

**Notice of Meeting  
BASINGSTOKE CANAL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**



**SURREY**  
COUNTY COUNCIL

**Date:** Thursday, 26 February 2015  
**Time** 10.05 am

**[There will be an informal public question time before the meeting commencing at 10.00am.]**

**Place:** Mytchett Canal Centre, Mytchett Place Road, Mytchett, Surrey, GU16 6DD

**Contact:** George Foster  
**(Room 122, County Hall, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey, KT1 2DN.  
Tel: 020 8541 9122, Email: victoria.lower@surreycc.gov.uk)**  
[For queries on the content of the agenda and requests for copies of related documents]

**Fax:** 020 8541 9005                      **DX:** 31509 KINGSTON  
**Minicom:** 020 8541 8914

**If you would like a copy of this agenda or the attached papers in another format, eg large print or braille, or another language please either call 020 8541 9122, write to Democratic Services, Room 122, County Hall, Penrhyn Road, Kingston upon Thames, Surrey KT1 2DN, Minicom 020 8541 8914, fax 020 8541 9009, or email george.foster@surreycc.gov.uk.**

**This meeting will be held in public. If you would like to attend and you have any special requirements, please contact George Foster on 020 85213 2732.**

**Hampshire County Council**

Councillor Keith Chapman  
Councillor John Bennison  
Councillor Brian Gurden  
Councillor John Wall

**Surrey County Council**

Mrs Linda Kemeny  
Ben Carasco  
Mr Chris Pitt  
Mr Colin Kemp

**Hampshire Districts:**

**Hart District Council**

Councillor Simon Ambler  
Councillor Jonathan Glen

**Rushmoor Borough Council**

Councillor Les Taylor  
Councillor J H Marsh

**Surrey Districts:**

**Guildford Borough Council**

Councillor Gordon Jackson

**Runnymede Borough Council**

Councillor J M Edwards

**Surrey Heath Borough Council**

Councillor Paul Ilnicki

**Woking Borough Council**

Councillor K M Davis

**Special Interest Groups**

**Basingstoke Canal Society**

Martin Leech  
Mr P Riley

**Parish Councils**

Alastair Clark

**Residential Boat Owners Association**

Julia Jacs

**Natural England**

Adam Wallace

**Inland Waterways Association**

Gareth Jones

**John Cale Canal Cruises**

John Cale

**Basingstoke Canal Canoe Club**

Liz Murnaghan

## AGENDA

### PART 1 - IN PUBLIC

#### 1 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

#### 2 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING: 16 OCTOBER 2014

(Pages 1 - 16)

The minutes will be available in the meeting room half an hour before the start of the meeting.

#### 3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

To receive any declarations of disclosable pecuniary interests from Members in respect of any item to be considered at the meeting.

##### Notes:

- In line with the Relevant Authorities (Disclosable Pecuniary Interests) Regulations 2012, declarations may relate to the interest of the member, or the member's spouse or civil partner, or a person with whom the member is living as husband or wife, or a person with whom the member is living as if they were civil partners and the member is aware they have the interest.
- Members need only disclose interests not currently listed on the Register of Disclosable Pecuniary Interests.
- Members must notify the Monitoring Officer of any interests disclosed at the meeting so they may be added to the Register.
- Members are reminded that they must not participate in any item where they have a disclosable pecuniary interest.

#### 4 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS

To receive either any questions or petitions.

##### Notes:

1. The deadline for Member's questions is 12.00 noon four working days before the meeting [*Friday 20 February 2015*]
2. The deadline for public questions is seven days before the meeting [*Thursday 19 February 2015*].
3. The deadline for petitions was 14 days before the meeting, and no petitions have been received.

#### 5 FINANCIAL UPDATE REPORT

(Pages 17 - 26)

#### 6 MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT UPDATE

(Pages 27 - 28)

#### 7 REPORT ON HOUSEBOATS

(Pages 29 - 30)

- 8      **REPORT ON UNPOWERED BOATS**      (Pages 31 - 34)
  
- 9      **COMBINED CANAL MANAGEMENT REPORT**      (Pages 35 - 46)
  
- 10     **BASINGSTOKE CANAL SOCIETY REPORT**      (Pages 47 - 50)
  
- 11     **DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING**

The next meeting will be held on the 25 June 2015

**David McNulty**  
**Chief Executive**  
Wednesday, 18 February 2015

**MOBILE TECHNOLOGY AND FILMING – ACCEPTABLE USE**

Those attending for the purpose of reporting on the meeting may use social media or mobile devices in silent mode to send electronic messages about the progress of the public parts of the meeting. To support this, County Hall has wifi available for visitors – please ask at reception for details.

Anyone is permitted to film, record or take photographs at council meetings with the Chairman’s consent. Please liaise with the council officer listed in the agenda prior to the start of the meeting so that the Chairman can grant permission and those attending the meeting can be made aware of any filming taking place.

Use of mobile devices, including for the purpose of recording or filming a meeting, is subject to no interruptions, distractions or interference being caused to the PA or Induction Loop systems, or any general disturbance to proceedings. The Chairman may ask for mobile devices to be switched off in these circumstances.

It is requested that if you are not using your mobile device for any of the activities outlined above, it be switched off or placed in silent mode during the meeting to prevent interruptions and interference with PA and Induction Loop systems.

*Thank you for your co-operation*

This page is intentionally left blank

**MINUTES** of the meeting of the **BASINGSTOKE CANAL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE** held at 10.00 am on 16 October 2014 at Mytchett Canal Centre, Mytchett Place Road, Mytchett, Surrey, GU16 6DD.

These minutes are subject to confirmation by the Committee at its meeting.

**Hampshire County Council**

Councillor Keith Chapman (Chairman)  
Councillor John Bennison  
Councillor Brian Gurden  
Councillor John Wall

**Surrey County Council**

Mrs Linda Kemeny  
Mr Chris Pitt

**Hampshire Districts:**

**Hart District Council**

Councillor Simon Ambler  
Councillor Stephen Gorys

**Rushmoor Borough Council**

Councillor Les Taylor  
Councillor J H Marsh

**Surrey Districts:**

**Guildford Borough Council**

Councillor Gordon Jackson

**Runnymede Borough Council**

Councillor J M Edwards

**Surrey Heath Borough Council**

Councillor Paul Ilnicki

**Woking Borough Council**

Councillor K Davis

**Special Interest Groups**

**Basingstoke Canal Society**

Martin Leech  
Mr P Riley

**Parish Councils**

Alastair Clark

**Residential Boat Owners Association**

Julia Jacs

**Natural England**

Adam Wallace

**Inland Waterways Association**

Gareth Jones

**John Cale Canal Cruises**

John Cale

**Basingstoke Canal Boating Club**

Liz Murnaghan

**22/14 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE [Item 1]**

Apologies were received from Ben Carasco, Adam Wallace, John Cale, Colin Kemp and Gordon Jackson.

Michael Sydney substituted for Ben Carasco.

- At the next meeting of the JMC the Chairman asked for a discussion around 'substitutions' to take place.

**23/14 MINUTES OF PREVIOUS MEETING:26 JUNE 2014 [Item 2]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:** None.

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. In reference to points 6 and 7 under Item 2 of the minutes, officers explained that the Memorandum of Agreement (MOA) had been ratified by the JMC. It was for every individual authority represented on the JMC to ratify the MOA.
2. The Chairman asked for an Item to be included at the next JMC's meeting to look at which authorities had ratified the MOA.
3. It was asked that supplementary questions referred to in point 5 of the minutes be circulated to members of the JMC (these are attached to the minutes).

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None

**Committee next steps:** None.

**24/14 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST [Item 3]**

There were none.

**25/14 QUESTIONS AND PETITIONS [Item 4]**

**Declarations of interest:** None.

**Witnesses:** None

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. A question had been received from a member of the public; an answer had been tabled at the meeting. The Chairman explained that John Cale had been contacted and asked if he wanted to continue with his position on the JMC.
2. A question had been received from a member of the committee; an answer had been tabled at the meeting. The canal manager explained

that the service was planning to purchase a mower to allow for additional areas of cut. At the moment there was a contractor who doing this work but the BCA could only pay for 11km of towpath to be cut per year as there was not much revenue available to do this work.

3. The Strategic Manager explained that a mowing machine would be jointly purchased by Surrey and Hampshire from capital budgets.

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None.

**Committee next steps:** None.

## **26/14 FINANCE REPORT: OUT-TURN FORECAST 2014/15 AND FORWARD BUDGET 2015/16 [Item 5]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

Jane Lovett, Finance Business Partner, Hampshire County Council

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The report was introduced by the Finance Business Partner who explained that £45,000 would be drawn from the reserve to cover the cost of a tree survey. The original budget savings identified at £29,345 had been covered with contributions from individual partner authorities in 2015/16 being based on the previous formula contribution.
2. A member of the committee explained that as part of the MOA, Surrey Heath had agreed to contribute £10,000 to the canal but as of yet had not contributed any funds to the canal. The member had written a letter to Surrey Heath on 22 September 2014 asking them to explain their position with regards to funding.
3. A member queried whether Surrey Heath had ever agreed to the formula set out for funding in the MOA. It was further queried why Guildford BC had not contributed its full funding to the canal.
4. It was stated that the funding formula had been agreed by Runnymede BC but a decision had been taken to reduce funding allocated to the canal due to various financial pressures.
5. The Countryside Group Manager explained that work had been commissioned on the economic benefits of the canal which would be forwarded to other local authorities. Some members stated that work on economic benefits of the canal were readily available.

**Resolved:**

- 1 Members supported the out-turn forecast for 2014/15.
- 2 The proposed budget for 2015/16 was agreed and accepted.

- 3 That all partner authorities be urged to make their full contributions and to honour the agreed scale contributions for 2014/15 and 2015/16.

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None

**Committee next steps:** None.

#### **27/14 SSSI CONDITION STATUS REPORT [Item 6]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

James Taylor, Strategic Manager – Basingstoke Canal

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The report was introduced by the Strategic Manager who explained the purpose of the report was to ask the committee to give officers the authority to request Natural England to re-asses the SSSI formal condition status as recommended by the Conservation steering group. Work undertaken by Dr Eaton concluded that the SSSI had improved to 'unfavorable recovering'. This was a very good status for the canal.
2. Members queried what evidence there was to say that the canal was in 'unfavorable recovering'. The Strategic Manager explained that there was an area of the Canal in the Fleet which had long been devoid of aquatic plants that had shown signs of re-colonisation by Milfoil, and this was principally the evidence which had moved the Canal towards 'unfavorable recovering' status.
3. It was explained that to get the canal to SSSI 'favorable' condition would be very difficult with the primary problem being tree shade.

**Resolved:**

The JMC authorised officers to submit Dr Eaton's report together with a letter requesting Natural England to re-assess the officially recorded condition of the Basingstoke Canal SSSI.

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None

**Committee next steps:** None.

#### **28/14 WATER STRATEGY GROUP REPORT [Item 7]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

John How, Volunteer (Inland Waterways Association / Basingstoke Canal Society)

James Taylor, Strategic Manager – Basingstoke Canal

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. The report was introduced by the Volunteer for the Basingstoke Canal Society. It was explained that a water strategy group had been set up to address issues around water supply. It was reported that the EA had indicated that they will look favourably at granting new 10 year abstraction licenses for the present (increased) volumes, without any additional justification. The Strategic Manager had made an application for the abstraction license. The new license should be received by March 2015.
2. An update was given on the telemetry project. This would allow for the accurate and live measuring of water levels on a half an hour basis. The results would then be put on a hosted website where water levels on the canal can be regularly checked.
3. The Volunteer for the Basingstoke Canal Society thanked officers from Hampshire for their support with getting trading arrangements in place. The equipment for the telemetry project should be installed by Easter 2015.
4. It was queried whether abstraction licenses were used fully. It was explained that abstraction licenses were crucial but mainly during the dry season.
5. The JMC congratulated the water strategy group for all their excellent hard work. Members felt this work needed to be publicised to show the good work being done on the canal.
6. It was explained that the EA used a similar water level measuring system which recorded the water level at each transition point.
7. The Strategic Manager confirmed that the costing for the telemetry system would be around £60,000 but the running costs for this system would be low.

**Resolved:** The report was noted

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None

**Committee next steps:** None.

**29/14 CANAL MANAGEMENT REPORT [Item 8]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

Phil Riley, Basingstoke Canal Society

Martin Leech, Basingstoke Canal Society

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. An update on the canal was given by the Basingstoke Canal Society member. Recent work on the canal was discussed in great detail including the successful work undertaken on the canal this summer.
2. It was commented on the need for the canal to be recognised in local plans of each district and borough. The Chairman explained that the service was in the process of collating the status of all local plans and checking whether the canal was included in these. The Chairman stated that officers would report back on this.
3. A member stated that the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedule was organised by officers and that there was capacity for the Canal to be included in local CIL schedules, but it frequently wasn't included. It was recognised that funds from CIL were being used on schooling and local infrastructure. It was felt that neighbourhood plans and forums would make a difference to where money from CIL was spent.
4. A member stated that the CIL schedule was ever changing and that officers should be approached in order to have work added to the schedule.
5. The Chairman thanked the Basingstoke Canal Society for all their hard work.
6. The purchase of the John Pinkerton II canal boat was financed through legacies left to the Canal Society.

***11.30 Cllr J H Marsh left the meeting***

**Resolved:** The report was noted

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

For officers to check the status of the canal in the local plans of district and boroughs.

**Committee next steps:** None.

**30/14 BASINGSTOKE CANAL SOCIETY REPORT [Item 9]**

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

Phil Riley, Basingstoke Canal Society

Martin Leech, Basingstoke Canal Society

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

7. An update on the canal was given by the Basingstoke Canal Society member. Recent work on the canal was discussed in great detail including the successful work undertaken on the canal this summer.
8. It was commented on the need for the canal to be recognised in local plans of each district and borough. The Chairman explained that the service was in the process of collating the status of all local plans and checking whether the canal was included in these. The Chairman stated that officers would report back on this.
9. A member stated that the CIL (Community Infrastructure Levy) schedule was organised by officers and that there was capacity for the Canal to be included in local CIL schedules, but it frequently wasn't included. It was recognised that funds from CIL were being used on schooling and local infrastructure. It was felt that neighbourhood plans and forums would make a difference to where money from CIL was spent.
10. A member stated that the CIL schedule was ever changing and that officers should be approached in order to have work added to the schedule.
11. The Chairman thanked the Basingstoke Canal Society for all their hard work.
12. The purchase of the John Pinkerton II canal boat was financed through legacies left to the Canal Society.

***11.30 Cllr J H Marsh left the meeting***

**Resolved:** The report was noted

**Actions/further information to be provided:**

For officers to check the status of the canal in the local plans of district and boroughs.

**Committee next steps:** None.

## 31/14 CANAL CENTRE REDEVELOPMENT PROPOSALS [Item 10]

**Declarations of interest:** None

**Officers:**

James Taylor, Strategic Manager – Basingstoke Canal

Lisa Creaye-Griffin, Countryside Group Manager (Surrey County Council)

**Key points raised during the discussion:**

1. A report was tabled at the meeting. The report updated Members on the progress of David Morley Associates to provide an economic scheme for the redevelopment of the Canal Centre site and future income proposals. It was explained that the service had not gone out to consultation on the proposal. It was explained that the Canal as a whole was under resourced and that income only amounted for a proportion of the BCA's budget; the work was needed to be done to improve income generation.
2. An informal consultation had taken place with the Canoe Club; the feedback received was taken on board. It was recognised that a number of other stakeholders including neighbours close to the site would be consulted in due course.
3. It was stated that there would be an emphasis on sustainable energy especially as SCC policy aims at a BREEAM standard of "very good" or where possible "excellent".
4. There was concern that funding from district and boroughs could possibly reduce once the economic generation scheme had been agreed.
5. The Chairman commented on the positive step forward with these plans in place. In the past there had been complaints around the lack of facilities but it was very good to see the centre moving forward.
6. The cost of paying David Morley Associates to provide an economic scheme and business plan was in the region of £98,000.
7. It was stated that it was possible that SCC might fund the whole project as the project was economically sustainable and would cover its capital repayment and interest costs. It was commented that surplus from the site would go back into the Canal management budgets.
8. Some Members felt the current proposals were not ambitious enough especially in terms of catering facilities on site. Officers were asked to look at the redevelopment work being done on canals in other parts of the country. The Strategic Manager explained that the catering consultant working with DMA had looked at what would bring the most economic benefit to the site.

9. As the site was only 5.5 hectares in size, consultants were limited on what they could do on site.
10. In terms of parking, consultants had agreed that there would be significant benefit from a small car parking charge. Members recognised that this could be a problem for some visitors.
11. Members asked that the proposals should include a lay-by style boating facility so potential visitors from the canal can stop and enjoy the site.
12. It was recognised that the redevelopment of the Canal Centre would be vital for the successful future of the Canal as a whole. Partnership arrangements with various stakeholders including neighbors of the site needed to be considered going forward.
13. The Countryside Group Manager explained that a progress report on the Canal would be going to the Surrey County Council Environment and Transport Select Committee in December.

**Resolved:** The report was noted

**Actions/further information to be provided:** None

**Committee next steps:** None.

**22/14 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 11]**

The next meeting will be held on 26 February 2015 at 10am.

**23/14 DATE OF THE NEXT MEETING [Item 11]**

The next meeting will be held on 26 February 2015 at 10am.

**Chairman**

This page is intentionally left blank

**From Mr John Cale (John Cale Canal Cruises)**

- 1. What disciplinary procedures do the JMC have in place for errant tenants / stakeholders of Surrey / Hampshire C.C / BCA? What protocols need to be followed by both parties & what appeals process is in place?**

**Response:**

The JMC is a joint committee of the constituent local authorities. Its role is to set the policy, strategy and budgets for the management of the Canal and to monitor the work of the managing agent - the Basingstoke Canal Authority. It has no role in disciplinary procedures.

Officers of the BCA or owning County Councils can take action where they believe actions of a licensee are in breach of the licensee's specific terms and conditions, or are in breach of the rules of navigation, or the law; for example, by interfering with water management, or damaging the Canal. There is no proscribed procedure or appeals process for dealing with these matters, officers' actions will vary depending on the nature and facts of the issue at hand. The rules of navigation (formed of the bylaws, boating terms and conditions and boaters handbook) are attached; commercial and quasi-commercial operators however currently have a variety of different individual licences with differing terms and conditions.

Complaints about the handling of a particular issue will be dealt with through the formal complaints procedures of the owning County Councils. Where concerning the actions of BCA staff this will usually be through the Hampshire County Council complaints procedure.

If there is a dispute between licensee's using the waterway that doesn't involve harm to the Canal, BCA or County Councils that will generally be a matter for those licensees to resolve between them - there are no tenants nor exclusive occupation of any area of the waterway. Neither the BCA nor County Councils can act as an arbiter in any such dispute.

- 2. What is the JMCs policy / views on procedural protocols pertaining to boat reclassification by the BCA?**

**Response:**

The JMC is a joint committee of the constituent local authorities. Its role is to set the policy, strategy and budgets for the management of the Canal and to monitor the work of the managing agent - the Basingstoke Canal Authority. It has no role in reviewing individual issues.

The BCA as the owner's agents may issue a licence which is the most appropriate for the current use of the boat in question. The decision to issue or not issue a licence was delegated to the Canal Director for the whole Canal; the Canal Manager and Countryside Client Officers have now taken over the duties contained in this former role. Estates Officers from each County Council also have the delegated

## Item 4 – Member Questions

2

authority to set rents, licence fees and issue licences within their own authority's jurisdiction.

**Keith Chapman**

**Chairman, Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee**

**BASINGSTOKE CANAL JMC– 16 OCTOBER 2014**

**PROCEDURAL MATTERS**

**Questions and Petitions-Item 4**

**Member Question (1) from Philip Riley to ask:**

*Will the BCA consider adopting a revised bank-side clearance policy which would involve not only a winter cut but also a cut in late spring/early summer and possibly also in the autumn?*

**Reply:**

The BCA ranger staff currently cuts the towpath at least twice per year (May/June and September); occasionally certain areas are cut for a third time, if there is an exceptional growing season. The BCA ranger team are currently not resourced to increase the number of towpath cuts, or employ a contractor to do so. Summer towpath cuts do not extend to hedgerows or to the bankside marginal strip between the towpath and water.

Cutting hedgerows and bankside vegetation is usually done in late autumn or winter to avoid cutting annual and bi-annual species before they set seed, and to avoid disturbing nesting birds. The towpath side winter cutting regime was completely discontinued about 5 years ago, at a time when staff levels were reduced. This has resulted in the presence of a greater number of tree saplings and woody perennial species such as bramble growing in the marginal strip which is seen to be undesirable as it reduces the diversity of the species on the bank. The present Canal Management Team re-instated a winter cut last winter to include hedgerows and the bankside marginal strip - the BCA can currently afford for a contractor to cut approx 11km of Canal per winter on a cyclical basis. It is proposed to replace the BCA's ageing Artesia mower with a more suitable Kubota mini-tractor and flail to enable the BCA Ranger staff to extend the winter cutting regime to a longer length of the Canal.

The matter of additional summer bankside cutting was discussed at the Conservation Management Steering Group on 8 October 2014. We were advised that the marginal strip is a vital hunting ground for dragonflies which are part of the SSSI citation, and that summer cutting may alter the balance of bankside plant species. Although the bank is technically outside of the SSSI regular cutting in summer may have a direct harmful effect on the dragonfly population which are protected characteristic of the Canal SSSI. It was agreed at the Conservation Management Steering Group that additional expert advice should be sought on the height and variety of plant species required to support the dragonfly population, and that the reinstatement of a complete winter cutting programme over more than one season would be monitored before additional summer cuts should be considered. Should it be seen to be acceptable and necessary to increase the frequency and area of summer cutting additional resources will need to be identified.



Mr Keith Chapman  
**Chairman of the Basingstoke Canal JMC**

This page is intentionally left blank

## BASINGSTOKE CANAL JMC– 16 OCTOBER 2014

## PROCEDURAL MATTERS

Questions and Petitions-Item 4**Public Question (1) from Duncan Paine to ask:**

*John Cale of John Canal Cruises is ceasing trading on the Basingstoke Canal as of the end of this season, and as such should not be represented on the JMC. Could I therefore ask that the Accessible Boating Association replace him on the committee. When the meeting in October 2013 held a ballot for Special Interest Groups to be co-opted on to the committee Accessible Boating was one vote behind John Cale, who was the last co-opted member. With him now not being eligible for the committee I ask that ABA succeed him on the committee.*

**Reply:**

The Constitution of the Joint Management Committee states that the Committee may co-opt "up to 5 other non-voting individuals and representatives of special interest groups as necessary." Co-opted members "shall normally be co-opted for periods of 4 years". There is nothing in the terms of reference and constitution to indicate that a co-option is automatically ended in the circumstances described in the question, and there is therefore no vacancy amongst the co-opted members of the Committee at present.



Mr Keith Chapman  
Chairman of the Basingstoke Canal JMC

This page is intentionally left blank

## HAMPSHIRE COUNTY COUNCIL

## Report

<b>Committee/Panel:</b>	Basingstoke Canal Authority Joint Management Committee
<b>Date:</b>	26 February 2015
<b>Title:</b>	Financial Update Report
<b>Reference:</b>	
<b>Report From:</b>	Report of The Honorary Treasurer

**Contact name:** Jane Lovett, Finance Business Partner, Hampshire County Council

**Tel:** 01962 847518

**Email:** Jane.Lovett@hants.gov.uk

## 1. Executive Summary

1.1 The purpose of this report is to brief members on the financial position of the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA). In summary members are asked to:

- review and agree the out-turn forecast for 2014/15;
- be appraised of issues arising following the external audit of the 2013/14 annual return;
- support the decision of the Treasurer and Chairman on the funding required to be drawn from the reserve in relation the Unpowered boat operation.

1.2 The out-turn forecast shows the Canal will draw £3,200 from the reserve during 2014/15, a reduction of £ 41,800 from the last report. This is due to the re-scheduling of expenditure of £39,000 on the Weir and Sluices survey a possible VAT liability of £7,500 on the current fishing license agreement. Additional savings of £5,100 are anticipated on salary costs and additional one off income of £5,000 has been received from network wayleave payments.

1.3 This in turn revises the 2015/16 position, with an anticipated draw of £39,000 from the reserve to cover the Weir and Sluices survey not carried out in 2014/15.

1.4 Following a recent break in at the Canal, additional costs to replace stolen equipment valued at around £10,000 will be covered by savings on the winter vegetation work, as costs were lower than originally anticipated.

1.5 Also on this agenda is a business case to run an unpowered boat operation on the Canal. Funding of around £24,000 would be required and drawn from the reserve during this financial year, if approval is given. This funding would be used to purchase equipment and cover other set up costs.

- 1.6 This funding is not included in the figures shown in the appendices to this report. It is anticipated that the funds would be replaced by the end of the first year of operation.

## 2. Out-turn forecast 2014/15

- 2.1 The outturn forecast is set out in Appendix A. The current forecast shows a draw on the reserve of £ 3,200, a change of £41,800 from the last report. This is due mainly to the re-scheduling of work to carry out the Weir and Sluices survey.
- 2.2 Work has been ongoing with Hampshire County Council's Tax Advisor, HMRC and the Basingstoke Angling Association (BAA) to establish the correct VAT treatment in relation to the current Fishing License agreement held between the BCA and the BAA.
- 2.3 The BAA is in the process of submitting the 2014/15 invoice to HMRC, to enable a judgement to be made on whether the supply is subject to VAT. The total liability will be in the region of £7,500 if HMRC rules the supply is subject to VAT and it has been agreed that BCA will cover the cost of the previous three years and a percentage of the current year's additional costs.
- 2.4 The out-turn forecast revenue expenditure shows a reduction of £40,600 since the last report. The reasons for these changes are explained below:
- **Employees (-£5,100)**  
It is anticipated that savings will be made to staffing costs due to the resignation of one of the canal rangers, although this will be partly offset due to higher than expected employer's NI costs relating to maternity pay.
  - **Canal Maintenance (-£31,700)**  
The reduction is due to the re-scheduling of the Weir and Sluice survey, the cost of £39,000 will be carried forward to 2015/16 and drawn from the reserve. This predicted underspend has been offset by £7,300 relating to higher than anticipated costs of contracts for reactive tree works, the emergency cover contract and lock gate purchases.  
  
Planned works within this area are continually monitored and rescheduled to ensure that costs remain within the funds available.
  - **Transport (£2,100)**  
Additional costs are expected due to unforeseen repair costs for the van and travel costs for the Strategic Manager, not previously budgeted for.
  - **Shortfall in Partner Contributions (-£5,900)**  
See note below under Grants & Contributions – Partnership Contributions.

2.5 The out-turn forecast figure for income has increased by £1,200 since the last report. The reasons for these changes are explained below:

- **General Fees & Charges (-£3,700)**  
Income is projected to be £3,700 lower than in the previous report due mainly to a reduction in anticipated camping fees of £1,900 and a possible VAT liability of £7,500 relating to the current fishing license agreement. These amounts being offset by increased income from boating license fees of £5,600 linked to additional mooring availability and small increases across a number of other fees and charges categories, totalling £100.
- **Grants & Contributions – Partnership Contributions**  
All Partnership contributions have been invoiced for the year with the majority now received. An additional £5,900 has been received, higher than previously projected as the full formula contribution has been received from Guildford and Rushmoor Borough Councils and Hart District Council.
- **Grants & Contributions - Other (-£3,400)**  
Income is projected to be £3,400 lower than anticipated at the time of the last report. The reduction is due to HLS project work being rescheduled, with the funding now to be claimed in 2015/16 as detailed in section 5 of this report.
- **Rental Income (£5,800)**  
One off additional income of £5,800 has been received for wayleave access for SCOTIS gas and UK Power networks.
- **Sales Income (£2,500)**  
There has been a small increase in shop sales and slightly more income received from Santa Cruises than anticipated in the last forecast. Only a minimal increase is expected in the current income level by the end of the year.

### 3. Looking Ahead 2015/16

3.1 The 2015/16 budget is show in Appendix A. Original savings to be identified of £6,000 will be covered by additional income from Santa Cruises, due to an inflationary increase being applied for Christmas 2015. Further income is also anticipated if those partners making a full contribution this year do so for 2015/16.

3.2 Due to the re-scheduling of the Weir and Sluice survey a draw on the reserve of £39,000 is now anticipated for 2015/16.

### 4. Capital Expenditure Programme

4.1 The current position on the main capital schemes is detailed in Appendix B, showing projected costs and income for 2014/15 and 2015/16.

- 4.2 Hampshire – the original schedule of spend for 2014/15 is likely to reduce by around £470,000 due to the tendering process for work linked to the Dogmersfield landslip. The majority of this work will now take place during 2015/16 with funding rolled forward accordingly.
- 4.3 Work is ongoing on the Telemetry system with the expectation that it will be operational by February/March 2015. Emergency equipment and housing has been purchased and plans for a new work boat are currently on hold while other equipment options are investigated.
- 4.4 Current spend to date against the 2014/15 allocation is £159,000.
- 4.5 Surrey – A scheduled spend of £526,000 is anticipated for 2014/15 with some embankment work possibly rolling forward for completion in 2015/16. Emergency equipment has been purchased and is housed on the canal.
- 4.6 The Canal centre redevelopment surveys, design and reports are now complete and the remaining payment to be made once they have been accepted.
- 4.7 Current spend to date against the 2014/16 allocation is £60,000.

## 5 Special Projects

- 5.1 The current positions on the externally funded special projects managed by the Canal are detailed in Appendix C.1.
- Odiham Castle - Funds stand at £3,600 with an expected expenditure of £2,500 in the current financial year. These funds will be used to replace and refurbish signage and paths in time for the Magna Carta celebrations in 2015. It is anticipated a balance of £1,100 will be carried forward for use in future years.
  - Higher Level Stewardship (HLS) funding
    - Surrey - None of the special project work was completed during 2014/15 before the claim deadline in October, and as a result no claim was made for the special projects grant. This was mainly due to further discrepancies being discovered with the submitted mapping and proposed project areas, together with insufficient BCA staff resource to run the two schemes at once.
    - Further discussions will take place with Natural England about the future of the Surrey agreement, and whether there is any possibility of completing future special projects later in the existing 10 year agreement, or whether to replace the entire scheme at the legal break point in 2016 with an alternative scheme.
    - The grassland maintenance work and associated annual funding revenue of £2,500 will continue for the current year and 2015/16.

- Hampshire – Only a small amount of the planned tree works will be completed at Rushmoor flash during 2014/15, with the majority of the work and the funding application taking place during 2015/16. The cost of this work will be in the region of £22,000 with match funding required of £10,000.
- Annual work on the maintenance of grasslands and control of invasive plant species has received funding of £2,718. This funding will offset the staff costs of undertaking this work.

## **6 External Audit Issues Arising Report**

- 6.1 The 2013/14 small bodies return was signed off by the external auditor on 25 September 2014. Just one issue was raised by the auditor and is set out below, together with officer responses.

### **Point Raised – Risk Assessment**

- The Auditor reported that the risk assessment was not reported to or adopted by the body.
- We highlighted in the previous year the need for the council as a whole to carry out an assessment, the review within the year was referenced in the report, a better but still brief review took place after the year end.
- This is a potential breach of regulation 4 of the Accounts and Audit (England) Regulations 2011 which requires authorities to review the effectiveness of internal control which includes arrangements for the management of risk.

### **Auditor Recommendation**

- We would recommend that the body as a whole review the risk register once during the year and even if the risks are covered by the joint councils such a minute would acknowledge the bodies understanding of their underlying risks.

### **Officer Response/Action**

- As previously advised, the risks associated with the Canal are covered by the joint councils, although a separate risk register has been set up and will be reviewed and updated following the Canal Inspection and monitoring meetings. This will be covered by the Canal Manager in her regular report to the Authority.

## 7 Reserves

- 7.1 A detailed breakdown of reserves is shown in Appendix C.2. This report makes no assumption on Members decision on the unpowered boats paper also on this agenda. Should these proposals be supported then a draw of £24,000 would be required in the current financial year.
- 7.2 A draw of £3,200 is forecast for the unallocated reserve in 2014/15. This is to cover the cost of the tree survey less funds re-profiled into 2015/16 for the Weirs and Sluices survey which will now be carried out during the next financial year.
- 7.3 The unallocated reserve is expected to stand at £278,462 at the end of the year unless approval is given to draw £24,000 funds for the unpowered boat operation. The dredging reserve remains unchanged at £24,078, giving a total reserve figure of £302,540 at the end of 2014/15.
- 7.4 It is now anticipated that there will be a draw on the reserve during 2015/16 of £39,000 due to the re-profiled Weirs and Sluices Survey. The total reserves are expected to stand at £264,440 at the end of 2015/16.

## 8 Conclusion

- 8.1 This report indicates the Canal continues to control costs while facing ongoing financial challenges. Full contributions received from Guildford, Rushmoor and Hart councils during the year has assisted in plugging the funding gap and will go a long way towards covering the savings to be identified for 2015/16. We continue to urge all partners to pay their full contributions, to ensure future income is sufficient to cover the ongoing costs of the organisation.
- 8.2 The Canal continues to maintain good standards, although financial constraints on the budgets of partners continue to create pressures.

## Recommendations

- 1 That members support the forecast outturn for 2014/15.
- 2 That members support the change in the revenue draw on reserves in 2014/15 and 2015/16.
- 3 That member support the decision of the Treasurer and Chairman on the funding required to be drawn from the reserve in relation the unpowered boat operation.

## BASINGSTOKE CANAL

## FINANCIAL OUTTURN 2014/15

## APPENDIX A

Actual Outturn 2013/14 £		Original Budget 2014/15 £	Forecast Outturn August'14	Actuals 31 Jan'15 £	Forecast Outturn January'15 £	Variance from previous outturn £	Forward Budget 2015/16 £
	<b>Expenditure</b>						
395,446	Employees	399,200	397,745	309,500	392,600	(5,145)	406,000
34,983	Premises	32,300	30,300	23,473	30,300	0	31,000
142,531	Canal Maintenance	153,000	224,500	85,724	192,841	(31,659)	157,000
65,203	Transport	59,300	59,300	49,993	61,400	2,100	61,000
41,451	Supplies & Services	42,400	38,000	28,589	38,000	0	39,000
0	Savings to be identified	(29,354)	0	0	0	0	(6,255)
0	Shortfall In Partner Contributions	27,002	27,202	0	21,306	(5,896)	31,038
<b>679,614</b>	<b>Total Revenue Expenditure</b>	<b>683,848</b>	<b>777,047</b>	<b>497,279</b>	<b>736,447</b>	<b>(40,600)</b>	<b>718,783</b>
	<b>Income</b>						
102,235	General Fees & Charges	89,300	79,200	84,325	75,500	(3,700)	76,800
516,645	Grants & Contributions - Partner	543,847	543,847	522,541	543,847	0	547,683
18,983	Grants & Contributions - other	1,200	34,600	8,625	31,200	(3,400)	10,100
24,036	Rental Income	23,701	43,700	44,927	49,500	5,800	54,700
29,866	Sales Income	25,800	29,500	31,551	32,000	2,500	29,500
0	Other Miscellaneous Income	0	1,200	1,196	1,200	0	0
<b>691,765</b>	<b>Total Revenue Income</b>	<b>683,848</b>	<b>732,047</b>	<b>693,165</b>	<b>733,247</b>	<b>1,200</b>	<b>718,783</b>
<b>(12,151)</b>	Contribution (to)/from Reserves	0	<b>45,000</b>	<b>(195,886)</b>	<b>3,200</b>	<b>(41,800)</b>	0
	<b>Partner Contributions</b>						
153,188	Surrey County Council	153,188	153,188	153,188	153,188	0	153,188
34,960	Guildford Borough Council	39,076	34,960	39,076	39,076	4,116	39,076
8,000	Runnymede Borough Council	16,869	8,000	8,000	8,000	0	16,869
10,000	Surrey Heath Borough Council	26,283	10,000	10,000	10,000	0	26,283
53,276	Woking Borough Council	53,276	53,276	53,276	53,276	0	53,276
153,188	Hampshire County Council	153,188	153,188	153,188	153,188	0	153,188
30,000	Hart District Council	30,924	30,000	30,924	30,924	924	30,924
3,048	Crookham Village Parish Council	3,048	3,048	3,048	3,048	0	3,048
6,750	Church Crookham Parish Council	6,750	6,750	6,750	6,750	0	6,750
240	Dogmersfield Parish Council	240	240	250	250	10	240
18,309	Fleet Town Council	18,309	18,309	18,309	18,309	0	18,309
4,036	Odiham Parish Council	0	4,036	4,036	4,036	0	4,036
0	Rotherwick Parish Council	200	0	0	0	0	0
250	Winchfield Parish Council	250	250	250	250	0	250
41,400	Rushmoor Borough Council	42,246	41,400	42,246	42,246	846	42,246
<b>516,645</b>		<b>543,847</b>	<b>516,645</b>	<b>522,541</b>	<b>522,541</b>	<b>5,896</b>	<b>547,683</b>
	<b>General Reserves</b>						
(291,457)	Opening Balance	(304,640)	(304,640)		(304,640)		(302,540)
(12,151)	Contribution (to)/from Reserves	0	45,000		3,200		0
(1,032)	Interest on Balances	0	(1,100)		(1,100)		(900)
<b>(304,640)</b>	<b>Closing Balance</b>	<b>(304,640)</b>	<b>(260,740)</b>		<b>(302,540)</b>		<b>(303,440)</b>

	Surrey County Council Estates	Surrey County Council Countryside	Surrey Vegetation Scheme	Hampshire County Council Capital Fund	Hampshire Emergency Repair Fund	Total
	£	£	£	£	£	£
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2014</b>	<b>(32,334)</b>	<b>40,166</b>	<b>(9,507)</b>	<b>(110,421)</b>	<b>(22,059)</b>	<b>(134,155)</b>
<b>Core Capital Contribution</b>	0	(500,000)	0	(1,000,000)	0	<b>(1,500,000)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Bank Works	0	340,500	0	362,000	0	<b>702,500</b>
Water Management	0	30,000	0	58,750	0	<b>88,750</b>
Equipment	0	52,745	0	52,941	22,059	<b>127,745</b>
Canal Structure	0	102,600	9,507	92,000	0	<b>204,107</b>
Consultancy	32,334	0	0	0	0	<b>32,334</b>
<b>Total cost of planned starts 2014/15</b>	<b>32,334</b>	<b>525,845</b>	<b>9,507</b>	<b>565,691</b>	<b>22,059</b>	<b>1,155,436</b>
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2015</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>66,011</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(544,731)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(478,720)</b>
<b>Core Capital Contribution</b>	0	(500,000)	0	(800,000)	0	<b>(1,300,000)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Bank Works	0	43,000	0	533,250	0	<b>576,250</b>
Water Management	0	79,500	0	709,500	0	<b>789,000</b>
Equipment	0	87,500	0	37,500	0	<b>125,000</b>
Canal Structure	0	255,500	0	62,500	0	<b>318,000</b>
Consultancy	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total cost of planned starts 2015/16</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>465,500</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,342,750</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>1,808,250</b>
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2016</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>31,511</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1,980)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>29,532</b>
<b>Core Capital Contribution</b>	0	(500,000)	0	0	0	<b>(500,000)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>						
Bank Works	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Water Management	0	361,250	0	0	0	<b>361,250</b>
Equipment	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
Canal Structure	0	19,000	0	0	0	<b>19,000</b>
Consultancy	0	0	0	0	0	<b>0</b>
<b>Total cost of planned starts 2016/17</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>380,250</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>380,250</b>
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2017</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(88,239)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1,980)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(90,219)</b>

Bank Works - Embankment repairs, including Tree works  
Towpath re-instatement  
Dogmersfield landslip work  
Hardbank boat mooring

Water Management - Telemetry system  
Stopgates and stop planks  
Weir and sluices  
Dredging

Equipment - Various equipment

Canal Structure - Culvert works  
Lock structure works

Consultancy - Engineering & legal services

Basingstoke Canal - Special Projects Reconciliation

	Odiham Castle Scheme	HLS Rural Payments Agency SCC	HLS Rural Payments Agency HCC	Total
	£	£	£	£
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2014</b>	<b>(3,600)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(0)</b>	<b>(3,600)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>				
Grassland Maintenance		2,519	5,636	8,155
Special Projects		0	0	0
Bank Repairs		0	0	0
Consultancy		0	0	0
Tree Work		0	900	900
Signage & maintenance	2,500			2,500
HLS Grasslands Income		(2,519)	(5,636)	(8,155)
HLS Income		0	(900)	(900)
HLS Match Funding		0	0	0
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2015</b>	<b>(1,100)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1,100)</b>
<b>Expenditure</b>				
Grassland Maintenance		2,519	5,636	8,155
Special Projects		0	0	0
Bank Repairs		0	0	0
Consultancy		0	0	0
Tree Work		0	20,790	0
Signage & maintenance	0			0
HLS Grasslands Income		(2,519)	(5,636)	(8,155)
HLS Income		0	(10,821)	0
HLS Match Funding		0	(9,969)	0
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2016</b>	<b>(1,100)</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>0</b>	<b>(1,100)</b>

## APPENDIX C.2

Basingstoke Canal Reserves 2014-16

	Unallocated Reserve	Dredging & Silt Disposal	General Reserves Total
	£	£	£
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2014</b>	<b>(280,562)</b>	<b>(24,078)</b>	<b>(304,640)</b>
Income (Interest on Balances)	(1,100)	0	(1,100)
Planned use of reserve	3,200	0	3,200
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2015</b>	<b>(278,462)</b>	<b>(24,078)</b>	<b>(302,540)</b>
Income (Interest on Balances)	(900)	0	(900)
Planned use of reserve	39,000	0	39,000
<b>Balance as at 31st March 2016</b>	<b>(240,362)</b>	<b>(24,078)</b>	<b>(264,440)</b>

This page is intentionally left blank

**Basingstoke Canal Joint Management Committee**  
26 February 2015



**Memorandum of Agreement**  
*Information Paper*

Lead officer: James Taylor  
Telephone: 01483 517538  
Email: james.taylor@surreycc.gov.uk

**Key Issue**

To inform Members on the progress of partner authorities in ratifying the revision to the Memorandum of Agreement approved by the JMC in February 2014.

**Summary**

Only Runnymede Borough has ratified the revised MoA. Most of the remaining partners intend to ratify the Agreement, some after the May elections this year.

**Update**

A revision of the MoA was approved by this Committee in February 2014. The decision of the Committee needs to be confirmed by a committee or cabinet of each partner authority with appropriate executive powers.

To date, only Runnymede Borough has approved the revised MoA at their Leisure Services Committee on 18 June 2014, however they did not agree to pay the contribution calculated by the funding formula.

Hampshire, Surrey and Hart all have plans to send reports to the appropriate body in the first half of 2015.

Woking, Surrey Heath, and Guildford are considering their positions. Rushmoor are investigating which body needs to consider the MoA, but do plan to make a report as soon as is reasonably practicable.

*Table 1* shows the current situation.

Table 1

<b>Authority</b>	<b>Approving body / person</b>	<b>Date for consideration</b>	<b>Decision</b>
<b>Guildford</b>	TBA	N/K	
<b>Hart</b>	Cabinet	April or July 2015	
<b>Runnymede</b>	Community Services Committee	18 June 2014	Approved
<b>Rushmoor</b>	TBA	TBA	
<b>Surrey Heath</b>	TBA	N/K	
<b>Hampshire</b>	Cabinet Member Decision	5 March 2015	
<b>Surrey</b>	Cabinet	TBC	
<b>Woking</b>	TBA	N/K	

This page is intentionally left blank

**Key Issue**

Proposal to Transfer Net Income from the Houseboats to the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA)

**Officer's recommendation**

**Update report for Information**

**1 Introduction & background**

2 There are 22 Houseboats on Basingstoke Canal located at Woodham and at Hermitage Bridge. The Houseboats are managed by Surrey County Council's Property Service. The intention of the County Council is to see all the income from Canal properties allocated to the Basingstoke Canal Business Plan. All these properties do need to be managed and so any gross income will be transferred net of the costs to manage the property.

3 In the last two years all the Houseboats have been moved onto new leases and an agreement for transferring the net income to the Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA) can now be progressed.

**4 Discussion**

5 Property Services at Surrey County Council have been managing the property on the Surrey stretch of the Canal. Some of the income from those properties already comes to the BCA, however the income from the houseboats was not transferred because of the outstanding work to renew all the leases. This work has now been completed and an in principle agreement made that the net income could be transferred.

6 The exact level of those costs has yet to be finalised but will include a contingency to ensure that in the years of peak costs, for example when the rents are reviewed any negative figure is not also transferred. Therefore if the costs exceed the income in a given year SCC would not be seeking a payment from the BCA. The gross income in the year at the current rental level is £90,000 per annum with an expected cost for management of £31,500, not including the contingency that is yet to be agreed.

**7 Financial and value for money implications**

8 Details still need to be worked out but this proposal will ensure the BCA has the net income from the houseboats added to its budget providing additional income at a time when there is increasing pressure on their budgets.

**9 Equalities & diversity implications**

10 There are no direct impacts of the proposal

**11 Crime & disorder implications**

12 There are no direct impacts of the proposal.

### **13 Conclusion and recommendation**

14 This is a report updating members of the Committee. The Committee will be informed once the final agreement has been reached with SCC Property Services.

Date: 26 February 2015

Lead officers: James Taylor

Telephone: 01483 517538

Email: james.taylor@surreycc.gov.uk

### Key Issue

To approve the BCA operating unpowered pleasure boats for hire at the Canal Centre at Mytchett.

### Summary

The Basingstoke Canal Authority (BCA) wish to manage and run the unpowered pleasure boats from the Canal Centre, providing a service to the Canal Centre customers and in turn generating income for the Canal. This would require investment into the business as the BCA does not currently own suitable boats.

### Officer's recommendation

The JMC is asked to:

- a) Approve and authorise the BCA to run the unpowered boat business at the Canal Centre.
- b) Authorise the BCA to purchase the necessary boats and equipment to enable the successful running of the business. This will require a draw on the BCA reserves as an investment to save.

## 1 Introduction & background

- 1.1 For the past eight years John Cale Canal Cruises (JCCC) has operated the boat business at the Canal Centre, however JCCC decided to decline to discuss any revision in licence terms and closed their operation in September 2014.
- 1.2 JCCC had offered rowing boats, pedalos and canoes, which were hired out on half hour or hourly basis.
- 1.3 The boats would be available for hire on weekends, bank holidays and school holidays, starting in April or Easter school holidays (whichever comes sooner) until October. On average this would work out at an estimated 104 trading days for a full season, however taking into consideration bad weather and quiet days it is presumed that a full season is based on 78 operational days.
- 1.4 Operational hours – Waterfront staff would be required to start work from 10am until 5pm. With the boats being made available for hire from 10.30am until 4.30pm, this allows half an hour at either end of the day for boat preparation and to secure the boats at the end of the day.

## 2 Consultation

- 2.1 Both sets of consultants commissioned by Surrey County Council to investigate the economic redevelopment of the Canal Centre recommend that the BCA operate the boat business themselves, as this will be more profitable.
- 2.2 Officers of the Joint Advisory Group gave support to the initial proposal.
- 2.3 Officers from Surrey Heath Borough Council indicated that they might like to discuss expanding such a business to cover a two-site operation jointly with Frimley Lodge Park in the future.

## 3 Discussion

- 3.1 The BCA proposes that this is an opportunity to generate additional income to help support the operation of the Canal.

- 3.2 Running a boating business in-house would ensure complete control of the standard of customer service. Customers would be able to pay by card offering greater flexibility. It could also lead to an increase in shop footfall and therefore potentially increasing secondary spending.
- 3.3 To make the business viable it is advised that the organisation would need a maximum of two years to cover the initial capital costs and to become profitable.
- 3.4 If the boats were to operate at a realistic average of 37.5% capacity the potential gross annual income would be £32,760 (see figure 3). Capacity calculated from 50% occupancy for 78 days based on previous operations at the Centre.
- 3.5 If the BCA was to operate the business it would require an initial capital investment to purchase necessary equipment and storage. The BCA would have ongoing revenue costs in the recruitment of two members of casual staff working on a rota basis. The estimated staffing cost would be £5970 per year (subject to agreed Hampshire County Council (HCC) 1% pay increase).
- 3.6 The pricing structure shown in figure 1 is based on the fees charged by the previous operator. Research indicates that this is in keeping with local competitors.
- 3.7 Waterfront staff will be directly employed by HCC and therefore covered by HCC insurance policy . Detailed Risk Assessments for the business and training plans will be prepared for the operating staff with advice from HCC CCBS Head of Risk.

**Figure 1**

	1 hour (£)	1 hour hire (additional hours) (£)
<b>Rowing boats</b>	<b>14.50</b>	<b>12</b>
<b>Canoes</b>	<b>11.50</b>	<b>10</b>
<b>Pedalos</b>	<b>8.00 ( ½ hr hire)</b>	<b>N/A</b>

#### **4 Financial and value for money implications**

- 4.1 As it has already been stated the BCA have very little equipment that can be used for such a business. Therefore an initial investment of £24000 would be required to enable the business to be fully operational, and will be paid back within two years. Figure 2 shows in detail the required investment.

**Figure 2**

Item	Total cost (£)	Additional info
<b>Storage container</b>	<b>2,000</b>	Including delivery and lock box
<b>Racking</b>	<b>500</b>	
<b>Rowing boats</b>	<b>11,900</b>	4 boats including oars (15ft rowing boats)
<b>Canoes</b>	<b>3,000</b>	4 Canoes including paddles
<b>Pedalos</b>	<b>3,400</b>	4 Pedalos
<b>Paddles</b>	<b>100</b>	Basic paddles for Canoes
<b>Life jackets</b>	<b>700</b>	20 Childrens, 12 Adults
<b>Safety boat</b>	<b>1,100</b>	
<b>Electric engine</b>	<b>1,100</b>	
<b>Wet Vac</b>	<b>200</b>	
<b>Total investment</b>	<b>24,000</b>	

4.2 Figure 3 indicates potential income depending on the number of boats hired on the day (capacity of boats). It is suggested that when taking into account bad weather and quiet days the income generated is likely to be closer to 37.5% capacity.

4.3

**Figure 3**

Capacity of boats	Annual income
25%	£21,840
37.5%	£32,760
50%	£43,680
75%	£65,520

4.4 The annual staffing costs to run the business is estimated at £5,970. This figure is based on 104 operational days. Lunchtimes will be covered by the Visitor Centre assistant who will also be trained to run the service and be fully competent.

4.5 Figure 4 shows the potential income over a five year period. Should the revenue generated be at 37.5% then this would allow the return of the investment back into the reserves and a small profit after year one.

4.6 Replacement costs would be met out of general reserves as necessary with approval from JMC.

**Figure 4**

Payback period	Investment	Staff running costs per year	Potential profit/loss(-) per annum based on level of income			
			25% £	37.5% £	50% £	75% £
	£	£				
<b>1 Year operation</b>	24,000	5,970	-8,130	2,790	13,710	35,550
<b>2 Year operation</b>	0	6,030	15,810	26,730	37,650	59,490
<b>3 Year operation</b>	0	6,090	15,750	26,670	37,590	59,430
<b>4 Year operation</b>	0	6,150	15,690	26,610	37,530	59,370
<b>5 Year operation</b>	0	6,210	15,630	26,550	37,470	59,310
<b>Total profit after 5 years</b>			<b>54,750</b>	<b>109,350</b>	<b>163,950</b>	<b>273,150</b>

4.7 A written quotation of precise fees and costs will be obtained in accordance with HCC’s Procurement procedures should Members approve the principle of the BCA running the business.

**5 Equalities & diversity implications**

5.1 Equalities screening has been conducted in accordance with Hampshire County Council’s policies and procedures.

- 5.2 Offering a variety of boats provides a service to a wide range of ages and abilities, however the activity itself may not be suitable, even with reasonable adjustments, to people with all physical disabilities.
- 5.3 The boat hiring scheme is per hour or half hour and not per person, and therefore does not discriminate against disabled people with able bodied carers. The disabled car parking spaces are situated close to the launching point, with a gentle slope leading to the waterfront area. The service will be continually staffed for safety and waterfront staff will also be able to offer assistance to disabled persons wishing to use the service.
- 5.4 Careful consideration has been given as to whether a hoist for wheelchair users should be purchased, however, this is likely to cost approximately £4500 - around 1/5 of the set up cost for the whole operation. Given previous experience which indicates that there is little demand from wheelchair users it is considered that this is not a reasonable adjustment to the service at the outset – but this decision will be reviewed annually.
- 5.5 The overall assessment of providing an equal service to people with disability is therefore considered to be low.
- 5.6 The hourly charge rate is for hire of the boat and not per person; this enables a family of up to four people to hire a boat for a reasonable cost. There are currently no car parking charges at the Canal Centre and there are good links to public transport – 20 minutes walk from Ash Vale railway station; the impact on low and no income families is therefore considered low.
- 5.7 There are considered to be no other equalities issues.

## **6 Crime & disorder implications**

- 6.1 The boats and equipment will be stored in a secure unit, the Centre has CCTV on-site.
- 6.2 Boats will not be hired to persons who are or appear to be under the influence of drink or drugs.
- 6.3 A refundable deposit will be obtained for every hire which will cover the cost of any damage/loss occurred.

## **7 Conclusion and recommendation**

- 7.1 As stated previously revenue is likely to be closer to income generated at 37.5% capacity which over a five year period amounts to £109,305.
- 7.2 The BCA running the boat business would ensure that all profits go towards the upkeep of the Canal.

## **8 What happens next**

- 8.1 The BCA will obtain written quotes from all suppliers and order equipment.
- 8.2 Recruitment will begin once approval has been given.
- 8.3 The BCA will establish on-site boat management systems.
- 8.4 Risk Assessments will be undertaken and Health and Safety training implemented as required.

**BASINGSTOKE CANAL JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE**  
Date: 19 January 2015



Hampshire  
County Council



Basingstoke  
**Canal**  
— Authority —

## Canal Management Report

Lead Officers: James Taylor / Fiona Shipp

Tel: 01483 517538 / 01252 370073

Email: [james.taylor@surreycc.gov.uk](mailto:james.taylor@surreycc.gov.uk) / [Fiona.shipp@hants.gov.uk](mailto:Fiona.shipp@hants.gov.uk)

### BCA Canal Manager

The BCA Canal Manager reports that:

#### Works

- Rangers have been focusing on getting HLS works completed at Rushmoor Flash. This is a tree felling project part funded by Natural England to increase light to the canal and overall improve the condition of the SSSI. This work is now complete although we plan to carry on with some off-side cutting of vegetation through this area.

#### Events

- Santa Cruises was another astounding success which even brought grandparents from as far away as Manchester to join their grandchildren on the trip. 166 trips were run over 20 days with 1992 spaces available. These sold out within a week of the spaces going on sale with 96% of spaces sold after two days! Net Income £19,812.47. In addition 81 lovely written compliments were received.

#### Staffing

- We are just starting the process of recruiting lock keepers for next season. These will be on temporary seasonal contracts rather than casual contracts allowing us easier staff management and reliability of staffing.
- One of our Rangers Alex Foy has left to start a new Ranger post with Hampshire County Council. He will be missed. His position has been filled by Stephen Bennett who had been covering Sara's maternity leave. Steve started with us a few years ago as one of our first lock keepers and has made himself indispensable every since and thus was well deserving of the post. He comes with many years of previous Ranger experience.
- Sara has now returned from maternity leave and we are very relieved to have her back to fix everything.
- We have had a work experience placement from Sparsholt college working with us for 3 weeks in January

#### Volunteers

- The Tuesday volunteer group have put in new fencing in Pondtail and Reading Rd car park and have started the winter onslaught on vegetation overhanging the canal with sessions already between the River Wey and lock 6 and also in N. Warnborough and at Odiham Castle.
- A tree management workshop was held in November and well received by the 28 volunteers who attended.
- We also held a thank you Christmas dinner for our Tuesday volunteers in December which filled the tearoom with merriment.

- FOAM (friends of ancient monuments) had their annual session up at Odiham Castle bashing back the scrub in the moat.
- We have now held 4 volunteer days (involving over 100 people) at Aldershot in conjunction with the MOD, cutting back vegetation alongside the canal in preparation for the towpath improvement works.

#### **Workboats**

- The weedcutter is in winter dock and undergoing strengthening repairs by the canal society to get her (Millie) ready for next season.
- The Canal Society are currently undertaking a refurbishment of the patrol boat at Ash Lock.

#### **Management Team**

- The winter work programme is now underway with 3 sets of lock gates expected to be replaced by the end of January
- Car Parking charges have been underway since last year at Reading Road car park. I have heard several reports that the car park is half empty most of the time. This is good news indeed and now makes it possible for canal visitors to park and use the canal, which was one of the main aims. We have also received income from those who are using it and this initially will pay back the costs to Hart for installation of the electricity, parking meter etc. We should start to see some additional revenue for the canal in a couple of years' time.
- Liaison on-going with several contractors at the moment over proposed works at Government Road bridge in Aldershot and over towpath improvements throughout Aldershot.
- We have been carrying out a condition survey of embankments on the canal. This is on-going in January and February.
- Another film used the canal as one of its locations back in November, watch out for 'Spaceship'!
- We are currently preparing for a 'Share your Space' campaign to be launched in Woking in April. This has been made possible with grant funding from Local sustainable transport fund (LSTF)

#### **SCC / HCC Strategic Manager**

The Strategic Manager reports that:

#### **Water Strategy**

The **telemetry** project, now being called "Smart Canal", is progressing well and is on track to deliver in the spring. This will be a major safety and water management improvement.

The EA have renewed the water abstraction licence for both back-pumping schemes at the St John's and Woodham flights of locks for a further 12 years. The Woodham licence covers the additional volume requested in 2012.

A depth survey is being procured to assess whether there are areas of Canal which require dredging to return it to its original capacity. This will influence plans to carry out dredging in winter 2015 and in 2016.

## Forward Planning

With the *Service Plan* now at an end work on its replacement – the *Operational Plan* - has commenced. This will be generated using the HCC standard and industry leading site management software CMSi. This will build on the work done to create a geodatabase, and will enable us to plan our work in the medium term much better.

## Risk Management

The Canal Partnership's MoA makes it clear that risk associated with the physical structure of the Canal rests with the owning County Councils. However, in accordance with the requirements of the Audit Commission the appropriate County Council Risk Assessments are reported in *Annexe 1* for the Committee to consider. The principle risks to the partnership, as distinct from the County Councils, are the financial risks in running the BCA.

## Capital works

Major works are planned in the capital programme for this winter in both Counties.

### Hampshire

- **Dogmersfield landslip** – the adjoining landowner has already carried out works on his land, leaving HCC to repair the canal banks and stabilise the whole of the slopes through piling and ground anchors as agreed. HCC consider that planning consent is required for this work. The design for HCC's works is now complete and a works package was tendered with a return date of the end of January. Given that planning consent has not been received, due to resolving issues surrounding ecology, it is becoming increasingly likely that the works will not be completed in their entirety before the boating season commences in April. Engineers are aware of the importance of the navigation being available from April, and are having discussions with the preferred contractor over whether to programme the repair of one side of the cutting in March and early April or whether to postpone the whole works until October.
- HCC Engineering Consultancy have been instructed to carry out repairs to two **culverts** under the Canal which the inspection identified as being in poor condition – some progress has now been made in arranging repairs. Only *Barley Mow* culvert will require the navigation to be closed.
- **Swan Bridge** – HCC engineers have appointed Atkins to report on designs for the replacement of the failing piling and slumping towpath and reinstatement of a suitable depth channel; their report is now overdue, and it seems likely that only a small amount of remedial work to the towpath will be carried out before the Magna Carta celebrations.

### Surrey

- A part time Engineer has now been employed to design and supervise the works, as SCC Highways no longer have staffing capacity to assist the project. This is proving much more cost effective than appointing an external firm of Engineers.
- The **Frimley Lodge Embankment** and towpath repairs at Mytchett are now out to contractors to price.
- A series of defects in the wing walls of **Locks 10, 20, 22, 23 & 26** have been identified as needing priority attention, and have been brought forward out of the 2015/16 programme. These works are currently out for contractors to price, and will need to be completed before the boating season begins in April.

- Further investigation is still required on the Rive Ditch (Woking) and Horsell Sluice outfall culverts.

#### Both counties

- The SCC Engineer is considering alternative approaches to repairing the leaks in **Ash Embankment** as actually carrying out the re-puddling was likely to cause more damage than it solved.
- Packages of work are being priced by contractors for the **tree hazards** identified by the tree survey.

#### Update on Work to Secure the Future of the Canal

- Last year there was a meeting of senior members and officers from both landowning authorities to discuss options for the future of the canal. Both authorities are currently implementing a capital programme, the early elements of which were procured jointly, and which is aimed to respond to both the level of risk associated with the structure and also the backlog of major maintenance. The current investment amounts to £2million from H.C.C with a comparable investment from S.C.C. This capital programme has already been partially delivered, with a further 2 years to run, work will continue to focus on high priority items including: culvert repairs, embankment and towpath erosion repairs. The Canal capital programme is closely monitored and budgets are refined and adjusted as projects are progressed with Engineering advice.
- Both authorities agreed that a sustainable future needs to be secured for the Canal and wanted to undertake an informed options analysis that considered a detailed and practical assessment of available options for the future. An important part of this was seen as securing a comprehensive and comparative valuation of potential options for the future together with their associated risks.
- On that basis both authorities felt it important to secure such an independent and informed options appraisal and to do so in a way that sensibly involved key stakeholders. Consequently following a soft market testing exercise, coupled with a formal tendering process, a specialist inland waterway company was jointly commissioned to undertake that work. The company, JBA Consulting, has extensive experience in this sector and they have now nearly completed their work. The work included a stakeholder consultation exercise as part of the process. There will be a follow up report to the next JMC which highlights the key results and to help inform any subsequent decisions.

Annexe 1

Entry from Hampshire County Council Risk Register

<b>Step 1: Risk title</b>		<b>Step 2: Description of risk</b>				
Breach of Basingstoke Canal		Structural breach of canal would lead to possible major flooding leading to loss of property and a risk to personal injury or loss of life. Biodiversity interests/obligations would also be severely compromised. Structural breaches may arise from a number of causes including overtopping or embankment failure. An annual maintenance programme, together with the current major capital programme are necessary to achieve a rapid steady state whereby revenue funding would be sufficient.				
<b>CCBS Risk template</b>	<b>Date of review</b>		<b>Risk Owner</b>	Jo Heath	<b>Service Risk Manager/Sponsor</b>	John Tickle

<b>Step 3: Type of risk-</b>	Strategic	uncertain future events that could negatively impact the achievement of your service’s vision and strategic objectives.	✓
	Financial	uncertain future events that could negatively impact the financials of the organisation.	✓
	Legal/regulatory	uncertain future events that could negatively impact your service’s ability to comply with the legal / regulatory landscape	
	Commercial	uncertain future events that negatively impact on the commercial or trading activities of the organisation	
	Operational	uncertain future events that could negatively impact the day to day operations of the organisation.	✓
	People	uncertain future events that could negatively impact the staff/ volunteers of the organisation or the people that the organisation interacts with.	✓
	Hazard	- uncertain future events that negatively impact on your organisation, caused by hazard a hazard of some sort.	✓

<b>Step 4: Risk category</b>	Operational- external, or internal factors, or a combination.	Relating to existing operations – both current delivery & building & maintaining capacity & capability	✓
	Project/Programme	Risks created by decisions to pursue new endeavours beyond current capability	
	Strategic -external, or internal factors, or a combination.	Relating to the business drivers for the Department/Service/organisation as a whole	
	Cross Cutting	Risks that affect or depend on other services across the council	✓

**Note:** An embedded control measure is defined as: Full compliant with statutory requirements; comprehensive procedures in place; no other controls considered necessary and on-going monitoring only.

<b>Step 5: What embedded control measures are in place to mitigate this risk ?</b>	<b>1</b>	Reviewed on several occasions in 2013 and 2014 with significant amendments as result of storms on canal. New contract for 24hr emergency cover set up, tested and working well.	<b>Date of next review</b>	Updated 19/09/2014
	<b>2</b>	Clear management structure in place for BCA with support from Basingstoke Canal Society (monthly meetings with BCA and monthly work parties), Volunteer lengthsman scheme almost whole canal length (walk section once /week) and volunteer workparties (one day/week).		19/09/2014
	<b>3</b>	As Listed in asset management plan. Survey regime in place for assets. Asset management plan currently being updated in 2014 and will now be version 5.		19/09/2014
	<b>4</b>	The BCA holds reserves which are drawn upon if there are any unforeseen changes to revenue expenditure such as a structural failure. The level of reserves meets the requirement to maintain the reserves at a minimum of 25% of annual expenditure, the value deemed to be the suggested minimum to be held for the long term financial stability of a body of this size. Any planned drawn on reserves must be approved by JMC		19/09/2014

		Only required if reserves level falls below 25% of annual expenditure.		
	5	Inspection and monitoring programme in place. Monitoring levels below engineering annual inspection rely upon Ranger staff and a developing volunteer lengthsman scheme. Risk management meetings every 2 months to monitor progress on this. Review as part of meetings to ensure BCA is adhering to the inspection regime in the AMP.		19/09/2014
	6	Policy and procedures in place for safe operational and construction work including inspection and monitoring regime.		
	7			
	8			
	9			

**MATRIX Table 1- impact scores (I)**

Impact is assessed in terms of its effect on **Financial/Costs, Business /Service and Reputation**. Although each of these is noted, the highest score is used to denote the overall impact.

	Impact score (severity levels) and examples of descriptors				
	1	2	3	4	5
<b>Domains</b>	<b>Negligible</b>	<b>Minor</b>	<b>Moderate</b>	<b>Major</b>	<b>Catastrophic</b>
<b>Finance/ Costs</b>	Costing less than £100,000	Costing between £100,000 and £1 million	Costing between £1M and £5M	Costing between £5M and £10M	Costing > £10M

<b>Business/ Service</b>	Business objectives/projects	Barely noticeable reduction in scope or quality	Minor reduction in quality/scope	Reduction in scope or quality	Failure to meet secondary objectives	Failure to meet primary objectives
------------------------------	------------------------------	---	----------------------------------	-------------------------------	--------------------------------------	------------------------------------

	Service/ business interruption	Little or no impact on service delivery	Minimal service disruption having limited impact on service delivery	Moderate service disruption having adverse impact on service delivery	Major service disruption having serious impact on service users	Major service disruption having serious impact on the public Permanent loss of service or facility
	Quality of service	Peripheral element of treatment or service suboptimal	Overall treatment or service suboptimal	Treatment or service has significantly reduced effectiveness	Non-compliance with national standards with significant risk to clients/patients if unresolved	Totally unacceptable level or quality of treatment/service
<b>Reputation</b>	Adverse publicity/ reputation	Rumours  Potential for public concern	Local media coverage – short-term reduction in public confidence  Elements of public expectation not being met	Local media coverage – long-term reduction in public confidence	National media coverage with <3 days service well below reasonable public expectation	National media coverage with >3 days service well below reasonable public expectation. MP concerned (questions in the House)  Total loss of public confidence

**Projects and change programmes** . When assessing impact for projects and change programmes, there is alternative impact guide for Finance/Costs . In addition, it is more useful to consider the possible effect on delivery timescales rather than reputation:

<b>Finance/ Costs</b>	Small loss / Insignificant cost increase	<5 per cent over project budget	5–10 per cent over project budget	10–25 per cent over project budget	>25 per cent over project budget
<b>Time</b>	Slight Slippage against internal targets	Slight slippage against key milestones or published targets	Delay affects key stakeholders & causes loss of confidence in the enterprise	Failure to meet deadlines in relation to priority outcomes	Delay jeopardizes viability of the project/ programme or enterprise

### Table 2 Likelihood score (L)

What is the likelihood of the risk occurring?

<b>Likelihood score</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>4</b>	<b>5</b>
<b>Descriptor</b>	<b>Rare</b>	<b>Unlikely</b>	<b>Possible</b>	<b>Likely</b>	<b>Almost certain</b>

<b>Frequency</b> How often might it/does it happen	This will probably never happen/recur  (0 to 5% chance of occurrence)	Do not expect it to happen/recur but it is possible it may do so  (6 to 20% chance of occurrence)	Might happen or recur occasionally  (21 to 50% chance of occurrence)	Will probably happen/recur but it is not a persisting issue  (51 to 80% chance of occurrence)	Will undoubtedly happen/recur, possibly frequently  (81 to 100% chance of occurrence)
---	---	---	--	---	---

**Please note:**

The highest of the 3 Impact scores (Finance, Business, Reputation) is multiplied by the Likelihood score to ascertain a final score for the risk and the overall risk level.

<b>Step 6: Assess the current risk score</b>	<b>Impact (I) Highest score</b>	5	<b>Finance/Costs</b>	5	<b>Business/ Services</b>	5	<b>Reputation</b>	4
	<b>Likelihood (L)</b>	2↓						
	<b>Total score I x L =</b>	5 X 2 = 10↓	Low 1-7 Annual review		Medium- 8-14 Biannual review	✓	High 15-21 Biannual review	

<b>Step 7: If the risk is medium/high or very high, what control measures can you put in place</b>	<b>1</b>	The Asset Management Plan must set funding priorities, and the resulting Action Plan requires monitoring and reporting systems to be in place. Currently being reviewed with regular asset inspections in accordance with AMP.	<b>Date for implementation</b>	
	<b>2</b>	Prioritised £2m capital programme of works and further survey programme now underway. Tree survey for full canal completed September 2014. Urgent works		

to lower this risk further?		have been attended to. List of more minor works to complete as part of a programme. 2014/15		
	3		Date for implementation	
	4		Date for implementation	
	5		Date for implementation	
	6		Date for implementation	

Step 8: Will the additional controls reduce the risk score further ?	Yes		No- please explain why it will not reduce the score.			Date of next review		
Step 9: Current action plan In place?	No		Yes	✓	Location of plan eg Hantsfile reference	<a href="#">Canal Risk Management Action Plan - live</a>	Date of last review	
Step 10: Have you got a Business Continuity/ Resilience plan?	No		Yes	✓	Location of plan eg BCM database, Hantsfile reference	BCM Database	Date of last review	May 2014
Step 11: Is there anything on the horizon that may change this risk? Eg Change in legislation.	No	✓	Yes		Please give details		Date of next review	

**Step 12:**

**Record of any further action required.**

Date of review	Details	Actions	Responsible person	Completion date

<i>Risk Ref.</i>	Risk	Date added	Residual level when added	Movement Date	Movement Direction	Current residual risk level
<i>ENV 2</i>	Failure of the Basingstoke Canal structure leads to damage and potential loss of life	Oct-13	High	Mar-14	↓	Low

<i>ENV 5</i>	Lack of effective development plan for Basingstoke Canal leads to maintenance plans being unsustainable in the longer term	Oct-13	Medium	–	–	Medium
--------------	--	--------	--------	---	---	--------

## REPORT TO JOINT MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE – FEBRUARY 2015

### 1. Work parties

The Society's work parties have been undertaking a variety of tasks throughout the autumn and winter. These have included:



- the cutting up and removal of felled trees at the land slip at Dogmersfield (*left*). The logs are being sold in order to raise funding for the Society, and to date, most have been disposed of.

It is hoped that approximately £3000 will be received for the timber.



- Laying wood chip along a previously muddy permitted path on the Malmesbury estate (*left*), adjacent to the western tunnel portal



- the delivery of a mud barge previously moored at Ash Lock (*left*) to a contractor on the R Wey. The barge was unsuitable for use on the canal and has now been sold to the contractor.



- the clearance of over-hanging vegetation mainly from the offside of the canal between Odiham and Greywell (*left*). This clearance is necessary in order to provide a clear passage for the John Pinkerton and other boats navigating to the western end of the canal.



- and the recovery of a patrol boat owned by the BCA that has languished in the Greywell tunnel mouth for many years. The Society's volunteers will be undertaking a programme of restoration of the boat.

Since the last Society report, around 160 man-days effort have been expended on Canal-related works, or £11.6K Equivalent Value in Kind.

For the whole of 2014 the totals were 730 man-days or £55.3K EVIK, and for the period 2011-2014, 2900 man-days and £224K EVIK.

## 2. Summer work camp

The Society is organizing a week-long work camp in July for a party of volunteers from the Waterway Recovery Group (WRG). While still at the planning stage, it is currently envisaged that the main task will be the extension of the mooring near the end of the Farnborough Airport main runway that was installed by the Society in 2012. This mooring is used by visiting boats in Farnborough Air Show years, and also by the John Pinkerton to take guests to the show. The trip boat operation is an important source of funding for the Society. It is hoped that the WRG volunteers can again be accommodated at HCC's Runways End Activity Centre which is near to the work site and provides an excellent facility for the hard-working volunteers.

## 3. Projects

The provision of better facilities for users of the canal has always been a priority for the Society. Projects which the Society has been actively pursuing include:

- the improvement of Ash Wharf (*below*). Currently the wharf is in poor condition with collapsing piling, an unkempt grassed area, no mooring bollards or seats and no boating facilities. The Society is hoping to work with the BCA, SCC, Guildford Borough Council, Ash Parish Council and local residents and land owners in a scheme to address all these issues.



- Woking quay and replica canal barge. The Society is working with Woking Borough Council and Surrey County Council on a new wharf in the town centre and a replica of a Basingstoke Canal barge which will be positioned next to The Lightbox. The barge will provide the opportunity to inform the public about the history, heritage and restoration of the canal. It will also have an important educational role.
- Hatchwood Farm boat basin in Odiham. The Society has now secured the support of Odiham Parish Council to the provision of a boat basin adjacent to the Hatchwood Farm housing development near Colt Hill. The basin will provide much needed moorings at the western end of the canal.

Other ideas for the Colt Hill area include a visitor centre and a footbridge linking the car park to a new community area to be established by the Parish Council.

#### **4. Magna Carta boat rally.**

Plans are now in hand for a boat rally at Colt Hill, Odiham on 24<sup>th</sup> May 2015 as part of the Magna Carta 800 celebrations. It is hoped to attract about 30 boats to the rally which will provide an excellent opportunity to showcase the canal.

Philip Riley  
Chairman  
The Basingstoke Canal Society  
17.01.15