

DRAFT

Newlyn Pier and Harbour Commissioners

Meeting of the Advisory Board held at 2.30 p.m. on Friday 14 January 2022 in the Conference Room, Newlyn Harbour offices

In attendance: Nick Howell (Acting Chairman) (NH)
Simon Cadman
Nigel Davis
Nick Downing
Paul Durkin (PD)
Laurence Hartwell
John Lambourn
Thalia Marrington (TM)
Tony Pearce (TP)
David Stevens (DS)

Also in attendance: Andrew Watts

	<p><u>Questions from Members of the Public</u></p> <p>There were no members of the public present, and no questions had been submitted in advance of the meeting.</p>	
1	<p><u>Apologies for Absence</u></p> <p>Apologies for absence were received from Fr Keith Owen, Richard Adams and Tom McClure.</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> <p>PD declared a personal interest in the Newlyn FISH trust, which is chaired by his wife.</p>	
3	<p><u>Minutes</u></p> <p>The draft minutes of the previous meeting were presented and it was noted that, in addition to those named, John Lambourn had also sent his apologies.</p>	

DRAFT

	<p>It was RESOLVED that, once this addition was made, the minutes of the last meeting were a true and accurate representation.</p>	
4	<p><u>Matters Arising</u></p> <p>There were no matters arising which were not already items for discussion on the Agenda.</p>	
5	<p><u>Public Exhibition</u></p> <p>The AB considered the response to the public exhibition, which had been very well-attended (especially when compared to other public consultations, in Newlyn and elsewhere). Between 300 and 400 people had been through the doors, and the AB's next priority was to see what the clear message from visitors had been.</p> <p>The overall feedback was highly positive, with suggestions for improvements - for example, by extending the breakwater to protect Newlyn from North-easterly gales - rather than a rejection of the concept. There was, however, a degree of cynicism about whether the concepts would ever lead anywhere.</p> <p>It was emphasised that the last two major projects in Newlyn had failed due to a lack of consultation rather than a lack of funding. What was now needed was an agreed vision which could then be pursued. (This had been stressed by Cornwall Council's officers, who wanted to see consensus from every stakeholder on a vision before things came together.)</p> <p>NH had prepared a summary of the comments which had been left, but the AB members summarised the public response to their individual stands.</p> <p><u>Syncrolift</u></p> <p>The fishing industry was very positive about the syncrolift, and generally agreed that Sandy Cove was the preferable location due to the depth of water. The AB discussed installing a syncrolift within the harbour as a first option - although many expressed doubts that the harbour would be deep enough for a boat and the platform - which could extend the life of the existing slip. This could, in the longer term, become a lift for under-12 vessels and punts, whose owners had already requested covered facilities. Grants may be available to NPHC for this, and the AB discussed whether a shiplift within the harbour would make a deepwater shiplift more or less likely.</p>	

DRAFT

	<p>The AB heard that Syncrolift fabricate and install the shiplifts, and train staff in their use, but the shiplifts were not independent commercial operations. There was, in other words, no one else to bear the capital costs.</p> <p>The next stage was to discuss the needs of boat-owners, both those who use the existing slip and those who travel elsewhere for maintenance.</p> <p>The size of the syncrolift would depend on the business case - but members of the AB emphasised the commercial viability of facilities in Newlyn, noting the cost (in steaming time, fuel and labour) of using other ports, as well as the costs of competing ports.</p> <p>The AB discussed whether it was realistic to try to capture the market for vessels of larger tonnage, such as beam trawlers or supply ships for offshore renewables, given the lack of engineers locally to undertake servicing. The general view, however, was that a larger facility would create jobs, and the expertise could grow, with an obvious synergy with the innovation centre (see below). It was noted that there was already an engineering company based in Penzance, whose lease on the Dry Dock runs out in 2025, who should be included in discussions.</p> <p>Innovation Centre</p> <p>Again, there was general consensus in favour of the development - with only one visitor who did not want to see any building on the site - and that skills and knowledge training was key to any industry. (Several visitors hoped that the centre would enable Seafood Cornwall to expand their training opportunities to include business management, tax, etc.) There was no objection to the scale or location of the development, nor to the materials shown in the drawings.</p> <p>There had been controversy over whether the architects' sketches should have been shown, which suggested that plans were further advanced than they were. This reflected discussions on the NPHC board as to whether new designs were necessary for the innovation centre. The AB did not consider a re-design necessary or prudent, given that the existing plans had already gone through public consultations.</p> <p>The NPHC had drawn down from the Towns Fund to pay for the business case for the innovation centre: Seafood Cornwall would not own the building but their rent, as target tenants, would provide the business case. Other target tenants could include the MMO, who were covered under the "regulatory" head of the Towns Fund award.</p>	TP/DS
--	--	-------

DRAFT

	<p>The AB discussed whether Seafood Cornwall could apply for a grant for fit-out to avoid this being paid for out of the Towns Fund, but agreed that this could be saved until the building had progressed further.</p> <p>It was clear that this is what the community wanted. TM offered to pass on the feedback to the full team meeting of the Town Deal Fund, which was discussing the building next week.</p> <p>Access Road</p> <p>There had been more comments on the proposed access road than anything else, overwhelmingly positive. However, the AB heard that Cornwall Council's general preference was for upgrading existing roads rather than building new roads. Another possible partner was the Projects and Infrastructure Authority who did undertake new projects, and a meeting with Defra minister George Eustice was being sought.</p> <p>The NPHC have emphasised that they needed to see a commitment to a road before they moved any further on the Sandy Cove element of the concepts.</p> <p>TM asked if it would be helpful for someone from Cornwall's highways team to attend a future meeting to discuss future plans and consultations. There was going to be a further consultation on the Healthy Streets Initiative in the near future, and the AB considered that it was important to discuss Penzance and Newlyn's roads together - lorries needed access along the Promenade because of bottlenecks on the Coombe, especially given the new developments at Tredavoe, and the pedestrian crossings should be appropriate for heavy goods vehicles.</p> <p>Car Park</p> <p>The reaction to the proposed car park on the Coombe was equally positive. The AB agreed that the NPHC should be encouraged to support the car park, which would add commercial value to the Newlyn area.</p> <p>Heritage</p> <p>A number of visitors to the exhibition had suggested that the copper works should be part of the redevelopment of the harbour, with a heritage trail linking the ice works building round to the old quay. The FISH trust were already conducting a feasibility survey into the iceworks building, with a view to seeking a capital grant for buying and fitting out, and the heritage portions of the harbour could be joined in one application. There may be grants available to them to maintain the Old Quay which were not available to the NPHC.</p> <p>The AB agreed that it should recommend an all-encompassing scheme to the NPHC. The AB's terms of reference were wider than the harbour, and it should consider all assets in Newlyn which were not meeting their</p>	TM
--	---	----

DRAFT

	<p>potential, and to work with other organisations such as the FISH trust and the Newlyn Archive.</p> <p>The AB noted the success of heritage trusts within other commercial harbours, particularly in Plymouth and in Scottish ports. A group which could get its own funding could manage assets such as the Old Quay on a long lease as part of the vision for Newlyn's future.</p> <p>The AB asked PD to invite a member of the FISH trust to attend the next meeting of the AB.</p> <p>Penlee Quarry MDL had not taken part in the exhibition, which some visitors noted. While the development of Penlee Quarry was part of the vision, it was outside the hands of the NPHC.</p> <p>Summary The AB decided that a summary of the comments left at the exhibition should be passed to the NPHC, with nothing attributable to any individuals. It was important to include any negative comments, as well as the many comments about maintenance issues in the harbour.</p> <p>The AB discussed future public engagement, noting that the NPHC had been happy with the articles in Penzance Voice but that future press releases may be more controversial, particularly if the AB came into conflict with the NPHC.</p> <p>It was agreed to place a summary on the website so that the AB could continue to gather feedback on the concepts.</p>	
6	<p><u>Any Other Business</u></p> <p>There was no other business, and the meeting closed at 4:42 pm.</p>	
	<p>The next meeting will be on 11 February 2022 at 2:30 pm</p>	