

**NOT FOR PUBLICATION**



**Papers for a meeting of the  
WASH FISHERIES SUB-COMMITTEE**

**to be held at  
EIFCA Offices  
6 North Lynn Business Village, Bergen Way,  
King's Lynn, PE30 2JG  
on  
24<sup>th</sup> March 2026  
at  
1030 hours**

### Vision

The Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority will lead, champion and manage a sustainable marine environment and inshore fisheries, by successfully securing the right balance between social, environmental and economic benefits to ensure healthy seas, sustainable fisheries and a viable industry.



Meeting: **Wash Fisheries Sub-Committee**

Date: 24 March 2026

Time: 1030hrs

Venue: EIFCA Offices, 6 North Lynn Business Village, Bergen Way, King's Lynn  
PE30 2JG

### Revised Agenda

- 1 Election of a Chair of the sub-committee - *Clerk*
- 2 Welcome by the Chair
- 3 Apologies for absence - *Chair*
- 4 Election of Vice-Chair of the sub-committee - *Chair*
- 5 Declaration of Members' interests - *Chair*

### Action Items

- 6 To receive and approve as a true record, minutes of the Wash Fisheries Sub-Committee Meeting held on 11 April 2023.
- 7 *To resolve that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for items 5 to on the grounds that it involves the disclosure of Information relating to the financial or business affairs of any particular person (including the authority holding that information), and it involves the disclosure of information which is likely to reveal the identity of an individual which is exempt information as defined in paragraphs 2 & 3 of Schedule 12A of the Act.*
- 8 Wash Cockle and Mussel Permit Application 1 - ACO
- 9 Wash Cockle and Mussel Permit Application 2 - ACO
- 10 Wash Cockle and Mussel Permit Application 3 - ACO
- 11 Wash Aquaculture Application - ACO
- 12 Any other urgent business

*To consider any other items which the Chair is of the opinion are matters of urgency by reason of special circumstances which must be specified*

Julian Gregory  
Chief Executive Officer  
Date: 9 March 2026

## Vision

The Eastern Inshore Fisheries and Conservation Authority will lead, champion and manage a sustainable marine environment and inshore fisheries, by successfully securing the right balance between social, environmental and economic benefits to ensure healthy seas, sustainable fisheries and a viable industry.



## Wash Fisheries Sub-Committee

A meeting of the Wash Sub-Committee took place at the EIFCA Offices in King's Lynn on 11<sup>th</sup> April 2023 at 1000 hours.

### Members Present:

Cllr P Skinner	Sub-Committee Chair	Lincolnshire County Council
Mr L Mogford	Sub-Committee Vice Chair	MMO Appointee
Cllr T Adams		Norfolk County Council
Cllr M Chenery of Horsbrugh		Norfolk County Council

### Eastern IFCA Officers Present:

Jon Butler	Head of Operations (Deputy Clerk)
James Teasdale	Project Officer
Jodi Hammond	Minute Taker

### WSC23/01 Election of Chair and Vice-Chair

Cllr Skinner was put forward to take on the role of Chairman, there were no other nominations.

**It was Resolved to elect Cllr Skinner to the position of Chairman**

**Proposed: Cllr Chenery of Horsbrugh**

**Seconded: Mr Mogford**

**All Agreed**

**As there was only one nomination for the role of Vice Chair it was Resolved to appoint Mr Mogford to the post.**

**Proposed: Cllr Adams**

**Seconded: Cllr Skinner**

**All Agreed**

### WSC23/02 Apologies for Absence

Apologies for absence were received from, Cllr Coupland (LCC), Messrs Bowell and Copeland (MMO Appointees)

### WSC23/03 Declaration of Members' Interests

There were no amendments to those Declarations of Interest already recorded.

## **WSC23/04 Summary of Transition Process & Objectives**

Project officer Teasdale briefed members on the process that had been followed to arrive at the current position. Members were reminded the objective was part of the transition from the WFO 1992 to the Wash Cockle and Mussel Byelaw 2021. The element being discussed was management of access to the cockle and mussel fisheries in The Wash. To enable a smooth transition the Access Policy included a process to cover the move from a Licensing system to becoming a permit system under the new byelaw.

A large part of the process was the applicants' ability to prove they were the beneficial owner of a vessel, which was intended to remove the ability to 'rent out' a licence.

Phase 1 of the process applied to those applicants who held an Entitlement at the point the WFO 1992 expired. The majority of applications received included a good level of evidence to support the application.

Phase 2 was for applicants who were not Entitlement holders to whom a points system was applied on which allocation of permits would be based. Members were provided with the basis on which points would be allocated.

Following allocation of permits under Phases 1 and 2 there would be an Appeals Process for any applications which had not been successful. Whilst there was a preferred upper limit to the number of permits available if the Appeals panel felt there was a very strong case to allocate a permit and none were available an additional permit could be allocated. The Appeals Panel would comprise 3 members who had not been part of the Wash Fisheries sub-committee decision and the CEO would undertake the role of Clerk.

**Members Agreed to Note the contents of the report and presentation.**

## **WSC23/05 Resolution**

***Members Resolved that under Section 100(A)(4) of the Local Government Act 1972, the public be excluded from the meeting for items 6 & 7 on the grounds that they involve the likely disclosure of exempt information as defined in Schedule 12A of the Act.***

***Proposed: Mr Mogford***

***Seconded: Cllr Chenery***

## **WSC23/06 Phase 1 Applications**

Members were advised of the evidence provided by applicants and the process applied when working through the evidence. Not all applications were clear due to the complex nature of fishing businesses, consequently the applications were put into three categories after the evidence was examined. The categories were 'strongly recommended', 'low evidence' and 'contested applications'. In order for members to make a decision a summary of each application was provided for their consideration.

It was noted that some vessels appeared twice, members were advised that some processors held multiple entitlements and claim to be the beneficial owner whilst the individuals listed as skippers were also claiming to be the beneficial owner.

Members considered each application summary of the 46 which fell under the 'strongly recommended' category. Project Officer Teasdale presented a revised paper in relation to one of these applications and made members aware of additional evidence having been received subsequent to the submission of the original paper to members. Having carefully considered each application summary, it was agreed to issue a permit to 45 of them. It was noted there were extenuating circumstances attached to the remaining applicant so the decision was made to ask for more evidence which would be considered at a future sub-committee meeting. Members were aware this may affect fishing opportunity for the individual, but it was possible to grant a dispensation to fish so the individual was not stopped from fishing until a sub-committee could be convened.

In the 'low evidence' category there were two applications, both of which were well known members of the fishing industry. Having considered the evidence that had been provided as well as Officer knowledge of the individuals it was agreed to issue both with a permit.

The 'contested applicants' category contained 3 applications where another applicant had applied as the beneficial owner of the same vessel in Phase 2. All three Phase 1 applications had not produced sufficient evidence to support the owner being a genuine beneficial owner. The Sub-Committee were shown supporting letters that had been submitted along with these applications. Project Officer Teasdale also brought a corrected paper for one application in this category, and made members aware of the remaining error therein being the recommendation of a direct referral to the Appeals Sub-Committee, which was not possible under the Transition Policy. The replacement paper instead recommended to not grant on the basis of lack of evidence.

It was agreed not to grant permits to these three applications.

Considering there had been 61 'active Entitlements in place when the WFO 1992 expired and this process had allocated 47 permits plus 1 held in abeyance, this left 13 permits to be allocated to maintain the level of exploitation that was in place under the WFO 1992.

#### **Members Resolved**

- **To Note the recommendations at Appendices A, B and C and supporting rationale;**
- **To Decide that the evidence to support per each application at Appendix A, B and C was satisfactory to grant eligibility, with the exception of one which would be reconsidered at a future sub-committee meeting.**
- **To Decide the maximum number of permits to be issuable under Phase 2 would be 13, with one remaining for the disputed applicant in Phase 1**

**Proposed: Cllr Adams**

**Seconded: Cllr Chenery of Horsbrugh**

**All Agreed**

*Summary in accordance with Section 100(c)(2) of the Local Government Act 1972*

#### **WSC23/07 Phase 2 Applications**

Phase 2 of the process was open to all fishers regardless of whether they had previously held an entitlement. In this phase there were 17 applicants but only 13 permits available. Project Officer Teasdale provided members with an overview of how points had been allocated to each application, which subsequently determined their placing in terms of being recommended for a permit.

A summary of each Application in this phase were also provided for members consideration, and again divided into three categories.

The first category 'uncontested beneficial owners' had a total of 8 applicants within it, all of whom had provided significant evidence that they were the genuine beneficial owner of the vessel.

The second category was 'Nominated Representative Applications'. Project Officer Teasdale provided members with a revised paper within this category and made members aware of additional evidence having been provided subsequent to the original being provided to members. All of these had appeared as a nominated representative on licences issued under the WFO 1992. Some had been on a waiting list for an Entitlement under the WFO and all could be evidenced as having fished within The Wash fisheries as nominated representatives.

The final category 'other Phase 2 applications' had four applicants still to be considered. All applicants could provide evidence of fishing in some capacity within the Wash fisheries. The points allocated to each of them ranged between +10 to -11 which did not put them in a position to contest any of the applications considered under the previous two categories.

Members decided the 13 highest scoring applications should be allocated the remaining 13 permits. Leaving one permit for consideration at a future meeting and three with sufficient points to be offered to be added to the register of interests for future permits.

**Member Resolved**

- **To Note** the recommendations at Appendices A, B and C and supporting rationale;
- **To Decide** that the evidence to support each application was satisfactory to grant the proposed points;
- **To Decide** there were no permit applications under Phase 2 which needed to be deferred to a future meeting

**Proposed: Mr Mogford**

**Seconded: Cllr Chenery of Horsbrugh**

**All Agreed.**

**WSC23/08 Any Other Business**

No other matter of business had been notified to the Deputy Clerk.

There being no further items of business to discuss the meeting closed at 1135 hours.