

Newlyn Pier and Harbour Commissioners

Meeting of the Advisory Board held at 1p.m. on Wednesday 15 July 2020 at Seafood Cornwall Hub

In attendance: Nick Howell (Vice Chairman) (NH)
Godfrey Adams (attending as a substitute for Craig Tonkin)
Simon Cadman
Paul Durkin (PD)
Laurence Hartwell (LH)
John Lambourn (JL)

Also in attendance: Andrew Watts (AW)

	<p><u>Questions from Members of the Public</u></p> <p>This was a closed meeting to comply with COVID-19 safety restrictions. No questions from the public had been submitted in advance of the meeting.</p>	
1	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Daisy May, Paul Trebilock, Andrew Pascoe, Tom McClure and Fr Keith Owen (KO). Godfrey Adams attended as a substitute..</p>	
2	<p><u>Declarations of Interest</u></p> <p>JL declared a personal interest in any items on the agenda in connection with the harbour as a boat owner, the owner of a business premise situated adjacent to the harbour and which benefited from a delineated right of way over the harbour to the Strand.</p>	
3	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>It was RESOLVED that the minutes from the meeting held on 20 May 2020 were a true and accurate representation.</p>	

4	<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>There were no matters arising that were not already items on the Agenda for discussion at the meeting.</p>	
5	<p><u>Committee Procedure and Terms of Reference</u></p> <p><u>Website</u> The minutes of the last meeting stated that the NPHC should be encouraged to post the AB’s Auction paper on their website, but (although it was passed to them on 4 June) this has not happened; the details of the AB on the NPHC website are also out of date. It was agreed that it was vital for stakeholders and the general public to be kept informed of what the AB was discussing, and, given the costs of the AB creating its own website, it should be part of the NPHC website; but that it was unreasonable to expect the Harbour Master (HM) to handle this in addition to his other responsibilities.</p> <p>LH has been discussing with the HM the possibility of having authorisation to go directly to the NPHC’s website builders.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the NPHC should be asked to give this authorisation by the end of the month.</p> <p><u>E-mails for Chair and Vice-Chair</u> It has already been agreed in principle that the Chair and Vice-Chair of the AB should have dedicated e-mails on the NPHC website.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the NPHC should be asked to instruct the NPHC’s website builders to set these up by the end of the month.</p> <p><u>Terms of office</u> The AB has been operating on the terms of the Harbour Revision Order, but this has no details on terms of office or remedies for non-attendance.</p> <p>Rather than introduce a formal procedure for non-attendance, the AB agreed that the Chair should have an informal conversation with any AB member missing three consecutive meetings.</p>	<p>LH</p> <p>LH</p>
6	<p><u>Harbour Strategy 2050</u></p> <p><u>Response to the Working Groups’ Presentation to the NPHC</u> The AB has not presented operational issues to the NPHC at this stage. The new scheme, however, has incorporated solutions to some of the current complaints (draught, crew facilities, fuel etc.), and harbour users should be encouraged to refer management issues directly to the NPHC</p>	

<p>rather than the AB in the first instance. (Making it clear that operational matters are outside the AB's remit is another reason for updating the AB's pages on the NPHC website.)</p> <p>KO, NH and PD presented the development concepts to the NPHC in a Zoom meeting and received a very positive response, and the AB was asked to continue its work. The NPHC agreed that everything was "still on the table".</p> <p><u>Update of Sandy Cove and Newlyn Harbour Concepts</u></p> <p>The AB considered in detail the updated plans for the Sandy Cove development, and noted that they resolved the two main operational issues of inadequate draught and lack of space quayside.</p> <p>PD reported that he had been speaking to Cornwall Council, in recognition of the fact that the development would need an access road. Their immediate feedback was that developing Newlyn as a commercial harbour would enable Penzance to concentrate on the tourist and leisure industry, which would allow both locations to concentrate on their strengths.</p> <p>Discussions with the council, as with MDL and NPHC, have been informal so far, and it was now up to the NPHC to pursue the plans and allow them to gain their own momentum.</p> <p>The NPHC has asked the AB to keep the plans confidential at the current stage. The AB agreed that this was appropriate.</p> <p>IT WAS RESOLVED that the plans presented at the meeting represent the recommendations of the AB as a whole, and should be given to the NPHC for their consideration and for them to take forward.</p> <p>This did not, however, mean that the AB was not open to discussions about prioritisation, phasing of the work, and so forth, and the NPHC should be invited to refer any such questions back to the AB for its consideration..</p> <p><u>Feedback and suggestions for future workshops</u></p> <p>The AB discussed the <i>Comités Locales des Pêches</i> in France and Belgium, which are an important part of the management of harbours. More to the point, they would enable the NPHC to show that stakeholders are on board with any proposed developments and support any funding applications. It was recognised that it was important for Newlyn to speak with one voice, and the AB was the first stage in this process.</p>
--

7	<p><u>Discussion on Harbour management issues</u></p> <p>While operational issues are not considered part of the AB's remit, the following concerns were raised during the meeting:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">● It is not enough for the NPHC to resolve issues (such as the water supply) if they do not tell people that they have been resolved;● The NPHC website does not contain information about the new Harbour Commissioners and their expertise; and● Trust in the AB may be increased if the NPHC could be shown to be acting in response to its recommendations, which could include operational matters. <p>The AB did not, however, make any recommendations on these points except in so far as already covered.</p>	
8	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>There was no other business, and the meeting closed at 2.55 p.m.</p>	
	<p>The next meeting will be held on Wednesday 16 September 2020.</p>	