

Meeting: Harbour Committee

Date: 24th September 2019

Wards Affected: All wards in Torbay

Report Title: Approach by FUGRO

Is the decision a key decision? No

When does the decision need to be implemented? 24 September 2019

Cabinet Member Contact Details: Councillor Mike Morey, Cabinet Member
Infrastructure, Environment and Culture

Supporting Officer Contact Details: Adam Parnell
Head of Tor Bay Harbour Authority
☎ Telephone: 01803 292429 (Ext 2724)
✉ Email: adam.parnell@torbay.gov.uk

1. Proposal and Introduction

1.1 The Harbour Authority has been approached by a company wishing to 'lay-up' vessels in Brixham Harbour. This will generate revenue but could be contentious given their size. This report seeks approval to undertake this on a 'trial' basis until the end of the financial year and to gauge public reaction prior before committing on a longer term basis.

2. Reason for Proposal and associated financial commitments

2.1 Along with other harbours, Tor Bay harbour has been asked if it would consider 'laying up' Fugro vessels (see appendices). Once in position these would be relatively immune to the environmental conditions experienced in Brixham Harbour and would be here for relatively short periods of time between commissions elsewhere.

2.2 This proposal does not present any financial commitment on behalf of the Harbour Authority or Torbay Council, but is instead a potential revenue generator. However, the vessels are visually intrusive and this could cause public consternation, hence the decision being brought to the Committee.

3. Recommendation(s) / Proposed Decision

- 3.1 The Harbour Committee is requested to approve the 'laying up' within Brixham Harbour of one or more of these vessels for short periods for a trial period not exceeding 01 April 2020 to gauge opinion prior to a longer-term decision being made.

Appendices

1. Aran-250
2. Excalibur
3. Fugro-1200
4. Wavewalker

Background Documents

None

Section 1: Background Information

1.	<p>What is the proposal / issue?</p> <p>To accommodate large laid up vessels on a trial basis.</p>
2.	<p>What is the current situation?</p> <p>Brixham recently accommodated a similar sized vessel to the Aran-250 as part of the Oxen Cove jetty development. There was no notable adverse comment.</p> <p>Following an approach by Fugro for the harbour to be a potential 'lay up' harbour for their vessels while between commissions it is proposed that this could be a small but potentially ongoing revenue generator for Tor Bay harbour so long as environmental and other considerations are taken into account</p>
3.	<p>What options have been considered?</p> <p>Not to accept the vessels; to accept only certain vessels, or to accept all of the vessels.</p> <p>It is not proposed that the largest vessel be accommodated as it would take up too much of the enclosed harbour</p>
4.	<p>What is the relationship with the priorities within the Partnership Memorandum and the Council's Principles?</p> <p>This supports the principle of a thriving economy</p>
5.	<p>How does this proposal/issue contribute towards the Council's responsibilities as corporate parents?</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
6.	<p>How does this proposal/issue tackle poverty, deprivation and vulnerability?</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
7.	<p>How does the proposal/issue impact on people with learning disabilities?</p> <p>Not applicable</p>

8.	<p>Who will be affected by this proposal and who do you need to consult with? How will the Council engage with the community? How can the Council empower the community?</p> <p>The visual impact of these could result in objections from residents and tourists. It is therefore proposed that a trial period only be agreed.</p>
<p>Section 2: Implications and Impact Assessment</p>	
9.	<p>What are the financial and legal implications?</p> <p>This proposal would generate a modest revenue return. No legal implications are foreseen.</p>
10.	<p>What are the risks?</p> <p>There is a risk that they are not accepted by residents or members of the public due to their imposing size. This is mitigated through a trial period.</p> <p>There is a risk that they deny part of the harbour to recreational and commercial vessels but this would be mitigated by their anchoring away from the main fairway.</p> <p>There is a risk that they damage the fundus or disturb natural habitats. This is mitigated through careful selection of anchorage sites.</p> <p>There is a risk that they will be too exposed to environmental conditions. This will be mitigated through comprehensive liaison with the company in advance to ascertain their environmental resilience prior to arrival.</p>
11.	<p>Public Services Value (Social Value) Act 2012</p> <p>Not applicable</p>
12.	<p>What evidence / data / research have you gathered in relation to this proposal?</p> <p>Fees and charges set by neighbouring harbours have been studied, and Harbour Liaison Fora have been consulted to ensure that their presence would be accepted</p>
13.	<p>What are key findings from the consultation you have carried out?</p> <p>Broad agreement that they are allowed in so long as the environmental impacts are fully understood in advance</p>

14.	Amendments to Proposal / Mitigating Actions None