

**Sovereign Harbour Residents' Association Annual General Meeting
Saturday 21st April 2007**

Agenda

1. Welcome to Members
2. Review of Business
3. Chairman's Report
4. Treasurer's Report
5. Appointment of Committee for Coming Year
-Requirements of Constitution
6. Introduction of New Committee Members
7. Proposed Changes of the SHRA Constitution (Presentation and vote by members)
8. Open Discussion Session for Members
9. AOB

Item 1

Welcome to Members

Rick Runalls called the meeting to order and welcomed the Members present.

Item 2

Review of Business

Rick reviewed the Agenda and highlighted the Revenue Account that would be covered in the Treasurer's Report. He explained that with the exception of himself and Barry Miles, the other Committee Members were sitting in the body of the hall as until the Membership had accepted the present Committee to serve for the coming year, they were no longer Committee Members.

Item 3

Chairman's Report

See Appendix 1

Item 4

Treasurer's Report

See Appendix 2

Barry Miles introduced the Accounts for the year ending 31st March 2007. He explained that they were unaudited as sadly, the Honorary Auditor, Len Pegley had recently died. He said that consideration had been given to using Commercial Auditors, but due to the expense was hoping that someone within the Association would have the qualifications and be willing to assist. He offered posthumous thanks to Len and thanks to Ian Weeks for all his help on the administration of the membership. It was confirmed that membership had doubled over the past year and that there were now approximately 800 members. Susan Morris queried whether the Association could make charitable donations and it was explained that the Committee had considered this and had

decided that the Committee had the authority to make charitable donations but should be prepared to justify such donations to members on their basis of their relevance to the Harbour and its environment. In response to a question on the accounts it was pointed out that Committee Members individually do not generally claim any expenses for expenditure that had been incurred on Committee business. The exception to this being costs associated with large scale printing / reproduction.

Item 5

Appointment of Committee for Coming Year

-Requirements of Constitution

Rick explained that as there were only twelve members standing for the Committee an election did not need to take place under the Constitution.

Item 6

Introduction of New Committee for Coming Year

Rick introduced the Committee in turn, who then moved to the top table. He asked the two new members present, John and Carol Teasdale to introduce themselves and then introduced Brian Dennis as the third new member who had had to unavoidably leave the meeting early.

Item 7

Proposed Changes to the SHRA Constitution (Presentation and vote by members)

Rick explained that this item was now off the Agenda as he considered more time was needed to discuss this within the new Committee.

Item 8

Open Discussion Session for Members

Rick firstly introduced Paul Stratford who is running the Resolution Project. He explained that he was a scuba diver who had discovered what was thought to be 'The Resolution', an important shipwreck in Norman's Bay. He was hoping a maritime education centre could be built around the Langney Point Martello Tower as the Harbour had a huge history and heritage. He would like to involve young people and interest them in ecology and marine biology. Having met both the SHRA Committee and members from Eastbourne Borough Council there was enough declared support to take the project to the next stage. Rick confirmed that the SHRA would be a natural supporter for such a project.

Ian Weeks wished to make it clear to Members that an article in the last Waterlines referring to the actions of some of the management companies did not refer to any of the companies managed by residents themselves.

Rick reported that Linus Gunning, a well known local resident and active supporter of the SHRA was involved in a proposed pensions debate that would be held at the T & G building on 18th May at 7.30.

Other discussions from the floor included concern about the state of the North Harbour Martello Tower, parking along Pacific Drive adjacent to the roundabout near the Jones development, the

siting of dog bins and the regularity of contents removal, as well as the lack of litter bins and seating around the Harbour.

It was confirmed that tree planting along the main roads into North and South Harbour would not be possible due to the siting of drains and services, but it might be possible to introduce more greenery around these main thoroughfares. It was felt that the Council should take some action on this, not least as Sovereign Harbour was the only area in Eastbourne where there was no public park of any kind.

Queries were also raised over the appearance of the Spit on the Outer Harbour, the views from seating by the lock gates obscured by signage, the noise from the ice cream van parked near the locks, the need for improvements in the bus services and the possibility of a future bus link between North and South Harbours.

It was also pointed out that there was no signage on the beach to instruct the public on what was not allowed, i.e. barbeques or fireworks, or signs pointing out the dangers of the mudbanks on the Outer Harbour. One suggestion was that there could be specific areas around the Harbour where small children could play as at present there is nowhere round the main Harbour areas for children of any age to go to. It was suggested that these areas should be spaced out on, or adjacent to walkways so they could form 'oases', breaking walks up. Several people also asked if there was any development on a medical centre or community hall. Rick Runalls outlined discussions the Committee had had with the project manager working on the development of the medical centre on behalf of Dr. Adoki of the Harbour Medical Practice. Rick explained that he was expecting more progress on this and was trying to get a better understanding of the delays. Ian Weeks suggested that residents use the letters page on the SHRA website to post all their suggestions and concerns. He said it was quite widely read, but did not often receive contributions.

Item 9

AOB

As there were no further items of business to discuss Rick brought the meeting to a close with thanks to all the Committee Members for their work over the past year.

The meeting closed at 2.15 pm.

Appendix 1

Chairman's Report

1) Committee's Vision and Objectives

The majority of Committee members have served the Association for two successive years and essentially our overall vision and objectives have remained unchanged, although the opportunities for delivering these have markedly shifted, as highlighted in the sections below.

In summary our vision had two facets. Firstly we wanted to develop a Residents' Association that was both transparent and responsive to members' priorities and affective and professional in dealing with local government, developers and other groups with the potential to shape life on the Harbour. Secondly we wanted to influence those organisations with the power to shape the remaining development of the Harbour to deliver a sustainable community by providing missing social facilities while maximising business and quality employment opportunities.

Cornerstones of the Committee's strategy have been to maximise the engagement of residents across the Harbour by seeking their views and involving them in campaigns, and to maintain a non party political stance.

2) The Past Year

- a) We continued with our policy of distributing Waterlines to all residences on the Harbour, rather than just members of SHRA, since this represents our principal means of communication across the Harbour. The feedback we get from this is strongly positive, although it has occasionally drawn a critical response from various groups, but this has been primarily of a political nature. It is worth noting that by selling limited advertising within the magazine over the last 12 months we have almost succeeded in eliminating the cost to residents of its production. We are very pleased with the success of Waterlines, but it should be recognised that its production falls almost entirely on two Committee members.
- b) The success of the SHRA web site continues and allows access to our activities and those of other residents groups on and off the Harbour. Waterlines is widely read from this source and we have had recent confirmation that Carillion and their consultants routinely access the site. Once again the web site and its maintenance, like Waterlines, currently rely entirely on the same two Committee members.
- c) The monthly 'surgery' at Simply Italian continued through the year and provided a useful source of contact with residents. We even had a recent visit from members of the Committee of Brighton Marina Residents' Association who we had contacted to see if

it would be useful to share experiences. They are facing similar problems arising from over-development.

- d) Membership numbers have risen again and for the 2006/7 year reached over 800 'paid up' with approximately 880 'on the books', the difference primarily arising from people leaving the Harbour. These numbers compare with 470 in the 2005/6 year.
- e) Following the successful campaign against the 'B&Q application' in the 2005/6 year the SHRA organised and led a campaign against Sovereign Harbour Limited's (Carillion) five applications to build more high density housing on four of the limited number of development sites remaining. This became another triumph for residents when on 8th August last the Planning Committee rejected all applications after a barrage of passionate arguments from residents, Committee members and other speakers and an unconvincing presentation by SHL's consultants. It was valuable to the campaign to be able to demonstrate that positive thinking of what would be appropriate for the sites when two committee members drew up and presented alternative concepts for the sites. The significance of this victory cannot be over stated since the strength of residents' views became a catalyst in re-focusing EBC on the priorities in future Harbour development and in getting the attention of the developers. Following on from the planning successes it was particularly pleasing when a cross-party motion supporting Harbour aspirations was agreed at the Council Meeting of 19th September.
- f) Although residents' planning successes were a great encouragement we only considered these as intermediate steps. The reality was that we were facing an appeal by Carillion of the B&Q decision, and were also anticipating similar appeals of the other planning rejections. It was at this point we were contacted for a one-to-one meeting with LMMC, Carillion's PR consultants. We declined this unless it was extended to our elected representatives and a LibDem representative. This was agreed and the meeting that followed, which was supported by the leader of the Council, leader of the opposition and Cabinet members, has led to a formal session with Carillion their consultants and EBC representatives. The results of this have been reported in Waterlines and the local press. We are reticent to claim too much from this at such an early stage, but for the first time the developer appears to be recognising the social requirements of the community. In addition we believe that there is a new willingness to consider a 'master plan' which includes all the remaining development sites on the Harbour, not piecemeal development on a site-by-site basis.
- g) The Committee has formulated and presented ideas for the remaining Harbour development from its own views and ad hoc feedback from residents. However, we had felt uncomfortable that we had not systematically canvassed residents' views, and it was to start filling this gap that we organised the open day at Haven School on 24th February. Rather than present our ideas again we set out with a 'blank sheet' and collated the views expressed by residents. The report from this open day was welcomed by EBC and became a key input at the initial meeting held with Carillion. This was just a start and we are now anticipating option plans from Carillion's consultants incorporating and balancing residents' aspirations and those of EBC with the

developer's own business interests. How these will turn out we do not yet know, but whatever happens there will be public consultation giving residents another opportunity to input their views, and the SHRA Committee will continue to fight for a sustainable community.

- h) The Sovereign Harbour Trust, its objectives, make up and apparent lack of transparency in the way it disposes of the funds provided by residents remains an important issue for us. The Board of Trustees was set up with 6 seats, 3 of which were filled with Carillion employees or ex-employees while the remaining 3 were allocated to the Environment Agency. Since the EA were not moving to fill these we approached them to see if they would nominate SH residents as alternative attendees. They declined to do this but nominated 3 independent members who took up their seats about 6 months ago. The SHRA Committee met with these independents and is currently working to strike up a dialogue with them so we can at least start getting clear feedback on the workings of the Trust. If we can build this relationship up we are hoping that the new trustees will start to actively represent residents' interests. We will also continue to fight for proper SHRA representation on the Board of Trustees.
- i) We have over the last 2 years worked to try and influence adoption of the Harbour roads and walkways by the County Council. The general condition of some thoroughfares was starting to degrade while others had not achieved an adequate standard to start with. Getting something done about this was virtually impossible for either SHRA or other residents groups since responsibility largely resided with individual developers and their management companies. However, through perseverance and support from local elected representatives the situation is now improving. For instance, Pacific Drive is now 'on maintenance' and therefore a public highway, subject to all normal traffic laws. Because of this, adoption of residential developments on North Harbour can now go ahead. It is anticipated that some will be adopted within the next few months.
- j) Thanks to the commitment of a small group of Committee members the SHRA had representation at virtually every Planning Committee and Council Meeting. This has enabled a good overview to be taken on Council decisions and has enhanced the standing of SHRA.
- k) In a recent initiative the SHRA established contact with the local constabulary to explore the possibilities of setting up a Local Action Team (LAT). The main purpose of a LAT is to improve the quality of life on the Harbour. It affectively is a problem solving team where residents work in partnership with agencies such as councils, the police and community groups (for example local authority youth services, crime disorder teams, etc). Any issue or need in a community that requires local people and agencies to work together for the best solution can be addressed through a LAT. Although they are often associated with community safety issues, crime and disorder are definitely not the only issues addressed. Follow-up meetings have been held and elected representatives are now involved. This is still in the development phase but the

Committee see a LAT as a valuable tool in addressing residents concerns and well worth contributing to.

- l) There are many people around the Harbour with ideas that bring residents with shared interests together in a social way. Wherever possible the Committee has tried to support these through advertising their activities in Waterlines and in some cases by committee members getting involved themselves. Good examples of initiatives by residents are Harbour Friends, Marina Mums, Sovereign Harbour Racing Club and the Sovereign Harbour Investment Club.
- m) The current style of Committee has been around for two years now and we believe we have been successful in much we have tried to do. However, there will always be limits to our activities since what we achieve arises from our ability to influence rather than from any formal authority or responsibility. With this in mind we have been investigating the possibility of establishing a Community Council on Sovereign Harbour. This would have some formal powers and responsibilities with democratically elected representatives and some funds at its disposal. The SHRA can lead on setting this up but it cannot go ahead without the support of Harbour residents. We are eager to present the idea to residents, seek views, and hopefully support. We believe that such a body would help provide a real sense of identity for the Harbour and would take many of the larger issues on more effectively than the Residents' Association. We see this as an important issue that should be taken forward as a priority in the forthcoming year.

3) **Thanks**

- Firstly, I wish to recognise the contributions over the last two years of three Committee members who are not standing for re-election. Molly Burton, Carol Golder and John O'Hara. Molly actually was a member of the previous Committee and provided continuity and insight when we took over two years ago. She has been a passionate activist and was one of the founder members of the 'No to B&Q' group. John and Carol had a background with the BBC and used their design flair to produce valuable alternative concepts for some of the Harbour development sites. When we sometimes felt we were saying 'no' to every proposal from the developers they gave us the ability to demonstrate that we had ideas of our own. I am sure the membership would join me in expressing gratitude for their support for the SHRA and wishing them well in the future.
- The Committee wish to express our thanks to two Harbour businesses who from the beginning have offered us encouragement and support.

Temple Bird (Solicitors) - deserve particular thanks for their outstanding commitment to the community. They have for two years generously provided use of their conference room for Committee meetings and have been unflagging supporters of the SHRA. They were the first to take out advertising within Waterlines and the income this has provided over the period has been a welcome contribution to minimising the cost to residents of producing Waterlines.

Simply Italian - have also been supporters of the SHRA for the period this Committee has been in office. They routinely allow us to use their lounge for our monthly surgeries, and provide space for other residents groups to hold social gatherings and meetings.

We also wish to thank you and other residents who give us encouragement but stress the need for ongoing material help – the Committee can't do it all themselves.

Although we have had our ups and downs with our elected representatives in the past it is particularly satisfying to recognise the support we are now getting and in particular the cross-party support that has helped to get developers to realise that we are a serious lobbying group that won't go away. Our thanks go to all political representatives who have supported us and our expectations are that this support will continue in the future irrespective of elections.

Personal thanks.

4) **Priorities for the Coming Year**

- Development of the remaining sites to insure we get the community facilities we need, the commercial viability of the harbour is enhanced and quality job opportunities are provided.
- Take the proposal of a Community Council to the residents to seek their views and support.
- Renew effort on establishing open communication with the new trustees on the Board of Sovereign Harbour Trust and through this to make more transparent the business of the Trust.
- To continue developing the LAT into an affective body for addressing residents needs.
- More of the same.

SHRA committee members will continue to work hard to take forward all these key areas, but we are a small group and there is a lot to do. We welcome support from other residents who, while they do not wish to become Committee members, may have an interest or experience in a particular area and would like to provide some additional help. Your support will be most welcome.

Appendix 2

Sovereign Harbour Residents Association

REVENUE ACCOUNT for the Year Ending 31st March 2007

<u>INCOME</u>	<u>2006/7</u>	<u>2005/6</u>	<u>2004/5</u>
Subscriptions	3765.00	4262.50	555.00
Income from Advertising	3840.00	1750.00	-
Donations	90.00		
Bank Interest	129.74	28.00	-
	<u>£ 7,824.74</u>	<u>£ 6,040.50</u>	<u>£ 555.00</u>
<u>EXPENDITURE</u>	<u>2006/7</u>	<u>2005/6</u>	<u>2004/5</u>
Presentations	0.00	70.00	-
Printing / Publications	500.28	3528.35	316.65
Waterlines	3577.68		
Stationery	485.90	537.22	14.00
Internet Cost	126.76	126.76	-
Membership Cards	227.62	310.35	27.93
Hall Hire	105.00	97.50	100.00
P.O Box Fees	56.15	54.00	-
Postage	2.52		
Insurance (Public Liability)	358.05		
Transport Hire	445.10	150.00	-
Miscellaneous Sundries	40.00	42.07	29.40
Telephone	227.11		
Gazebo, Banner, Display eqpt. Software	1400.74		
Bank Correction	0.43	2.50	-
	<u>£ 7,553.34</u>	<u>£ 4,918.75</u>	<u>£ 487.98</u>
<u>Excess of Income over Expenditure for the Year</u>	271.40	1121.75	67.02
Balance Brought Forward at the Beginning of the Year	1322.41	1318.66	1251.64
Balance Carried Forward at the End of the Year	<u>£ 1,593.81</u>	<u>£ 2,440.41</u>	<u>£ 1,318.66</u>
<u>Balance Sheet At 31st March 2007</u>			
<u>Current Assets</u> :- Cash at NatWest Bank Current A/c	3009.07	1322.41	1318.66
Cash at NatWest Bank Reserve A/c.	6458.03	4528.29	-
<u>Total Current Assets</u>	<u>£ 9,467.10</u>	<u>£ 5,850.70</u>	<u>£ 1,318.66</u>
<u>Current Liabilities</u> - Prepaid Subscriptions	3345.00	3410.00	-
Cheques Issued not cashed	792.00		
<u>Total Current Liabilities</u>	<u>£ 4,137.00</u>	<u>£ 3,410.00</u>	-
<u>NET CURRENT ASSETS</u> - Held for Revenue Account	<u>£ 5,330.10</u>	<u>£ 2,440.70</u>	<u>£ 1,318.66</u>
<u>REVENUE ACCOUNT</u> - Balance at the end of the Year	<u>£ 5,330.10</u>	<u>£ 2,440.70</u>	<u>£ 1,318.66</u>