



## Brixham Harbour Liaison Forum

Tuesday 2<sup>nd</sup> September 2008  
10.30 at Brixham Yacht Club,  
Brixham

**Attended:**    **Capt. K Mowat (KM)**                      **Capt. P Labistour (PL)**                      **Mrs A Wilson (AW)**  
                  **Mrs S Armstrong (SA)**                      **Mr C Bedford (CB)**                      **Mr R Williams (RW)**  
                  **Mr R Smith (RS)**                                **Mr K Bower (KB)**                      **Mr D Putt (DP)**  
                  **Mr B Curtis (BC)**                                **Cllr M Morey (MM)**

**1. APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE:**

Apologies were received from Mr D Jones and Cllr R Horne

**2. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

It was agreed that the minutes of the last meeting were a true and accurate record with the exception of Mr K Bower's name being not included on the apologies for absence section.

**3. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE LAST MEETING:**

**SWW**

RW asked for up to date copies of the water testing results

Action: AW to send results to RW

**Port Master Plan**

CB mentioned it was just too large to print

KM said there was a substantial cost involved

CB noted it would need a person employed for a year

**Torbay Coastal Forum**

KM informed the group that he, along with Dominic Acland and Elaine Hayes, had met with Nick Bye and Elizabeth Raikes. The Mayor and Chief Executive had both been supportive of the idea of a Coastal Forum and KM explained that there would be a large meeting for stakeholders in the autumn.

**Attendance**

PL noted that RW had been concerned by the lack of attendance at the previous Liaison Forum meeting.

KM said that a report was due to go to the Harbour Committee suggesting a form of constitution for the Harbour Liaison Forums. This was unfinished work from the Municipal Ports Review. He had been looking at the Constitution for the Community Partnerships which might lend itself to this Forum and would cascade to everyone; he also thought that the Brixham Harbour Users constitution might provide some ideas.

***Action: KM to cascade a draft Harbour Liaison Forum Constitution for consultation, following approval from the Harbour Committee.***

MM asked if members calendars were checked before dates of meetings were decided.

KM replied that the Liaison Forum dates were set a year in advance and scheduled 2 weeks prior to each Harbour Committee meeting. It was felt that this approach gave Members plenty of time to decide whether they can attend or not.

#### **4. Planned Maintenance Inspection**

PL said that a Harbour Masters Notice had been issued last week; he explained that Marine Services had a planned inspection schedule for the harbour fabric, which was organised with the Engineers at the Council. He explained that there was currently an underwater inspection taking place.

***Action: PL to bring the inspection schedule to the next meeting.***

SA asked what the plan was if any holes etc. were discovered.

PL explained that the harbour would have a problem if there was a lack of budget to do the necessary work but the inspection report was an important step to deal with any repairs that were identified.

KM said he has working with the Council's Engineers and the Environment Agency to try and get the breakwater and other piers recognised as Flood Defences and this was possibly a way of getting funding. If there are problems identified then Marine Services are duty bound to inform the Harbour Committee who then have to advise the Council who own the asset.

SA asked if the Northern Arm went ahead could any repairs to the breakwater be undertaken at the same time.

KM said it was definitely worth considering if the Northern Arm went ahead in the next 3 years.

KM said that Harbour & Marine Services were now a stand alone business unit and were no longer part of the TDA. A copy of the new management structure was circulated. KM reported that as part of the Council's Change Agenda some thought was being given to centralising the management of all the Council's assets, including those within the harbours. There were obvious and significant issues to be addressed if assets were lost from the harbour estate. KM explained that no decisions had been made and that the Chief Executive was aware of his concerns. KM expected that Harbour & Marine Services, along with the Harbour Committee would be properly consulted prior to any change in the management of harbour assets.

PL gave an example of some of the Car Parks which used to come under Harbours.

KB expressed surprise that there was a problem convincing the authorities that the Breakwater was a flood defence.

KM said that previously the Environment Agency funding for flood defence would have been insufficient in any event but it now seems that there is a bigger funding allocation.

CB reiterated that the threat to harbour assets was very real.

#### **5. Regeneration**

PL read from the regeneration progress report.

SA queried whether the same infill was being used that went into the construction of the MFV basin and would this produce the same problems.

RS explained that it was china clay waste – granite sand which is extremely compactable.

PL said it was a much more substantial structure than the MFV basin, he explained that Phase 1 was due to be completed in November and that costs had now been agreed for Phase 2. Dean and Dyball have been appointed as contractors.

PL went on to explain that Phase 3, the Northern Arm, was going to be the subject of a possible application to the SWRDA regional infrastructure fund. If successful this funding route could allow construction of the Northern Arm ahead of any development in Oxen Cove/Freshwater Quarry. In any event the funding would amount to a loan from the SWRDA.

BC asked if there had been any further progress regarding the possible problems with the Crown Estate.

KM has asked for an electronic drawing showing our sea-bed ownership with an overlay of the Northern Arm proposals.

BC said after all this time it would be a shame to restrict where the Northern Arm is located.

KM said they would be looking into the costs of leasing the sea-bed from the Crown.

CB mentioned it might be best to build the Northern Arm before any development within the harbour as it would be much cheaper to do so.

KB mentioned there had been an Eel Grass survey and there was not much left at the breakwater site which suggested it was the dynamic movement on Breakwater which had reduced the grass but where scollopers had been into the Fishcombe Cove site the grass had not been too badly affected.

KB explained to the Forum the traditional method of ongoing strengthening of the Breakwater with concrete blocks.

KM explained that the MOD does something similar with the Plymouth breakwater.

***Action: PL to speak with Nick Garswood about the benefits of something similar at Brixham***

## **6. Winter Storage**

PL told the group that letters had gone out to customers and the date is potentially 4<sup>th</sup> October on the Breakwater hard, with possibly with a handful of boats in Oxen Cove.

## **7. Harbour Committee**

KM explained the next meeting had changed to 29<sup>th</sup> September at 5.30pm at the Berryhead Hotel. The items on the agenda are:

- Elect Chairman
- Review of Committee membership regarding the terms of Advisors
- Composition, Format and Governance of the Liaison Forums
- To note the Minutes of the Liaison Forums
- Budget Monitoring Report
- Results of the Harbour Users Survey
- Concept proposal of an extension to Torquay Harbour
- An application for reduced Harbour charges from a disabled sailing charity

- Marine Services Performance Indicators

KM asked members to think of any other relevant performance indicators they think would be useful. The current ones used are: fish tolls, navigation lights, harbour lettings occupied and harbour user's survey.

SA suggested the Number of Events and hoped they would increase but does need a starting point to compare.

**Action: KM to look at numbers of events.**

CB said there was good news with Torbay Week happening again next year.

## 8. Stage Coach Ferry Trial

PL explained that the Harbour Masters had only agreed to the trial was going ahead on 1<sup>st</sup> August. He explained he would be happy to arrange for members of the Forum to go on board and any concerns or issues noted then perhaps discuss at the next meeting after the trial. He explained that the fast ferry would be paying dues etc and was not therefore being subsidised. PL explained that the ferry operating company were Red Funnel who operated in the busy waters between Southampton and Cowes. Early indications are that operationally things seems to be reasonably well in Torquay but it is becoming apparent that there is not enough room for all the operators on the Brixham steps, consequently it has taking up a lot of management time. Also, it can be seen that the requirements of passenger boat operators are not being best served by our existing infrastructure.

RS said that Stagecoach were talking about building their own pontoon and having a new ferry.

MM said he was judging the raft race on Friday and there appeared to be an issue with fly posting etc.

PL said that Stagecoach were not allowed to tout on the Harbour Estate and this is a breach of Harbour Byelaws and this was being dealt with.

CB said we had no control over activity in Fore Street.

KM said he had spoken with Richard Stevens, Operations Director, Stagecoach Devon and explained the Harbour Byelaws regarding touting on the harbour estate.

MM asked if we were governed by best value in terms of procuring any future ferry service. KM said yes if the operator required sole use of facilities.

Quite an in-depth discussion ensued regards the fast ferry trial.

KM explained that if a fast ferry service were to go ahead there were a number of issues to address, including the following:

- Infrastructure needs
- Procurement issues
- Existing rights
- Policy issues – like ticket/booking outlets
- Navigational safety
- Implications on existing policies i.e. Maritime Events

He said that given the need for new infrastructure, full public consultation, procurement, funding and the decision making process from the Harbour Committee to full Council, a new service would be unlikely before 2010.

SA agreed that there were problems with infrastructure and there had been discussions with the RDA and it would cost about £5 million and this would need to match funding, which a local ferry operator could not deliver.

SA said that the existing ferry operators had never been asked if they needed new infrastructure and she had worked out the movement of every single boat in and out of Brixham and was astounded to see that there were 80 boat movements a day and with the Stagecoach Ferry this increases to 101.

KM said he believed there was overcapacity in the local passenger boat market.

CB said this trial will prove many of the points we have been trying to get through to other members.

BC is impressed with the professionalism of the fast ferry crew and the boat itself. He said that most people know it is impossible as a business venture but there is positive support from the Town Hall that this is wanted. He mentioned he came back on the Western lady and was equally impressed.

SA explained the possible reasoning behind this ferry explaining that regards bus company subsidies based on the green transport plan they get 100%.

RW was at the original presentation meeting and it was indicated that £1m of infrastructure funding could be supported by the RDA.

PL said he would hope to have sight of the survey results regarding passenger movements which would be needed for an application for funds to improve the infrastructure.

SA said she had already done this and could provide the figures.

***Action: SA to provide passenger numbers to PL & KM***

SA said it would be helpful to put the ferry times with the bus time table. It needs to be recognised as a service.

KM said it was important to raise the profile of the existing and potential role of the harbour in terms of integrated transport.

## **9. AOB**

KM said that with the help of the Forum it was important to expand and grow the identity of Tor Bay Harbour and the role of the Harbour Committee, especially at a strategic decision making level. At present he is branding the new business unit with a new letterhead, etc.

SA asked for the Liaison Forum meeting dates to be changed.

***Action: AW to change meeting dates to Wednesday***

DP passed on a message from Nick Wright that the access to staff offices is slowly being restricted by the barriers and this could be dangerous.

***Action: PL to get barriers moved***

<b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS:</b>	<b>26<sup>th</sup> November 2008</b>	<b>10.30am</b>
	<b>11<sup>th</sup> March 2009</b>	<b>10.30am</b>
<b>DATES OF HARBOUR COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>29<sup>th</sup> September 2008</b>	<b>5.30pm</b>
	<b>8<sup>th</sup> December 2008</b>	<b>5.30pm</b>
	<b>23<sup>rd</sup> March 2009</b>	<b>5.30pm</b>



## Torquay/Paignton Harbour Liaison Forum

Tuesday 26<sup>th</sup> August June 2008  
10.30 at Torquay Harbour Office,  
Beacon Quay, Torquay

Attended:	Capt. K Mowat (KM)	Cllr N Amil (NA)	Cllr R Excell (RE),
	Mr J Bond (JB)	Mr K.Lane (KL)	Mr C. Jeffries (CJ)
	Mr J.Turner (JT)	Mr R Cudmore (RC)	Mr C.Baker (CB)

**4. APOLOGIES:**

Apologies were received from Mrs C Scott, Cllr R Horne, Cllr P Addis, Mr J Carter, Mr R Gater, Mr R. Curtis, Mr N.Penman, Mr W.Butcher, and Mr. G.Jennings.

**5. MINUTES OF LAST MEETING**

It was agreed that the minutes of the last meeting were a true and accurate record of the meeting.

**3. CALL FOR AOB (Allowed due to late Agenda)**

The effectiveness of the fairway buoy was submitted as an item for discussion.

**4. MATTERS ARISING FROM THE LAST MEETING:**

**(a) Stagecoach Ferry**

There was considerable real concern and emotion expressed regarding the trial commencing in September. KM stated that R Gater had sent his apologies but had asked that the following statement be read and recorded at the meeting.

*"There had been promised consultation on the fast ferry which had not happened. If it becomes permanent it will prevent all major dinghy racing in the Bay. The national dinghy class associations will not come to the Bay, as they will perceive a risk whether there is one or not. This will result in the collapse of the sailing Clubs who rely on these events for funding. It should be stressed that the recent Topper Event was the biggest fleet ever assembled in the UK and it is estimated that it brought £500,000 into the local economy. The Topper Association want to return! The Laser Nationals which can currently be reckoned as 200+ boats are scheduled for 2009 but this will be in doubt if the ferry went ahead as would the dinghy element of the new Torbay Week regatta."*

KL stated that he supported RG's remarks, as the races required a 1.5 mile beat to windward, which would be impossible if there was a fast ferry service. KL continued by stating that Paignton Pleasure Cruises and the Torbay Boating Association felt that the Council was riding roughshod over them and their lack of consultation beggared belief. The Boating Association would be demanding a huge reduction in their fees i.e. at least 50% if the ferry went ahead as, whilst the need to overcome traffic problems was clearly understood, the Council in terms of their attempts to run an economic service was not backing local stakeholders. KM responded by apologising personally on the subject of

consultation as he had agreed that the trial could proceed and he did not believe it was necessary to have consultation for a trial. However, there would be full consultation if the trial were to move to a permanent arrangement. He continued by stating that the trial was approved in concept on 1<sup>st</sup> August with Stagecoach and that he was disappointed to subsequently discover that the timetable appeared to have been printed in July. KM made those present aware that he felt that communications with Stagecoach could be improved and that he was not necessarily always involved in the discussions. He said that the consultation events held earlier in the year had not included the rowing, sailing or yacht clubs or indeed many other wider stakeholders. Part of the problem was that the whole matter had, so far, been largely approached from a pure transport perspective.

RE stated that the Stagecoach activity must not encroach on pleasure trips and that there must be strict control. He further stated that he felt that the national youth provision for pleasure and sport would be restricted by a fast ferry as would the increased interest in water sports resulting from our success in the Olympics.

CB asked what provision had been made to allow for sprat and anchovy trawling in September.

KM stated he had every confidence in the Red Funnel crews who were very experienced in this sort of operation. He suggested that all objective concerns and observations should be directed to the Council via himself and the Transport Planners (Geoff Coleman) as this was part of the purpose of a trial. KM undertook to make the Mayor and Councillors aware of the experiences and feedback arising from the trial.

**(b) Alcohol Ban Paignton Harbour**

KM reported that the supportive letter from Paignton Harbour users was awaited and that he was awaiting receipt before raising the matter with Cllr Aiton.

***Action: JT to remind Neil Penman (Pgn Harbour Users) that the letter was awaited.***

**5. CAPITAL WORKS**

**(a) Town Dock Update**

KM reported that the pontoon signage had now been ordered, the spring in the pontoons was due to plastic rather than concrete floats and that Environmental Health did not have any solutions regarding the seagull problem.

There had been issues regarding access to the power supplies caused by the very large number of visiting yachts using the outside of the dock. This was being resolved by keeping a berth free on the inside of the wave screen for berth holders to access water/power.

There were only a few moorings unsold and these were those in exposed positions. A proposed change to the Mooring Policy was to be submitted restricting visitors to 2 weeks with no return in one week. This proposal was to prevent mooring holders from, for example, Paignton or Brixham monopolising valuable visitor space.

**(b) Haldon Pier**

KM reported that a design scheme was going ahead with the view to spraying concrete onto the outer face in spring 2009. This would be followed by rock armour being installed in September 2009. If there was enough funding left then excavation of the core of the structure may also take place.

**(c) Torbay Coastal Forum**

KM reported that there had not been any proper meetings to date, but that he was to meet with the Mayor and Elizabeth Raikes that day to seek support for the idea of a Coastal Forum.



**(d) Port Master Plans**

KM reported that he had not received any feedback from Forum members and urged those present for some views and comments.

***Action: All to consider Port Master Plans and submit views by or at the next meeting.***

**6. HARBOUR COMMITTEE**

**(a) Upcoming Agenda**

KM explained that the next meeting had changed to 29<sup>th</sup> September at 5.30pm at the Berryhead Hotel. The items on the agenda are:

- Elect Chairman
- Review of Committee membership regarding the terms of Advisors
- Composition, Format and Governance of the Liaison Forums
- To note the Minutes of the Liaison Forums
- Budget Monitoring Report
- Results of the Harbour Users Survey
- Concept proposal of an extension to Torquay Harbour
- An application for reduced Harbour charges from a disabled sailing charity
- Marine Services Performance Indicators

**7. COMPOSITION FORMAT & GOVERNANCE OF HARBOUR LIASON FORUMS**

KM said that this was unfinished work from the Municipal Ports Review. He stated that the Forums required a Constitution in terms of ground rules on how they operated. The Forum was asked for ideas. RE suggested that the Community Partnership constitution might provide a way forward.

***Action: ALL to consider the future constitutional arrangements of the Forum. KM to cascade a draft Harbour Liaison Forum Constitution for consultation, following approval from the Harbour Committee.***

**8. AOB**

RC expressed concern that the fairway buoy was not fully understood and often ignored. After input from other members KM stated that the buoy was advisory but that in order to monitor the situation he needed input of any near misses or accidents. This could be recorded, along with existing data, which could then be analysed and the risk assessed. It could however be the subject of a repeated Notice to Mariners for early next season.

Various options were discussed including the provision of a 5kt buoy seaward of the existing green buoy.

***Action: KM to consider as part of the ongoing review of the Safety Management System.***

KM thanked everyone for attending and reminded everyone that they are welcome to add agenda items up to the day before the meeting.

Meeting closed 12.30pm

<b>DATES OF NEXT MEETINGS:</b>	<b>25<sup>th</sup> November 2008</b>	<b>10.30am</b>
	<b>10<sup>th</sup> March 2009</b>	<b>10.30am</b>

<b>DATES OF HARBOUR COMMITTEE:</b>	<b>29<sup>th</sup> September 2008</b>	<b>5.30pm</b>
	<b>9<sup>th</sup> December 2008</b>	<b>5.30pm</b>

**23<sup>rd</sup> March 2009**

**5.30pm**