the intention to apply the restriction of all vessels over 24 metres rather than just to commercial vessels as agreed by Members in January. The Director of Operations (DO) said that the General Direction would make it clear that any vessels over 24 metres would need to operate under a specific risk assessment which would include the potential for pilotage. The Chair said

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

that any such case would probably only require a passage plan by the skipper of any vessel over that size.

In response to a question, the CE stated that there would not be any implications on the infrastructure of the Broads and the DO added that if there were to be a new commercial enterprise that brought larger vessels in, then there would have to be a lot of planning involved as there was currently no infrastructure for this to happen, but it did not currently affect the General Direction.

## 7. Proposed navigation charges for 2025/26 in the navigation area and adjacent waters

The Chair stated that, following presentation of the report written jointly by the Chief Executive, Director of Finance (DF) and Collector of Tolls, and after members had the opportunity to ask questions, he would invite Members in turn to present their preference for the tolls increase together with their reasons, so that the Navigation Committee could provide clear direction and recommendations to the Broads Authority.

The Chief Executive reminded Members of the paper circulated to them in September setting out the challenges that the Authority faced in terms of income and expenditure, followed by the briefing/workshop in October. The key issues were that there had been a decline in the number of small private boats which had an adverse impact on income. The CE referred Members to section 3 of the report which set out the pressures in terms of costs. The CE said that, in the October briefing, Members were polled on the level of toll increase they thought appropriate, which was set out in a graph in section 4.2 of the report. The CE reminded Members that, in addition to the discussion on tolls, there were two smaller issues to discuss: one regarding hired sailing craft; and the other about day hired petrol/diesel craft.

The DF provided an update on the financial figures and referred Members to table 4 on page 31 of the papers which gave figures up until the end of September. She said that the forecast had since improved to £209,956 surplus, the majority of the increase had been because the pay award for staff had finally been agreed. A figure of £1,925 per FTE had been budgeted for but a settlement was reached at £1,290 per FTE. Staff would receive this in the December pay and it would be backdated to 1 April 2024. With additional costs of national insurance and pension contributions, it equated to an £853 saving per FTE. The DF said that in table 5, the result in the change to the forecast meant that reserves would be £564,850 which was 13.1%.

The DF said that as part of the toll setting process, officers had been looking at savings on the navigation side of the budget, and one area was to move some of the operation technician work to National Park. This had been achieved by moving some land holdings into the Countryside Stewardship scheme which offered high payment rates than other land management schemes. Therefore, by moving a portion of the work to National Park, this equated to £91,940. At present, the operation technician split was 70/30 and it would now be 60/40 – a 10% shift.

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

The CE said that the paper produced in September showed that if the Authority were to maintain the level of service as currently provided, it would require a 12% increase in tolls and the paper made it clear that in his, and the Management Team's view, was too much in terms of the impact on the toll payers and what was needed was to look at where savings and cuts in services could be made. Fortunately, there had been some changes in the financial position which the DF had explained.

The CE explained that there was a complex arrangement where some elements of the Broads Authority work was entirely National Park such as planning, some elements entirely Navigation such as the collection of tolls, however, there was a lot of shared costs which were set out in a transparent basis in the accounts. A critical part in terms of navigation was the work of the operations technicians and in the current year, the basis of time spent was 70% navigation and 30% National Park. The CE said that through Natural England, the Broads Authority had been awarded a significant amount of money through the Countryside Stewardship programme to look after the wildlife sites and conservation sites, it meant that for next year it was possible to increase the amount of time the operations technicians spent on conservation work rather than navigation work, to the equivalent of over £90,000/three members of staff. The key thing to remember, however, was that less work would be done to the benefit of navigation as a result of this shift. The Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology (HCME) would have to reprogramme some of the navigation work such as dredging and maintenance and would look at where efficiencies could be made to make the most of the resource available.

A Member asked whether this would be a one-year change, or would it be into the future. The CE confirmed that it would be into the future.

The CE presented some slides providing an update to the information available in September and October. The CE said that there was concern that income from tolls was on the decline, which was mainly due to the reduction of small boats and this seemed to be a national trend and not just restricted to the Broads. There had been a huge growth in smaller craft during the pandemic, however, that growth had tailed off significantly – confirmed by the figures provided by Paddle UK. The CE added that fortunately the Authority's income in October was in line with the forecast.

The CE said that following the Chancellor's budget earlier in the week, he had been in contact with Defra following the announcement of the increase in Employers NI contributions in 2025/26. Since the budget, the Chancellor had confirmed that local government would be expected to pay the additional contributions, and therefore the expectation was that the Broads Authority would not get relief from this. The CE said that he had not, as yet, heard back from Defra on this point.

The CE referred to the graph in 4.2 of the report, which showed Members' preferences on toll increases by percentage. He said that there was a wide variety of views, from 10% increase to 0%, with a mean of ~ 6%. The CE said that his job was to find a series of options that gave Members a degree of unanimity about what the outcome would be. The CE talked through a slide showing a table providing different scenarios of tolls increases through toll income/boat

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

levels vs service cuts. The CE said that his own view was that £50,000 of service cuts was quite a lot and that he thought the Authority should be making some provision for the potential loss of boats.

The CE said that in addition to the discussion around the setting of tolls, he asked Members to consider freezing the tolls for hired sailing craft in the two classes, the pure sailing craft and the auxiliary sailing craft. He added that hiring a sailing craft was something special in the Broads and it would be sending a signal to those small commercial hire operators that the Authority had listened and responded to their concerns. In addition, the CE said that there was an existing difference between day hired craft powered by diesel and petrol, and day hired craft powered by electric. The CE said that he did not suggest that by an increase in the toll for diesel/petrol powered boats and a lower increase in tolls for electric would encourage the move away from diesel/petrol to electric overnight, but it would encourage greener boating.

Lastly, the CE said that he would like Members to consider minor charge increases at Ranworth, Reedham, Great Yarmouth and Norwich to align charges with other organisations, as detailed in the report.

A Member commented that the existing infrastructure was a restricting issue for electric boats and that there were not enough charging points, as was the cost of development of electric boats which required a lot of investment from hire boat companies. The CE said that the Member was correct about the infrastructure and that the Authority had looked at various options, in particular with the innovation centre at Hethel, but thought that these were some years from being deployed. This, however, reinforced the case that there should be a bigger differential between the cost of tolls for electric day hire boats and diesel/petrol day hire boats.

A Member referred to the table of options and asked what would cuts look like in respect of the safety on the Broads and other services – both in terms of frontline and backroom costs. The CE referred the Member to the exercise carried out at the tolls briefing meeting, where members were asked to indicate on a chart where they thought the Authority could make service cuts. The two service areas that came top was the practical work, which was in second place, where the Authority had been able to make a reduction of £90,000, and the Rangers in first place. The CE said that following the accidents in Great Yarmouth, the Authority had increased the Ranger service so that Ranger launches were out every day of the week over the summer season, the cost of which was currently £137,000 of extra money. The Head of Ranger Services (HRS) had completed some additional work to look at what reductions of £20,000, £50,000 and £75,000 would mean if the Authority were to look to Ranger Services for those cuts. This was as follows:

- £20,000 – would mean a reduction of 6 patrol days per week;
- £50,000 – would mean a reduction of 12 patrol days per week; and
- £75,000 - would mean a reduction of 18 patrol days per week.

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

The CE said that it would be feasible to reduce the level of Rangers, although not to the level before the accident at Great Yarmouth, without any significant adverse impact on safety. One of the things that the HRS would like to do was to review how patrol levels were organised to ensure that there was the right level of coverage. The CE said that the reduction of the £137,000 by £50,000 would still leave a margin above the patrolling the Authority had traditionally carried out.

The CE advised that there was a possibility of bidding for funding under the Landscapes Connections programme which could deliver £10m of funding, however, if the Authority were to remove some other services, this would mean that there would not be the personnel to develop and deliver that bid.

A Member commented that he was nervous about reducing Ranger Services and would like to see cost savings from other services, and asked whether savings in other areas had been looked at thoroughly. The CE said that once the Navigation Committee had submitted their recommendation as to where the tolls should be set, the Management Team would look at all options and how savings would be achieved and then present those to the Authority. The CE said that he did not expect Members at the Navigation Committee to commit to any areas of service cuts, but thought it was helpful to provide Members with an indication of what any cuts would mean.

A Member commented that any decision would need to be grounded in the rate of inflation. The CE said that the current rate of inflation was 1.7%, however, the impact to the Authority was much greater, for example staff costs had increased by 4%, repair costs to Ranger launches had gone up 6% and in general, costs were going up significantly, and would estimate that the total cost of rises was about 6%. The Member replied that he thought that on the basis of that percentage, it would be entirely reasonable to keep the toll rises in line with that and not to go below and suggested that the Authority create a basic rationale to align future rises with the cost of inflation to the Broads Authority.

In response to a question regarding diversification of income and whether the Authority had looked at other income streams, the CE said that in terms of raising additional income, the big opportunity was the National Lottery which the Authority would pursue. In addition, the Authority had used plant and equipment for private work such as weed cutting on Wroxham Broad, but had since received legal advice that was not positive from a navigation point of view, therefore, that route of income stream would be unlikely.

In response to a question about why the Authority was not charging for moorings outside of Ranworth, Reedham, Great Yarmouth and Norwich, the CE said that the Authority only charged for moorings where a service was provided, such as mooring help and facilities. It would be difficult to charge at other moorings where there were no staff because it would be very difficult to collect fees and enforce non-payment, therefore it would not be straightforward.

A member asked how many staff the Broads Authority employed and how many of those were part of the frontline maintenance team and Rangers. The CE responded that the

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

Authority had approximately 100<sup>1</sup> FTE staff and the Director of Operations (DO) confirmed that there were 72 FTE staff in the maintenance and Ranger teams which would shrink slightly once the seasonal staff had finished the season.

A Member commented that there had been a reduction in dredging, and that finance and support services directorate was over 20% of the budget, and said that he was worried that there had been two years of above inflationary increases on the tolls and the Authority had not addressed the real issue: that there were too many staff. The CE replied that the Authority could achieve less with less staff but referred the Member to the survey by the NSBA that highlighted the need for more moorings, weed cutting, dredging and tree management. The CE said that the process was trying to find a balance between what users want and what they were prepared to pay.

A Member commented that last year contributions to the reserves were paused and asked whether this was the plan for the coming year. The DF said that the plan, when agreed to not contribute to the reserves in 2024/25, was to restart contributions in 2025/26 and the figures Members had in front of them included the planned contributions for 2025/26. The Member asked if there were no contributions to the reserves in 2025/26 would that mean that the Authority would have to dip into the reserves taking them below the 10% threshold. The DF confirmed that the Authority had not contributed to the earmarked reserves and the 10% related only to the Navigation reserve. The DF said that the Authority had a minimum reserve policy which was 10% which was maintained as working capital. The earmarked reserves were used for instances where a new capital purchase was needed and money could be taken from the reserves rather than from the budget. The CE said that if the reserves did go below the 10% threshold, then it might mean that certain work was not undertaken. The CE said that he had planned to contact Defra to see if there was any likelihood of further capital money which might ease the position.

A Member commented that he supported the CE's comments about a reduction in Rangers and thought that it would not have an impact on safety, bearing in mind that there were fewer boats on the water and the hire boat season was shorter, and asked could the Authority justify the number of Rangers with the reduction in boat numbers. The DO said that the number of boats and the number of incidents were not directly related and although there was a reduction in boat numbers in 2024, the Authority had seen an increase in incidents and an increase in overstaying. For example, in August alone there were a number of incidents on the Broads. In addition, there were a lot of sailing vessels that capsized and there had been increase in notices of contravention for overstaying, which was all dealt with by the Ranger services team.

A Member asked whether the CE could clarify whether the changes already mentioned, such as staff time being allocated to the Countryside Stewardship scheme and the pay award, had been included in the table of options chart. The CE confirmed that this was built into the table, however, the HCME would need to look in detail as to what the practical effect of the

---

<sup>1</sup> Following the meeting it was confirmed that there were approximately 140 FTE staff.



Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

allocation would be. The CE said that in September, the Authority was looking at a 12% increase to maintain services but was now looking at 7.3%.

A Member commented that he was pleased to hear that the HRS would be looking at the way in which Rangers were used and said that he thought there were ways that they could be used more effectively and efficiently, and added that the Authority should find smarter ways of doing things without reducing services provided. The Member also commented that visibility was critical and suggested that workboats be branded which would have an impact on people's behaviour.

A Member asked whether the DO had record of the police patrols on the Broads and whether the number had reduced. The DO said that the Broads Beat vessel was still operational but, on many occasions, personnel were using cars rather than the boat. A Member commented that the Broads Beat did visit boat yards by car and speak to single sex boat parties as a prevention measure. A Member commented that the Broads Beat were often seen on the River Yare.

Another Member suggested that the Authority should consider using drones as part of the Ranger services.

A Member commented that he would not encourage charging for all moorings and said that it was well known that the main cause of accidents on the Broads were trips and falls when alighting from their boats. By encouraging use of informal moorings might put hirers, in particular, at risk.

A Member commented that eight years ago Ranger Services was 15% of the navigation budget whereas now it was 22% and asked whether there were more Rangers out on the Broads now. The DO said that the Ranger force was increased so that patrolling would be seven days per week throughout the season.

The Chair then asked each Member in turn what their preferred option of increase would be. The comments and suggested increase were:

- Although expected the trend of boat numbers to reduce, did not want to reduce head count and therefore should stretch budgets rather than cutting jobs by finding efficiencies and improvements – 6%
- Need to drastically look at what the Authority did, why it does it, and cut costs accordingly – 5%
- No service cuts and agreed with stretched budget. Not sustainable for toll payers to continue to pay for services in the long-term – 7.5%
- Understand some cuts and savings needed to be achieved but there must be no compromise on safety. Agree that the Authority should look at income diversification to give a more considered view when setting 2026/27 tolls – 7.5%
- Based on the real inflation that the Broads Authority was experiencing in addition to the cost of, and negating the impacts of, climate change – 6%

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

- Inflation costs needed to be taken into consideration and suggested another reserves holiday – 6.6%
- Agreed with looking at efficiencies and should put pressure on staff to look at cost savings, however, was against using safety as a reason – 5%
- Safety costs were paramount, inflation to the Broads Authority was greater than it was to the person buys the 'basket of goods'. Other bodies that had similar costs were looking at 12% increase in their tolls, and one was looking at 12% each year for the next four years – 6.5%
- Did not think costs should be increased over the cost of inflation and anything above that would lead to criticism – 5%
- 5%
- Believed that there were opportunities to improve services and agreed with the suggestion that the Authority should consider using drones, as well as AI – 6%
- Based on what boat companies could charge their customers and increased costs within business - 5%

Michael Scott proposed, seconded by Peter Dixon

**It was resolved by 9 votes in favour and 1 against (with 2 abstentions) to recommend to the Broads Authority a 5.9% increase in tolls for 2025/26.**

Members discussed the cost of tolls in relation to hired sailing craft and petrol/diesel day hire boats versus electric day hire boats.

A Member commented that there should be some differentiation on hybrid boats as well as electric. The CE confirmed that hybrid day hire boats did currently have a reduction on tolls compared to petrol/diesel hire boats, but the differential could be looked at.

A Member asked how much freezing the tolls on hired sailing craft would equate to. The CE said that he did not think it would make a big difference in income.

A Member said that he did not think that reducing tolls for electric day hire boats would make any difference in encouraging firms to move to electric boats. The CE said that it was important that the Broads Authority supported sustainable transport on the Broads.

A Member asked why tolls were not being frozen for private sailing craft. The CE said that private sailing craft currently received a significantly lower toll than hired sailing craft - £13.66 per square metre compared to £25.08 per square metre. A Member commented that the hired sailing craft was a vital part of introducing people to sailing on the Broads.

Members supported the CE's request for flexibility on rounding up or down figures when setting the tolls for the various groups of craft.

Michael Scott proposed, seconded by Tony Grayling.

**It was resolved unanimously**

- i. to recommend to the Broads Authority that the tolls be frozen on hired sailing craft and**
- ii. to instruct the Chief Executive to explore the differentials between electric, hybrid and diesel-powered day hire boats ahead of the Broads Authority meeting on 29 November.**

In relation to the increase in charges for the yacht stations as set out in 5.1 of the report, Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Michael Scott.

**It was resolved unanimously to recommend to the Broads Authority that the charges for Ranworth Staithe and Reedham Quay be increased by £2 to £12 for an overnight stay, and the overnight charge at Norwich and Great Yarmouth Yacht Stations be increased from £16 to £17.50.**

The Committee adjourned at 12:05pm and reconvened at 12:15pm with the exception of Leslie Mogford and Michael Scott who had left the meeting.

## **8. Construction, Maintenance and Ecology work programme – progress update**

The Director of Operations (DO) presented the report by the Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology and confirmed that there were no further updates.

A Member asked whether all three of the water plant cutting vessels had been in use during the season. The DO said that the cutting vessels had been moored at various places, north and south, around the navigation area as an efficiency saving, however, there was not always staff available to run all three vessels at the same time. The DO said that there would be an update for Members at a future meeting about the amount of water plant cutting carried out during 2024. The Member asked whether there were any staffing shortages across any other maintenance tasks. The DO said that the shortage was only in relation to operating all three water plant cutters at the same time and added that through the capital grant the Authority was able to purchase modern equipment, but did not have the budget to employ extra staff.

A Member asked whether the Broads was being affected by Floating Pennywort. The DO said that through reporting from the Rangers and the construction and maintenance team, the ecologists then attended any site and would create a plan to deal with any presence of the plant. He confirmed that some of the Authority's sites had been quite badly affected, however, there were robust plans in place to deal with any invasive species, including Floating Pennywort.

## **9. Broads Authority 2009 Provision – Removal of wrecks**

Members received the report of the Director of Operations (DO). The Broads Authority had seen a proliferation of non-compliant vessels, but wanted to be very clear that the Authority

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

was not adding a new rule about vessel condition and it was not looking to remove ‘scruffy’ vessels, just non-compliant vessels. The DO said that another term often used was ‘abandoned vessels’, and confirmed that to be an abandoned vessel under the terms of the Broads Act, it had to have no registered keeper. While any vessel had a registered keeper, the Authority would always work with the owner to try and resolve any problem. This, however, did leave the Authority with a number of vessels on the Broads network that were not registered and were abandoned which needed to be dealt with. The DO said that in 2020 the Broads Authority dealt with four abandoned vessels; in 2023 the Authority dealt with 19 abandoned vessels; and in 2024 the Authority were currently up to 28 abandoned vessels, 17 of which were at the Dockyard awaiting disposal. The DO added that a special compound had to be created at the Dockyard to break up the vessels and to be able to handle any waste from the bilge carefully and responsibly. The DO said that the disposal of such vessels cost the Authority ~ £4,000 each.

The proposal was for a strengthening in the criteria applied. In the 2009 Act, additional words were added to include the term ‘unserviceable’ but did not define what unserviceable was. In 2013 the Boat Safety Management Group (BSMG), chaired by the Chair of the Navigation Committee, produced a definition of what unserviceable meant. With the help of the BSMG at the October 2024 meeting, the Authority had now added to the list of criteria which defined what an unserviceable vessel was, and this was set out in italics in section 5.4 of the report.

The Monitoring Officer (MO) commented that during this exercise, the Authority looked at Marine Law and unserviceable was defined as ‘unfit for sea service’ or ‘neglected as unfit for sea service’. The MO said that unfit did not mean unseaworthy and the Broads Authority was entitled to define what was unfit, and therefore a sailing vessel with no mast would be deemed to be unfit – it would be capable of going on water but it would be unfit to do so.

The Chair clarified that at the BSMG meeting, there had been some debate around sailing boats concerning masts, standing rigging, and shrouds being in a position where the boat was probably rotten beneath, which would pose a significant risk during strong winds causing the mast to fall. This was why the criteria in section 5.4 had been added.

Stephen Bolt proposed, seconded by Tony Grayling.

**It was resolved unanimously to recommend to the Broads Authority that the listed criteria for ‘Unserviceable Vessels’ in relation to the removal of wrecks be redefined and adopted.**

## 10. Principal and effectiveness of body worn cameras

Members received the report of the Director of Operations (DO) reviewing the outcomes of the trial of body worn cameras following feedback from the Health and Safety Committee who had observed an increased trend in reports of abusive and violent behaviour towards frontline staff. The Authority ran a trial and public consultation at the same time. However, the overriding feeling from those who used the body-worn cameras in the trial was that rather than calming the situation, the cameras were seen to inflame it, which was the opposite of what the Authority was trying to achieve. The DO said that it was quite an

Please note these are draft minutes and will not be confirmed until the next meeting

expensive system. Although the Authority should not tolerate bad behaviour, it was expected that when enforcing bylaws, there would be some bad behaviour. Body-worn cameras did not seem to mitigate that, and the DO said that the Authority already had robust procedures in place to protect staff as set out in section 5 of the report.

A Member asked whether there was CCTV in areas where incidents had occurred. The Chief Executive said that often many of the incidents happened in remote locations. The DO said that the Authority did have CCTV at Ranworth and at the Yacht Stations, however, they did not capture audio and any footage was not evidential.

A Member commented that it was good that the Authority trialled the cameras and gathered information and suggested that it might be worth revisiting in the future.

The Members of the Navigation Committee supported the recommendation not to continue with body worn cameras, noting the decision would be made at the Broads Authority meeting on 29 November 2024.

## 11. Date of next meeting

The next meeting of the Navigation Committee would be held on 9 January 2025 at Yare House, 62-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1RY commencing at 10am.

The meeting ended at 12:30pm

Signed

Chairman

## Appendix 1 – Declaration of interests: Navigation Committee, 07 November 2024

Member	Agenda/minute	Nature of interest
Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Mark Collins, Peter Dixon, Alan Goodchild, Leslie Munford, Bob Neate, Simon Sparrow, Paul Thomas and Daniel Thwaites	7	Private toll payer. The Member Code of Conduct allowed for these Members to participate and vote.
Mark Collins	7	Commodore of the Northern Rivers. The Member Code of Conduct allowed for this Member to participate and vote.
Simon Sparrow and Daniel Thwaites	7	Commercial hire boat operators. Disclosable pecuniary interest. Granted a dispensation by MO to participate and vote.