

Clerk:Kay HeywoodTelephone:01803 207026E-mail address:governance.support@torbay.gov.ukDate:Monday, 23 July 2012

Governance Support Town Hall Castle Circus Torquay TQ1 3DR

Dear Member

## HARBOUR COMMITTEE - MONDAY, 23 JULY 2012

I am now able to enclose, for consideration at the Monday, 23 July 2012 meeting of the Harbour Committee, the following reports that were unavailable when the agenda was printed.

Agenda No Item

5. Harbour Liaison Forum Minutes

(Pages 13 - 16)

Page

Yours sincerely

Kay Heywood Clerk





Meeting Title	Brixham Harbour Liaison Forum		
Venue	Brixham Harbour Office		
Date	11 <sup>th</sup> July 2012 at 10.30		
	·		
Present	Capt K Mowat (KM)	Cllr V Ellery (VE)	
	Capt P Labistour (PL)	Mr D Saunders (DS)	
	Miss K Annis (KA)	Mr P Bartlett (PB)	
	Capt B Curtis (BC)	Ms S Farley (SF)	
Agenda Items	Ferry infrastructure and pontooning at Brixham Harbour		

	Actio
A round table discussion was set up to discuss the new frequent ferry service that will commence in 2013 as a consequence of Torbay Council's successful bit for sustainable transport funding. Sally Farley was introduced to the Forum as the project manager for this service.	
PL reported that Jacobs (specialist transport consultants) had drawn up outline proposals for the pontooning infrastructure within Tor Bay Harbour and a drawing of the proposed site within Brixham Harbour was circulated, these were indicative of the likely design and build.	
SF stated that due to funding the project needed to be up and running by March 2013.	
A pre qualification questionnaire (PQQ) had been issued by Torbay Council's procurement team. The PQQ will be evaluated and then tender documents issued to ensure that the design work can commence at the end of the season.	
Contracts for the ferry service were due to be sent out mid August with a bidder's day towards the end of October.	
KM said that there were aspirations for a new passenger ferry service with an EU Classification for all year round service including hours of darkness. It was expected to have a 30 minute schedule and be able to carry a maximum of 150 people.	
SF reported that the service would be able to integrate with a new cycle route that Torbay Council is currently constructing plus changes to the bus service to link in with the ferry.	
KM would like the evaluation team to work alongside some of the Harbour Committee advisors, PL and himself in the final decision making of the pontoon build.	
Page 13	

PL suggested that one of the recommendations in the Harbour Committee report would be to create a working group.	
The outcome of the Forum meeting was that the locations both in Torquay and Brixham were agreed in principle.	

Next Meeting Venue Future meetings	5 <sup>th</sup> September 2012 Brixham Harbour Office. 28 <sup>th</sup> November 2012 <sup>6th</sup> March 2013 10.30	10.30am 10.30am 9am
Dates of Harbour	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2012	5.30pm (Paignton)
Committee	17 <sup>th</sup> December 2012	5.30pm (Torquay)
Meetings	18 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	5.30pm (Brixham)





Meeting Title		Torquay & Paignton Harbour Liaison Forum				
Venue		Torquay Harbour Office				
Date		10 <sup>th</sup> July 2012 at 1400				
Present		Capt K Mowat (KM) Mr J Turner (JT) Mr C Baker (CB) Cllr J Richards(JR) Cllr V Ellery (VE) Mr J Bond (JB) Mr A McCloud (A Mc) Mr J Bardolf-Smith (JB-S)	Mr M Smith (MS) Mrs H Meacock (HM) Mr A Brown (AB) Ms S Farley(SF) Cllr B McPhail (BM) Mr A Pooley (AP) Ms H Shrimpton (HS)	Mr W Butcher (WB) Cllr J Faulkner (JF) Cllr M Hytche (MH) Cllr J Richards(JR) Mr T Ekers(TE) Capt P Labistour (PL) Mr M Bishop (MB)		
1.	Apologies	s for Absence			Action	
	Gordon O					
2.	Aganda					
۷.	. Agenda KM stated that the only item for discussion was the issue around the Sustainable Transport Fund and the related ferry infrastructure.					
3	Subject					
_	····	it clear that a similar meeting	would be held with the B	rixham Harbour		
	Liaison Forum the following day. He also stressed that certain contractual issues could not be discussed as possible interested parties could be present. Furthermore KM stressed that any discussions concerning the future provision of a ferry service would need to be held without ferry operators present at the end of the meeting. The main purpose of the meeting was to discuss the location and layout of the new passenger ferry infrastructure. SF reminded those present of the background and current status of the funding and the likely expression of interest and bidding dates for both the construction of the infrastructure and the provision of the actual ferry service. KM stressed that given the timescale of delivery, by Easter 2013, and other considerations relating to the condition of existing structures and legal consents; the only viable location for the pontoon in the short term was off Beacon Quay. He continued that he was aware that most parties involved did not see this as an ideal solution and he knew that the Old Fish Quay and/or Princess Pier were seen as preferable options. There followed a lengthy debate on why these alternative locations could not be considered at this time and some expressed the view that once in place on					
	Beacon Quay it would not then be moved. After continued further debate VE stated that in the final report to the Harbour Committee it would be a good idea to suggest that a working group be established to plan longer term locations/solutions. KM stated that his preference at this time was not Beacon Quay and he would endeavour to ensure that any contract design included the ability to move the structure to an alternative location.					
	Page 15					

A further stressed that if the Forum are unable to accept an interim solution then e project could not be delivered and the funding would be lost. He then tabled ree different design solutions and after some detailed debate option 3 (a sketch tion prepared by the harbour staff) was considered to be the most viable	
alon prepared by the harbour stan) was considered to be the most viable.	
e following were emphasised by the Forum as vital constituents :-	
<ol> <li>Minimise any restriction on sea room for the benefit of all users</li> <li>Provide reasonable access for those with limited mobility</li> <li>Flexible enough to accommodated vessels with varying freeboard</li> <li>A non slip decking surface</li> <li>Adequate lighting</li> <li>Adequate fendering</li> <li>Appropriate navigation lights on the pontoon</li> </ol>	
8 Power supply	
is section of the meeting was concluded and the ferry operators left the eeting.	
nere then followed a discussion that covered the likely level of ferry subsidy, tential limits on the size of craft and price capping. The meeting then recommended that the following factors were fully considered then reviewing any bids from a ferry operator :-	
The vessel's turning circle The need for bow thrusters The need for twin screw conventional propeller propulsion	
Noise restrictions Wake/wash limits	
Naste water reception tanks/pump out facility	
Maritime & Coastguard Agency (MCA) passenger classification	
I agreed the above but emphasised that a number of these matters would be in e hands of the MCA.	
was agreed that the views of the Forum would be relayed to the Harbour ommittee.	
	<ul> <li>project could not be delivered and the funding would be lost. He then tabled ee different design solutions and after some detailed debate option 3 (a sketch tion prepared by the harbour staff) was considered to be the most viable.</li> <li>e following were emphasised by the Forum as vital constituents :- <ol> <li>Minimise any restriction on sea room for the benefit of all users</li> <li>Provide reasonable access for those with limited mobility</li> <li>Flexible enough to accommodated vessels with varying freeboard</li> <li>A non slip decking surface</li> <li>Adequate lighting</li> <li>Adequate fendering</li> <li>Appropriate navigation lights on the pontoon</li> <li>Power supply</li> </ol> </li> <li>is section of the meeting was concluded and the ferry operators left the setting.</li> <li>ere then followed a discussion that covered the likely level of ferry subsidy, tential limits on the size of craft and price capping.</li> <li>e meeting then recommended that the following factors were fully considered ten reviewing any bids from a ferry operator :-</li> </ul> The vessel's turning circle The need for twin screw conventional propeller propulsion Noise restrictions Nake/wash limits Operating speed Nake waster reception tanks/pump out facility Nave height operating limit Maritime & Coastguard Agency (MCA) passenger classification M agreed the above but emphasised that a number of these matters would be in e hands of the MCA.

Next Meeting Venue Future meetings	4 <sup>th</sup> September 2012 Torquay Harbour office 27 <sup>th</sup> November 2012 5 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	10.30am 10.30am 10.30am
Dates of Harbour	17 <sup>th</sup> September 2012	5.30pm (Paignton)
Committee	17 <sup>th</sup> December 2012	5.30pm (Torquay)
Meetings	18 <sup>th</sup> March 2013	5.30pm (Brixham)