

# Navigation Committee

## Minutes of the meeting held on 03 April 2025

1.	Apologies and welcome	2
	Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014	2
2.	Appointment of Chair	2
3.	Appointment of Vice-Chair	2
4.	Declarations of interest	3
5.	Matters of urgent business	3
6.	Minutes of last meeting	3
7.	Summary of actions and outstanding issues following discussions at previous meetings	3
8.	Appointment of two co-opted members to the Broads Authority	3
9.	Abandoned and sunken vessels and financial implications	3
10.	Report on Surveys by Rangers 2024	5
11.	Chief Executive's report and current issues	6
12.	Income and Expenditure	10
13.	Construction, Maintenance and Ecology work programme – progress update	11
14.	2024/25 Health and Safety Review and internal audit recommendations	12
15.	Oulton Broad Power Boat racing dates for 2025	13
16.	Committee timetable of meetings 2025/26	13
17.	Date of next meeting	13

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

## Present

Alan Goodchild – in the Chair (from item 2), Harry Blathwayt, Stephen Bolt, Sue Cadamy, Mark Collins, Peter Dixon, Tony Grayling, Leslie Mogford, Bob Neate, Paul Thomas, and Daniel Thwaites.

## In attendance

Matt Dane – Head of Safety Management, Bill Housden – Head of IT and Collector of Tolls (item 9 - 11), Dan Hoare – Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology, John Packman - Chief Executive, Rob Rogers - Director of Operations, Lorraine Taylor – Governance Officer.

## 1. Apologies and welcome

The Chief Executive welcomed everyone to the meeting.

**Apologies** were received from Remus Sawyerr.

### Openness of Local Government Bodies Regulations 2014

The Chief Executive 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. Appointment of Chair

Alan Goodchild was proposed by Mark Collins and seconded by Peter Dixon.

**There being no other nominations Alan Goodchild was appointed Chair of the Navigation Committee for the forthcoming year.**

Alan Goodchild took the Chair.

The Chair thanked the committee for having confidence in him to continue as Chair.

## 3. Appointment of Vice-Chair

Peter Dixon was proposed by Alan Goodchild and seconded by Mark Collins.

**There being no other nominations Peter Dixon was appointed Vice-Chair of the Navigation Committee for the forthcoming year.**

The Chair welcomed Sue Cadamy to her first meeting as a co-opted Member to the Navigation Committee.

The Chair reminded members to respond to meeting invites so that Officers can ensure that the meeting was quorate.

#### 4. Declarations of interest

Members indicated they had no further declarations of interest other than those already registered.

#### 5. Matters of urgent business

No items were proposed as a matter of urgent business.

#### 6. Minutes of last meeting

The minutes of the meeting held on 9 January 2025 were signed by the Chair as a correct record of the meeting.

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

Members received a report summarising the progress of issues that had recently been presented to the Committee. The Chief Executive (CE) said that there was some good news to report on the Appeal under Section 31 Harbours Act 1964. The CE said that on 11 October 2023, the Broads Hire Boat Federation raised an objection with the Secretary of State for Transport in relation to the charges levelled by the Broads Authority under the right of objection provided by Section 31 of the Harbours Act 1964. The CE said that he was pleased to report that the Secretary of State had decided to rule in favour of the Broads Authority, and had upheld the charges for the financial year 2023/24.

#### 8. Appointment of two co-opted members to the Broads Authority

Members were asked to recommend the appointment of two co-opted members to the Broads Authority until 15 May 2026 as set out in Section 1(2)(c) of the Norfolk and Suffolk Broads Act 1988 as amended. The Chief Executive (CE) explained that given that Alan Goodchild had been appointed Chair of the Navigation Committee, he would automatically take up one of those appointments. This, therefore, left one vacancy that needed to be filled.

Alan Goodchild proposed and Mark Collins seconded that Peter Dixon be appointed as a member of the Broads Authority until 15 May 2026. No other nominations were received.

**It was resolved that Alan Goodchild and Peter Dixon be recommended to the Broads Authority for appointment as the co-opted members to the Broads Authority until 15 May 2026.**

#### 9. Abandoned and sunken vessels and financial implications

Members received the report of the Director of Operations (DO). The DO said that the paper before Members was a detailed explanation on how the Authority currently dealt with abandoned vessels and the costs associated with recovery of those vessels. The DO asked for

Members' comments on a potential amnesty/buy-back scheme and finding ways to mitigate the cost of removal from the navigation area. Once a vessel had sunk, the recovery was significantly more expensive and time consuming.

A Member commented that he thought that it was an excellent idea to provide incentives for people to bring their boats in and have them scrapped, and asked whether the DO could elaborate on what would happen to the various constituent parts of a boat once it had been handed over and scrapped and whether there was any possibility of making use of the waste materials. The DO said that at present, once the vessels came back to the special compound at the Dockyard, most of them would be crushed and go into landfill, however, anything that was of value was salvaged. The proposed scheme would need to be developed further so that when a boat was surrendered to the Authority more parts could be salvaged and sold at boat jumble sales. The DO said that as far as he was aware, there was no current recycling scheme that included material such as fibreglass salvaged from boats. The Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology (HCME) said that if any vessels that were surrendered to the Authority were sound and sailable, then they would be sold through sealed bids and the vessels would, therefore, remain in service and avoid the waste issue. However, those vessels that were at the end of their life, all salvageable items would be removed and the parts left, such as fibreglass, would go into landfill as there was no current recycling option.

A Member commented that if he did not pay the tax on his car the car could be seized, and asked whether there was anything that the Broads Authority could do in terms of the ability to seize boats that were not tolled, insured or compliant with the Boat Safety Scheme. The Member said that if the Authority was able to do that, it would be possible to remove boats before they became a problem and that it would not cost the Authority as much to deal with disposal. The DO said that the Broads Authority did not have the powers to impound vessels if the owner had not paid the tolls etc., and there was a process to pursue the non-payment of tolls through other means. The DO added that the only way that the Authority could seize vessels was that if they were deemed to be unsafe. The Chief Executive (CE) said that if someone had not paid their toll, the Authority did chase them and ultimately would take them to court, however, it took a lot of time and effort chasing non-payers which resulted in a huge cost to the Authority. The Head of IT and Collector of Tolls (HITCT) explained that last year he received 1,708 notices of vessels that were not compliant with registration bylaws, predominantly non-payment of tolls. If there was an identifiable owner, in most cases the tolls were eventually paid, however, some got taken to court. If there was not an identifiable owner, the Authority did have the abandoned vessel route to explore. The HITCT said that non-payment of tolls was a big part of the Tolls Team's time and said that in 2024 over 1,000 letters were sent out to owners of boats who had not paid their tolls, compared to just a few years ago when 300-400 notices of non-compliant vessels were received each year.

A Member said that getting rid of an old boat where there wasn't the ability to sell it was a big problem and asked whether the Authority risked being inundated with boats to dispose of and was there a way that the scheme could be phased. The DO said that the proposed scheme would be for private users only and not for commercial users. He added that the scheme would have to be discretionary and the Authority would have the right to not take a boat. The

DO said that if the scheme became popular, the Authority could put a waiting list in place to reduce strain on the Dockyard staff.

A Member commented that he was concerned that private boat owners, who could afford to scrap their own boat, would take advantage of the scheme, and was glad to note that the scheme would be discretionary.

A Member commented that the recent cost to the Broads Authority to raise sunken boats was quite staggering. The DO said that many sunken boats were dealt with by the Rangers at a relatively small cost to the Authority, however, the two vessels that were being dealt with at the moment required a five-person dive team with lots of safety back-up. This all came at a significant cost to the Authority. The DO gave an example of the sunken vessel at Polkey's Mill and said that because the person who owned the vessel lived aboard, there were lots of possessions onboard which were now in the water and the divers risked being entangled. This meant that there was a lot of work required to make the vessel safe before it could be raised.

A Member commented that the scheme was a great idea, and any improvement to safety was a positive step and thought that there might be an opportunity for companies to offer a breakage and recycling service. The DO said that anyone who owned a boat would know that they needed to look for an odd part, and the Broads Authority would therefore take more care during the salvage to preserve parts that could be resold.

The Chair said it was an excellent idea and thought that the Authority should look at introducing the scheme.

## 10. Report on Surveys by Rangers 2024

Members received the report of the Head of Safety Management (HSM). The HSM said that the report provided an update on the surveys carried out by the Ranger Team during 2024 covering all hire craft including paddleboards and motor craft. The HSM said that following the reduction in the Ranger Team there would be some changes for 2025 in that the surveys would take place at the Tourist Information Centres. In addition, a leaflet would be produced with a QR code that enabled the hirers to complete the survey online.

The HSM said that the 2024 survey highlighted that there were still some hirers who had not received a proper handover and others had received no information on alcohol consumption around boats.

A Member said that he was concerned that some paddleboard hire companies were not providing proper handovers and asked why hire boat companies were required to carry out proper handovers, but paddleboard companies were not. The HSM said that the Hire Boat Licencing Offer had been briefed to visit all paddleboard hirers this season. The Director of Operations (DO) said that both Rangers and the Hire Boat Licencing Officer would be required to do far more spot checks on paddleboard hire companies which would highlight those that were not doing show outs and trials.

A Member asked whether, although the Broads Authority could not enforce the wearing of life jackets and buoyancy aids when aboard a hire craft, there was some way that this could be mandated through the licencing rules for hire boat companies. The DO said that this was an issue and pointed out that the deaths that had occurred on the Broads in 2024 would have all been preventable if a life jacket had been worn, however, it would be difficult to police any requirement to wear a life jacket or buoyancy aid. The DO said that the Authority's messaging this year would be stronger warning of the dangers of not wearing a life jacket. The Rangers regularly stop people and speak to them if they see that they were not wearing a life jacket, especially if there were children present on the boat. The Member asked whether it could be made a condition of hire. A Member said that to hire a boat, the hirer must watch a safety video before they can take a boat out, life jackets were issued and the hirer shown how to use them.

A Member asked whether there were any statistics showing near misses etc. in relation to paddle sports, and how great was the hazard and risk to users. The DO said that most near misses were not reported to the Broads Authority. The DO said that the risks differed to those of other craft on the Broads, however, paddle sports did have their place and were a very important introduction to the Broads for many users. A discussion was had about pop-up paddleboard hire companies and the issues surrounding life jackets. Some Members were concerned that they had seen some paddleboard companies not providing buoyancy aids for customers, however, other Members reported that some pop-ups did have buoyancy aids available. A Member said that there were many private boat owners that did not wear life jackets. The DO said that the Authority understood the issue and was addressing it where possible.

A Member said that paddleboarding was a good activity for getting young people on the Broads and the activity should not be discouraged.

## **11. Chief Executive's report and current issues**

Members received the report of the Chief Executive (CE). The CE said that there were two main issues to discuss from the paper in front of Members:

### **Online tolls system.**

The CE said that there had been a big risk for the Broads Authority in that the existing tolls system was no longer able to be maintained. Therefore, the Head of IT and Collector of Tolls (HITCT) and the IT Project Officer, Steve Linford, spent a lot of time over the last year, working with a private contractor to get a new system in place. This had been implemented in time for the new season and was working well and that, as at 31 March, there had been a 26% increase in people paying their toll online which had saved a large amount of administrative time and cost.

The CE said that he would welcome Members' views on the proposed offer of staged payments for an initial trial period. The CE reminded Members that this had been discussed a couple of years prior and it had been identified that staged payments were quite difficult for the Authority to undertake in that the payment of tolls was a seasonal activity. It was not

possible, however, to make a comparison with that of the payment of car tax – car tax was a 12-month charge, whereas toll payment was a 28-day charge. In addition, the CE said that there had been a significant increase in those defaulting on payment and added that where people approach the Authority who were clearly in financial hardship and were struggling to pay their toll, the Authority would work with them to help resolve the issue.

The difficulty of staged payments were two-fold: first, it was more costly to provide this service; and second, when staged payments had been offered in the past, a number of people had defaulted after the first payment which meant that the Authority had to chase for the subsequent payments, again at a cost. The proposal was to offer staged payments, but would add a £25 administrative fee to cover costs.

The HITCT said that in 2024 the Authority received 118 requests to pay in three instalments in April, May and June. Of those requests, 44% of were either paid late or defaulted. Therefore, in addition to having to process the payment three times on the Authority's system, there was a lot of work chasing for payment via phone calls and letters being sent at additional cost to the Authority. The HITCT added that over 98% of people paid their toll on time and in one go, but believed that the Authority should be covering costs for the extra work and costs involved in the provision of staged payments.

The HITCT reported that there was a growing trend from some, not to pay their toll until they had received a Notice of Contravention from the Rangers. Some paid on receipt of the Notice of Contravention, however, in some cases a letter was then sent by the Tolls Team giving them 10 days to pay. If that letter was not successful, a second letter would be sent. In 2024 seventy cases had been sent to the Solicitor for a summons to be issued, at a cost of £140 per case, many of which were resolved out of court. The HITCT proposed that anyone who received a Notice of Contravention was charged a 'late payment charge' of £25 to cover the administration costs. Prosecutions had become a major part of the Collector of Tolls work each year and it was therefore thought that those owners who did pay their tolls should not have to subsidise those who did not.

A Member asked whether the Authority could inform the public through the Broadcaster magazine or similar, about what happened if they did not pay their tolls, i.e. the charges involved and the outcome if taken to court. This might deter those that thought that they could get away with not paying their tolls.

A Member commented that in his view, tolls for private boat owners were not unreasonable and that they should be paid upfront. The Member was not sympathetic to those who tried to play the system and thought that toll payers should not have to foot the bill of those who had not paid and that any costs incurred should be clawed back, however, thought that staged payments should not be offered except in particular cases of hardship.

A Member said that although he agreed with the Member's comments above it should be noted that boating should not be an elitest activity and it was for everyone. The Member was pleased that the Broads Authority was making provision so that everybody had a chance to be a boater.

A Member asked for clarification on the 28-day charge. The HITCT said that this was part of the Schedule of Tolls which set out two types of toll: a short visit toll which offered a period of between 7 and up to 28 days; and an annual toll which applied to any vessel which had been on the Broads for more than 28 days in one season.

A Member said that hire boat yards did have staged payments, however, there was a vast difference between hire boat yards and private owners in that a hire boat yard was very unlikely to default. The Member also felt aggrieved that people were playing the system and pointed out that a boat was a luxury item, and commented that those that did pay their tolls should not have to subsidise those who did not and supported the HITCT's proposal to introduce a late payment charge.

A Member commented that administration fees were reasonable, for example, if a person paid their insurance over time, it would cost more than if paid in full up front. The Member asked whether the HITCT had considered the use of Direct Debit to collect the tolls. The HITCT said that it was something that had been considered. Direct Debit had been used in the past when the Authority issued parking permits at Whitlingham, however, there were a number of people who defaulted or cancelled their payment. If the Authority were to introduce Direct Debit payments once a year for the entirety of the toll due, notifications would need to be sent out to inform the boat owner that the payment was due to be taken, the money then would be taken. However, if it was not possible to take the money, the Authority would have to look into other means of payment, all of which would come at a cost. At present, the Authority was quite fortunate in that, now it was easy to sign up to pay online, people were paying their tolls without any additional work or administration by the Tolls Team. The CE said that there were two reasons why the Management Team were reluctant to use Direct Debit for payments: the first because of defaults; and second because of the amount of administration that was required.

A Member asked whether the 28 day toll was tied up within the Broads Act. The HITCT said that it was not in the Act but had been in practice since the days of the Port and it was within the bylaws if a boat was kept for more than 28 days the boat must be registered. The HITCT said that he believed that the basic principal had been in place since the 2<sup>nd</sup> World War – it was not something that the Broads Authority had introduced, it was something that was inherited.

A Member said that he would like to see a £50 charge for a Notice of Contravention. A Member said that he would agree with that figure.

The Chair thanked Members for their input.

#### **National Park Grant**

The CE said that he had received a letter from Defra on 2 April with details of the National Park Grant for 2025/26. The CE said that Defra would be cutting the Broads Authority's revenue by 8.2% which amounted to £280,000, however, the Authority would get an additional £1.4m Capital Grant which had to be spent by 31 March 2026.



On Monday 31 March, the Chief Executives of the ten English National Parks met the Secretary of State and Minister. The Ministers were hoping that by giving National Parks capital funding, it would enable them to generate a revenue stream which would offset the loss of the revenue cut from the National Park Grant. The CE said that the Broads Authority owned very little land, most of which was in the flood plain, and therefore the ability to use capital to generate income was very limited. The CE asked Members if they had any ideas about how the £1.4m could be spent to generate income to offset a reduction in revenue of £280,000 a year, he would be delighted to receive them.

The CE said that the reduction in revenue would have a big impact on the services the Broads Authority could deliver. He was worried about the outcome of three-year spending review and potential further cuts on top of the new lower baseline figure. The DF would present a revised budget at the next Broads Authority meeting on 9 May.

In terms of navigation, it was not clear what implications this reduction in National Park revenue would have on the navigation budget and a revised budget might need to be brought back to committee at the next meeting. The CE said that the other element that he was pursuing with the Government was how the Authority used the capital money. The CE said that he was seeking approval for the Authority to spend some National Park capital funding where there was a benefit for users of the navigation. The CE said that he did not know what that might be, but it could include projects such as the delayed piling work at Potter Heigham and Repps Bank.

The CE said that the reason why the DF was not able to attend the Navigation Committee meeting was because she was on a training course being run by CIPFA about the definitions of capital and revenue. The Management Team had consulted KPMG and the advice received from them was that if the Authority had a long-term lease on a mooring and it was repiled which extended its life by another 25 years, this expenditure could be capitalised. The CE said that the challenge was to get Defra to agree that the Authority could spend National Park capital money on the enhancement of moorings by arguing that it met the second purpose National Park function of promoting opportunities for the understanding and enjoyment of the special qualities of the Broads. The CE said that he had always believed that navigation fitted under that purpose as it was one of the main ways that people enjoyed visiting the Broads – there were no extensive footpaths for people to use, instead there were waterways with boats on them. Therefore, the CE was trying to justify back to Defra that the Authority could spend that National Park capital on a National Park expenditure that delivered better access for people visiting the Broads.

The CE said that the letter from Defra set out the criteria for eligible capital spend which was divided into two streams: “activities may be directed towards innovation, investing to save, and income generation or delivery of 30 by 30.” The CE said that it was very difficult for the Broads Authority to spend huge amounts of capital money to deliver any of those requirements, therefore, he intended to go back to Defra to say that the Broads was a special place and the Authority wanted to spend some of the capital money on improving things for access to the Broads, specifically pontoons, enhancement of moorings and some of the

projects that had been put on hold for some time and were struggling to fund out of the toll income.

A Member said that it was important that access for the disabled and for diversity should be built into the argument when making the case to Defra.

A Member said that the line between navigation and National Park was, to a large degree, false and did not think that the Broads Authority should be apologetic in this thinking. There was a climate and biodiversity crisis which was affecting the Broads and it was home to a very large proportion of the UK's biodiversity and the maintenance of the navigation was fundamental to ensure the long-term future of biodiversity.

A Member asked whether the Authority was in a permanent position where income from tolls would be higher than the funding from Defra. The CE said that, in terms of the pie-chart for Broads Authority income, the area of income with most growth had been external funding. The work that the Partnership and External Funding Manager had been doing on the Landscape Connections scheme could potentially bring in £10m to the Broads.

A Member commented that the CE had requested input and advice from Members, and asked whether the CE had sufficient mechanisms in place to get the same from the boat owning community given the great importance of the money that they were putting into the Broads for its maintenance. The CE said that he thought there was more work to be done with the NSBA and other organisations.

A Member said that without dredging and other maintenance, the Broads would be a different landscape and it was the boat owners who paid for this work. Boats were essential to the future of the Broads and the science had already made the argument that maintenance of the navigation was a National Park purpose. The CE agreed and said that he was making the argument to Defra that using the National Park capital grant to support some of the activities which had traditionally been seen as purely navigation was reasonable and legal.

The CE said that there was a two-stage process, the first was the letter that had already been received, and the second crucial part was the Grant Agreement which would provide more detail on how the money could be spent.

A Member commented that, rather than spending money piling riverbanks to provide 24-hour moorings, the Authority would be better off to provide pontoons as these would provide a benefit for access and were much safer. The CE said that he agreed and that he hoped that this would be possible using some of the capital funding. The Chair agreed and said that pontoons provided a lot of benefits. It was non-slip surface, it would overcome the issue of the transfer of aggregate onto decks, and would rise and fall with the water level.

## 12. Income and Expenditure

Members received the report of the Director of Finance (DF). The Chief Executive (CE) said that the DF was unable to attend the meeting and therefore the CE would provide an update prepared by the DF. The CE referred Members to table 1 on page 45 of the papers. At the end

of February the actual net favourable variance had increased to £342,364 which was an increase of £53,000 compared to January. This was in part due to the variance on practical maintenance that had increased by £76,000 due to the delayed mooring works and had been offset by some timing differences which included the dredging surveys that came in ahead of profile. There were no changes to latest available budget set out in table 2 on page 47 of the papers, or the forecast set out in table 3 on page 48. The earmarked reserves had decreased by £7,966 to £1,368,038, however, these would reduce further in the March figures once the works at Mutford Lock had been invoiced.

A Member asked whether the work to Mutford Lock had come in on budget. The Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology (HCME) said that it had not only come in under budget but had also been completed ahead of schedule.

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

Members received the report of the Head of Construction, Maintenance and Ecology (HCME). The HCME said that the dredging progress was ongoing and that the year-end figures would be provided at the next meeting of the Navigation Committee in June. Over the winter, the timber capping, mooring posts, and path material had been replaced at North Cove moorings and a section of timber replaced on the upstream section at Cantley mooring.

The HCME said that the riverside tree management work had been completed for the winter 2024/25 programme and that the full five-year programme was on track.

The HCME said that work had been planned to remove the redundant timbers at Turntide Jetty and that would happen in the next few weeks. Part of the jetty had been repiled in 2015, however, the timbers on the end of the jetty had become a safety hazard to navigation. Once the work had been completed, a review of the marker posts would be carried out.

The HCME referred Members to Appendix 2 of the report and explained that this set out all of the operational staff time for 2025/26 and the allocation of time for both navigation and National Park work carried out. Operational staff time was now split with 60% of time spent on navigation and 40% spent on National Park duties. The HCME highlighted the 'Other navigation works' entry and said that this would include removal of wrecks and added that the more work the operations staff were doing on that, the less they would be able to do on other planned work.

A Member noted that in section 2.3 of the report it mentioned that crushed aggregate had been used for topping up moorings, and asked whether there would be any moorings where wood chip would continue to be used, and why the Authority had moved to using aggregate. The HCME said that the Authority used type 1 granite which had larger chunks of material mixed with smaller pieces which helped the material compact to make a safe and even surface. There were a number of reasons why crushed aggregate was used, part of which was due to the public risk assessment that Rangers performed on each site. Crushed aggregate provided a firmer and much safer base, and was a more resilient, cheaper and longer-lasting

surface that required less maintenance. The Chair asked whether the Authority had considered shingle mats. The HCME said that there was one at a mooring on Cockshoot Broad and it had not performed as well as was hoped. It was costly to maintain and had become a slippery surface.

A Member asked whether the Authority was achieving the productivity that was expected on dredging. The HCME said that the scope of dredging work changed during the year. For example, 2,870m<sup>3</sup> planned at Bridge Broad was pulled from the programme due to a change of landowner and lease. In addition, in some areas on the River Bure there was not the sediment build-up that was initially thought so these areas were not dredged and the sediment that was present was not able to be removed.

A Member said that he thought that there would be a review of navigation system dredging and asked what the timing was on that piece of work. The Director of Operations (DO) said that this had been tabled for later in the year.

## **14. 2024/25 Health and Safety Review and internal audit recommendations**

Members received the report of the Head of Safety Management (HSM). The HSM said that the following detailed analysis of health and safety statistics received, the conclusion was that the Broads was a safe and tranquil environment and reported incidents were low when considered against the high number of visitors who enjoyed the waterways. With the water environment and the risks that tidal waters posed, there would be, on occasion, tragedies that occurred. The HSM said that, of the seven reported fatalities in 2024, two were heart attacks and four were drownings through inadvertently entering the water. The common factor in all the drowning cases was the lack of a personal floatation device being worn. The highest reported incidents in the Broads for 2024 was inadvertent entering of the water. The HCME said that the report in front of Members contained a number of actions which included the Hire Boat Licencing Officer working with hire boat yards on the use of life jackets, and also to reinforce the safety message around the importance of wearing life jacket when mooring and moving around a vessel. Signage had been produced by the Communications team for Great Yarmouth Yacht Station together with leaflets which highlighted the incidents that had taken place in 2024 as well as the importance of wearing life jackets whilst on the Broads.

A Member asked whether the recent reports of sewage leaks in the Broads was a concern for health and safety. The Director of Operations (DO) confirmed that no sewage-related reports of ill-health had been received and the Authority's advice remained for people not to enter the water.

A Member asked whether safety had improved over the years. The HSM said that the statistics went back over 20 years and the figures did fluctuate. The DO said that every year the safety committee looked at the trends and trips, slips and falls remained the number one

incident on the Broads. The DO did not think that it would get to the point where there were no accidents, but reiterated that the Broads was a safe place to be.

A Member said that the private boats were not as heavily regulated as hire boat companies and there was nothing to stop private boat owners making the choice not to wear life jackets and this could reflect in the statistics.

A Member asked whether the Authority looked at the 'Don't drink and drown' campaign. The CE said that the Head of Communications was looking into that. The DO said that there was a need to target the messaging especially in relation to life jackets.

## **15. Oulton Broad Power Boat racing dates for 2025**

Members received the report of the Head of Safety Management (HSM). The HSM said that some of the events did not run in 2024 due to weather conditions and availability of officials. There were very few incidents, all of which were dealt with swiftly.

## **16. Committee timetable of meetings 2025/26**

Members received the report of the Senior Governance Officer. The Chief Executive (CE) said that this was the timetable for all committee meetings across the Authority for 2025/26.

The Chair asked Members to note the dates and reiterated that Member respond to calendar invites when they were sent out.

A Member asked whether the Navigation Committee members have another meeting to discuss the various items which the Members would like to see on the agenda for future committee meetings. The CE said that this could be arranged to follow a future Navigation Committee meeting.

## **17. Date of next meeting**

The next meeting of the Navigation Committee would be held on Thursday 5 June 2025 at Yare House, 622-64 Thorpe Road, Norwich, NR1 1RY commencing at 10am.

The meeting ended at 11:45am

Signed

Chairman