



Record of the February Committee Meeting

Held in the Centenary Room on 5 February 2020

1) Present

Conal Grier, Commodore [and Chair] (CG)
David Nixon, Vice Commodore (DN)
Richard Davis, Rear Commodore, Fishing/Motor Boating (RD)
John Garlick, Rear Commodore, Sailing (JG)
Mike Tennuci, Rear Commodore, Stores (MT)
Paul Walker, Rear Commodore, Social (PW)
Dave Casson, Hon. Treasurer (DC)
Mike Harvey, Health and Safety Officer (MH)
Chris Kershaw, Hon. Secretary (CK)
Peter Evans (PE)
Peter (“Perry”) Mason (PM)
Bob Spendley (BS)

2) Apologies for absence

Torsten Richter

3) Approval of the Minutes

Corrections having made to the provisional draft at the behest of two members of the committee, the Minutes, as now offered, were approved and signed by the Commodore

4) Members

a) New Membership applications

- i) RD had interviewed Shane Hackling. The latter wishes to join the club to pursue an interest in sea fishing. He has no boat. RD said that he had explained the various criteria for joining – work requirements etc and the applicant seems content. The application was approved.
- ii) It was noted that the application of Nathan Pinder had still not been corrected. This is purely a technicality and will be dealt with in due course.

b) Resignations

- i) None

c) Members’ Requests/Observations

- i) CK mentioned an email from John Barnes on the subject of, as the latter saw it, the proliferation of forms to be completed. CG commented that much of the information required is in the way of “due diligence” and argued that there was

nothing irrelevant on the form in question. MT commented that John had expressed himself to be fed up with filling in forms! CG said that it was vital to have confirmation of ownership (of all and any property kept on club grounds) and insurance; these are critical. It was not felt necessary to respond directly.

5) Reports

a) Commodore

- i) With regard to the coming AGM, CG observed that, while we had a fair response to the invitation to propose and second applications for the positions on the Committee, there were a number of places still vacant – in particular, with regard to sub-committees. DN commented that in respect of sub-committees, some confusion had been created by their inclusion on the board; custom had been for the chair of the respective sub-committee (himself/herself a member of the main committee) to invite members to join the relevant sub-committee. DC thought similarly. CG countered by saying that he thought the latter process could be seen as undemocratic and invited the criticism that the club was run by a coterie. BS suggested that the idea of giving members the chance to put themselves forward openly would potentially ease the process of making up the sub-committees, basically supporting CG's innovation.
- ii) Status of Treasurer – CG said that he had been contemplating the importance of the Treasurer's position and wondered whether the post should be elevated to that of, or equivalent to Flag Officer and in addition, in view of the complexity of the role, whether it should remain subject to the normal rules of re-election. The matter was discussed, with the expression of differing views, but generally, while the theoretical benefits of continuity were acknowledged and indeed, by historical precedent, where the office has been held by one individual for a number of years, the consensus was that the *status quo* should prevail – added to which, DC said that he would not be prepared to take on the role with its additional responsibilities, as outlined.
- iii) Levy and exemption on the basis of health conditions – by which, CG explained, in response to a question from BS, he means chronic, medically recognised infirmities. At present, the Rules require members to re-apply annually for exemption from the work levy. The subject provoked some discussion, but eventually it was agreed that the rule should be changed; however, since this is constitutional, it would have to be put to the members. The matter is to be included in the agenda for the AGM.
- iv) **Treasurer on items to note for AGM**
 - (1) DC had been looking at expenditure which the club should anticipate – for example, the gangway to the pontoon is in need of replacement for which he has obtained a quotation (for a slightly modified design; he feels that it should be wider) which was c £9k. This would be galvanised steel. However, an aluminium version could be acquired for c £6.5k (*F1 Precision* – an Island

based company). He thought the aluminium option preferable]. He next specified the concrete ramp, as mentioned at the last meeting; he has had a quote for £1,250.00. CG remarked that this is a H & A issue and must therefore be a priority. RD observed that the roof of South Store is leaking. And it was to the South Store that DC referred next, in so far as the distribution board needs attention. Currently, the electricity for the South Store is led from the old Centre Store and the link is not really up to scratch. He had in mind a complete re-wiring including replacing the main distribution board – for which he estimated just under £6K would be needed, albeit, this is an old quotation, but which would serve as a guide when budgeting. PW noted that the wiring trench is not deep enough. Also, some work was required to support the floor in Centre Store.

(2) CG suggested that the above was important information for the AGM. BS suggested that we would be prudent to conduct, as it would be said in surveying language – a “Survey of Dilapidations” and in addition to that some provision for planned preventative maintenance. RD said that we really did need someone to take control of a schedule of maintenance, as suggested by BS. DN said that he would look into this.

(3) CG interjected at this point to mention that he had had a conversation with the deputy Harbour Master (Ed Walker) in connection with a meeting to be held tomorrow between the Harbour Master and his team and ourselves (CG, DC and JG) and has sent them a “heads up”. Ed wished to make it clear that ECSC would not be expected to buy any of the intended fabric – i.e. piles and pontoons (indeed, we would not be allowed to incorporate any of our own equipment into the new development); they (CHC) will buy and lease back to the club. D pontoon would be kept unserviced, but would be connected to the hammerhead. Our pontoon would be replaced f.o.c. (we would just be liable to the Crown Commission for their annual dues.) A long pontoon would thus be available to the club. PW asked – where do they intend to bring in the services, where they are to be supplied? Apparently, this will be at the dolphin to the north. DC noted that the CHC will have to undertake dredging; they have an obligation to maintain the navigation. He stressed that we would not own the pontoon. Clearly the policy of the powers that be is to control the infrastructure within the river in order to be in a position to control its physical condition.

b) Vice Commodore

i) “Disabled” W.C and club’s disability statement - DN thought that we should proceed, if financially viable. CG said that we should try to put together some figures – even if only to enable a rough estimate to be made. CG also added that he had heard that the signs were on the way to us (H & A etc – as discussed hitherto) DN said that as regards some sort of declaration he had drafted a short

“non-actionable” statement, which we do not have on the club’s records at the moment. The question as to whether we have a legal obligation to make certain changes to our house hinges on whether we are deemed to be an association or a service provider, the main test of which depends upon the answer to the question – “Can anyone join the club?” In any event, he went on to say, he felt that there was a moral imperative to be inclusive and hence, we should invite ideas with regard to the said W.C. BS said that he felt some of the items already discussed this evening should take priority. DN suggested and formally proposed that we make the statement, as drafted on the website and work on, as time allows, aspirational plans for the necessary work; CG seconded the proposal, which was agreed. On the same broad subject, JG mentioned the issue of fitness to serve on the *Danny H*. The discretion is with John Barnes and it was observed that the safety consideration should override equal opportunity, both for the sake of the yachtsmen and women those on board the *Danny H* were trying to safeguard and those on board the *Danny H* itself.

- ii) Weekend work parties – here, the thinking behind the proposal was that the introduction of organised work at weekends would better enable full time employed members to fulfil their obligations. Specific tasks would have to be identified. CG thought that it was worth a trial – we should adopt a “suck and see” approach. DN finished his comments on this subject by saying that we needed a good project to give the idea some impetus.
- iii) Associate Membership – DN introduced a revised version of his proposal. Each Associate Member would pay a levy, annually in advance and the relevant age and marital status related fee. DC said that he was not moved to alter his previously expressed view on the subject and CG thought that CHC would be uncomfortable with people who would not be deemed full members of the Club having access to pontoons etc. DC and PW adding that people should just join as ordinary members. The idea was not put to a vote – DN withdrew the proposal. Group Membership, particularly with UKSA remains open to further discussion.
- iv) Proposal to dispose of unused Club assets – in particular, the old tractor and the RHIB. It turns out that the old tractor had been used fairly recently and DC commented that it is a back up if nothing else. In the case of the RHIB JG suggested that it might have some purpose if we realise the ambition to hold a dinghy regatta and suggested that we “hold” on this suggestion for the moment – particularly since, it transpires, we have had the offer of a substantial outboard from the GKN Motor boating club. Apparently, John Barnes thinks that it (the engine) is, or can be rendered serviceable.
- v) Organised cruises in the coming year – DN said that the Marchwood advance booking had been made, anticipating ten boats. The MMA was expanding its activities.

- c) **Hon. Secretary**
 - i) CK mentioned that SCRA had requested details of our race programme; JG replied –“done”.
 - d) **Rear Commodore, Stores**
 - i) MT said that the applications for onshore storage had been issued, but only about half returned to date. He will have a word with Karen tomorrow to follow up. PW commented that some people are responding on line, which is not what is wanted.
 - e) **Rear Commodore, Sailing**
 - i) JG said that it was planned to make the Flying Fifteens a separate class in 2020 – largely to pacify the rest of Class 1 boats, but there are signs that the fleet is growing, which may be justification in itself. The Flying Fifteens would still start with Class 1, but the course would be different.
 - f) **Rear Commodore, Social**
 - i) Nothing to report
 - g) **Rear Commodore, Motor Boats & Fishing**
 - i) RD reported that things were going well; he and Mike had organised a competition on 19th January, which had attracted nine boats, with fourteen fishermen and one Secretary competing. He described some uncertainty over the award of the Heaviest Cod trophy; he had used the trophy donated by Lee Silk for the purpose, but there was some misunderstanding as to the conditions of the competition, which he will clarify and resolve. He noted that the fishermen had planned another competition for the 11th April, which clashed with the Club’s next planned social. He said that some of the fishermen had complained about the lack of notices about their events, in contrast to those issued in respect of other Club events. He was told that the answer is simple – a note to Karen giving her the relevant details with a request to publish it will be sufficient to get the event recognised.
 - h) **Health & Safety**
 - i) MH said that he had spoken to a specialist company representative on the subject of the chemicals we use on the slipway. Apparently, the cleaner we are using decays quite rapidly in the sunlight. He was recommended calcium hypochlorate. DC commented that we should be mindful of what we put into the river. He thought that we should probably be using what the Council use at the Floating Bridge site.
- 6) **Treasurer’s Report**
- a) DC explained some of the entries as follows: - the £25.00 donation was made by a member who had taken some dinghy wheels from the club; £38.00 “Motor Boat and Fish. Income” was in respect of the bait box hire. We had made a profit of £134.00 on the recent paella supper. He explained the £107.87 expenditure against “Cradles & Equipment” as being the cost of a grease gun and grease and he had put the cost

of a battery charger in there as well. (It was noted that there is a fairly new one of those on the Danny H.) We had paid the following subscriptions: -

- i) RYA £330.00
- ii) SCRA £100.00
- iii) Island Sports & Recreational Council £ 5.00

- b) He went on to say that we are now holding less of our reserves in Lloyds Bank; we are using the Barclays account as our contingency fund. As and when the total goes above the level of the government guarantee, we will open another account.
- c) At the moment, the cost of replacing the piles and pontoons which we own would exceed the current reserve; DC thought that the piling would cost in the region of £29k and a further £99k would be needed for the pontoons in their entirety. Allowing such items a further life of ten years, and inflation, using 3% compound interest, we would need c £166k. There is a compelling need to continue to boost the fund. In the meantime, the amount that we pay the Cowes Harbour Commission and Crown Commission has increased substantially.
- d) After various calculations as to the necessary recovery rate he had arrived at a figure of £57.59/m. Our mooring fees (as a generic term) are rounded up to £107.00 for the outer berths, down to £35.00 for a basic mud berth (the rounding being to the nearest £0.50). Each berth has a minimum charge. The increase he was looking for this year involved an 8.8% increase, but since we had not increased the charges last year, the increase was not really as severe as it might seem.
- e) He intend to apply a similar rate of increase for the shore based facilities – yard storage, lockers and the sail storage facility, the latter being newly introduced last year. The take up of the sail store had been far greater than expected and as a result, he feels justified in placing a larger increase on this, which skews the figures the overall percentage increase for the shore based facilities in general. BS mentioned that there had been some grumbles about the disparity of capacity among the lockers. DC felt mildly exasperated – they are cheap enough at £14-00 per annum and although we could, as BS facetiously suggested, measure the cubic capacity of each and every one, we will not be doing so!
- f) Recently, Mike and his team had measured the length of every boat on our moorings and currently in the yard. In the yard, charges are based on a calculation involving both length and breadth and on the water; the measurement is of overall length, including bow rollers (but not anchors) and outboard motors in their lowered position. Charges would be based on this review and there had been some “revisions”. He also noted that they had discovered that some of the shore based boats which had been declared as tenders were large enough to substantially exceed our declared limit for the size of a tender, which is a maximum of 4m²; some should have been registered as dinghies.
- g) A lengthy discussion then took place on the calculation of each owner’s invoice. WebCollect, PW explained, can only charge in whole units and for accuracy, if we are

charging to the nearest half meter, the charge per meter would be entered at half the rate/m. Karen can do the full range of calculations on WebCollect quite quickly, provided this is adhered to. DC expressed himself unhappy with what he saw as this limitation in the system. BS suggested that we should consistently and openly round up to the nearest half meter. CG commented that there could be an element of perceived unfairness, but as BS argued, while this is the case, the sums involved are relatively small and at least the method is understood.

7) There being no other business, the meeting was declared closed.

8) **Time and Date of next meeting**

a) 1900 hrs, Wednesday, 4 March 2020

Meeting Closed at 21:00 hours