

Newlyn Pier and Harbour Commissioners

Meeting of the Advisory Board held at 2:30 p.m. on Wednesday 18 November 2020 via Zoom

In attendance: Fr Keith Owen (Chairman) (KO)
Nick Howell (Vice Chairman) (NH)
Simon Cadman
Paul Durkin
Laurence Hartwell (LH)
John Lambourn (JL)
Jason Ward (JW)

Also in attendance: Andrew Watts

	<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, Andrew Pascoe and Paul Trebilcock.</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>The following amendment was made to the minutes from the meeting held on 16 September 2020:</p> <p>The word “discrete” should be removed from item (6) to avoid confusion.</p> <p>Once this amendment was made, it was RESOLVED that the minutes 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</u></p> <p><u>Website</u></p> <p>LH reported that the website was moving forward, despite delays due to maternity leave at the website providers, and there should be a self-contained section by the end of the week, ready to go live. LH had asked for the AB section to allow plans to be posted and comments received online, and this capability will be included.</p> <p>The AB asked that members should be warned before anything went live, especially any plans, so they were ready for any feedback and could put time aside to deal with it.</p> <p>The AB discussed whether the plans could go live before the presentation (see item 6(b)), but it was agreed that it would be better if everything was shared at the same time.</p> <p>The AB agreed that its role was to pass on comments to the NPHC, and not to get into dialogue with individuals; moreover, although the NPHC was grateful for the AB undertaking its public consultation for it, the staggered timings of AB meetings and NPHC meetings meant that it was unlikely that replies to specific points could be made within a month. It was therefore imperative that whatever the AB presented, expectations should be managed: the AB would receive all comments and feedback and present a corporate response in due course.</p> <p>There were also commercial and operational questions which the AB could not answer, and KO agreed to write a preamble explaining these parameters.</p> <p>The AB recognised that it was important to demonstrate that the plans developed so far were based on the feedback received from the various sectors. NH agreed to produce the combined list of comments received - excluding harbour management issues, and with some explanation of the comments - which could be edited and put on the website in due course. LH agreed to host a single document which could be edited by members of the AB.</p> <p>There was also discussion about the technical aspects of presenting the plans to the various sectors: whether this would be through a webinar, based on the presentation for the NPHC, or Facebook Live. LH agreed to</p>	<p>KO</p> <p>NH</p> <p>LH</p>

	<p>talk to representatives from the catching sector and to consider the technical possibilities.</p> <p>At the very least, it would be possible to turn the presentation into an .mp4 video that could be shared on Facebook or twitter. JW volunteered to handle the AB's presence on Facebook.</p>	LH
6	<p><u>Harbour Strategy 2050</u></p> <p>NH presented the updated plans, attached, divided as requested into two sections: 2021-2023, and 2023 onwards. There was also an update on the Sandy Cove project, also attached. He reported that Seafood Cornwall's application for the Towns Fund had been rejected, and there was now a proposal for a much wider project, a maritime resource centre, which could obtain fisheries grants from January and which was incorporated into the plan.</p> <p>Other updates incorporated input from the structural engineers on the infilled area, which would be sufficient for a new market.</p> <p>It was agreed that the first stage of the plans would be a worthwhile stand-alone project, even if suboptimal for the deep sea fleet, as structural upgrading was already necessary (and would attract central government funding). It would, in fact, pay for itself, given the return on the buildings in rent, and would be functional even if the Sandy Cove plans were not taken forward.</p> <p>Some representatives of the catching sector had, in informal discussions, asked why the Sandy Cove project was not being progressed first, given its importance to them.</p> <p>The AB agreed that the Sandy Cove project was completely impossible without a road, and so, even if NPHC and MDL agreed on a joint venture, the project would depend on Cornwall Council. (It was noted that MDL's last attempt to develop the Penlee site, a decade ago, failed due to arguments about traffic.) PD reported that he had sent drawings to the council but had not received any feedback.</p> <p>The AB agreed that it was necessary to make the case for a road to Cornwall Council, and this could be made by the fishermen themselves.</p> <p>It was noted that there were council elections in 2021, and local candidates should be invited to attend the presentations and encouraged to support the plans.</p> <p>On a national level, as well, the timing gave the Sandy Cove plan the best</p>	

	<p>opportunity to be heard, as there would be a focus on the fishing industry post-Brexit, either because of the increase in territorial waters or - in a worst case scenario - as a concession to the fishing industry after a disappointing deal.</p> <p>MDL were still very interested in a joint venture, once Cornwall Council agreed to the road. The details were still to be agreed, but the principle was that once the final layout was agreed, ownership of the joint venture would be based on the percentage of land owned by each party, and each party would bear the same proportion of the construction costs.</p> <p>The only potential for disagreement was that MDL may want to develop Port Penlee before the Sandy Cove development. But this would depend on the plans for the breakwater so was not something the AB needed to consider at this stage.</p> <p>Derek Thomas MP had suggested that the AB speak to the Chairman of the Isles of Scilly Steamship Company, but NH had been unable to gain access. In any event, the leisure sector would be a matter for MDL's side of the joint venture.</p> <p>The AB agreed that it was necessary for the catching sector to be represented at future meetings, so that the AB could make the business case for particular aspects of the plans (such as the Syncrolift which could be built at Sandy Cove).</p> <p><u>Presentation and Forums</u></p> <p>The NPHC have still not given any indication of what plans can be shared, although the Harbour Master is happy with a presentation at the end of January, which is as soon as the Commissioners can be available to take part. (The initial suggestion of a Christmas presentation, to coincide with the catching sector's availability, was felt to be premature, especially given lockdown and the issue of staffing.) It was agreed that it was imperative that the Commissioners should be involved, especially since they had not yet taken ownership of the AB's plans for the future.</p>	
7	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>The Harbour Master has asked the AB to consider whether there could be individual links between members of the AB and Commissioners, to coincide with the NPHC board being given "portfolios". (For example, linking Abbie Smith, who is the NPHC's lead on publicity, with LH.)</p> <p>While this may be useful in giving a first port of call on any specific issue, the feeling was that these individual links should not be pigeon-holed at</p>	

	<p>such an early stage, as the AB's function was collating the different sectors and providing a corporate view. (In any event, the relevant points of contact for specific questions or interests would be obvious from the information provided on the website on each member's skills and background.)</p> <p>It was agreed to leave this suggestion until after the presentation of the plans to the general public, after which it will become apparent how the AB and the NPHC are going to work together in future.</p> <p><u>Timetabling</u></p> <p>The AB discussed alternative times for the monthly meetings, given LH's availability. It was agreed to keep the time at 1 p.m., the better to accommodate members from the catching sector, but to move the day to the third Thursday of the month.</p> <p><u>Budget</u></p> <p>The AB discussed the need for a budget of its own: the plans presented were at the limit of what could be done privately, and members may need to travel to London for meetings with architects and the Department of Transport. KO reported that he had raised the matter with the Harbour Master.</p> <p>There was no other business, and the meeting closed at 4:32 pm.</p>	
	<p>The next meeting will be held on Thursday 17 December 2020 at 1 p.m.</p>	