

# **ANNUAL MEETING BETWEEN CONSULTATIVE COMMITTEE AND FALMOUTH HARBOUR COMMISSIONERS**

1100 hours on 28 September 2010

*(amended following meeting held on 7<sup>th</sup> Dec 2010)*

**Attendees:** Ian Munday  
David Bickle  
Tim Light  
Walter Amos  
Morwenna Richards  
Barry Buist  
Mark Sansom  
David Ellis (Chair)  
Peter Morgan  
Peter Fish  
John Langan  
Richard Reed  
Rob Yates  
Lesley Allan (Minutes)

**Apologies:** David Muirhead

## **1. Chairman's Welcome**

Chair of the Board, David Ellis (DE), started the meeting by thanking the Consultative Committee; he said that the Board value their effort and commitment, and that this is part of why the status of FHC has improved.

## **2. Review of the Year**

Mark Sansom (MS) then began a review of the year. Ian Munday has taken on the role of Chair following Cliff Brown's retirement. David Muirhead had been appointed to the CC and there would be advertising for three new phased changes to the CC in the next nine months. The CC would be looking at the harbour use and evaluating the regulation structure, together with Stakeholder feedback.

MS suggested that the CC be an "Agony Aunt" for PFDI and consideration of Board minutes. There needs to be a good understanding between the Board and CC and how they can help each other and how to feed into Board's objectives.

## **3. The Role of the Consultative Committee**

Ian Munday (IM) reported that, as chair, he had the feeling that the CC had been coasting rather than flowing and it would now be

getting more substantive. It would be refreshing members and getting a good range of harbour users available as a tool for the Board to use in advance or retrospectively.

DE questioned advertising for three new members. He was all for raising the profile, but was comfortable with the current gentle recruiting process.

Peter Morgan (PM) felt that the CC was more geared towards leisure and needed to cover commercial as well. He added that the committee should be looking forward for future recruitment.

Walter Amos (WA) pointed out that there had been a number of applicants from both leisure and commercial in the past.

IM likened the CC to the "Board's critical friend", and was used in Terms of Reference to act as a body rather than individual representatives. He thinks that there is more scope within individuals to externally network.

David Bickle (DB) FHC needs to consult with the public, and that is what the CC is for: interested in trying to enhance the harbour; and therefore should be looking for people with different skills and interests.

It was suggested that a calendar-based process would allow the committee to work back to detail exactly what needs looking at.

Tim Light (TL) said CC should look at key performance indicators. The CC may be able to develop more business-like aspects of FHC; judge performance and issues, environment issues, sustainability and therefore get a broad view on the business.

WA stated that a major role of the CC was to be reactive and give a balanced opinion on FHC plans, and added that this annual report should be a starting point for moving forward. The Board needs to be consistently giving feedback, because not all things will necessarily go your way; and the Board also need to be proactive in their use of the CC: they are used to the CC being there but need to pass information over.

The CC do feel that it has been listened to on an undulating path but is now on an upward one. The Board meets monthly and issues raised have a fast gestation period. Some actions could create a trigger for CC to review; it should appear in the minutes that CC is being consulted.

With regard to the Board Annual Strategy meeting for the next 12 months, it was asked if there was any way of using CC for a broader-based input, to consciously decide what to do and timetable it. Maybe the Chair of CC could be present; measurability should come into it and Key Performance Indicators into future

annual reports. It was decided that this would be a item for discussion at a future Board meeting.

The annual report was imposed by the DoT [encouraged] to be one report, followed by MTP2 guidance.

The Board welcomed feedback from the CC on the annual report.

A query was raised regarding benchmarking against any other trust ports. It was reported that FHC have got a good working relationship with other harbours and ours appears to work very well in comparison.

Over the years, once there is Trust Port Guidance covering all ports, there may be some Key Performance Indicator comparisons. There may be a possibility for common Harbour Bye-Laws and maybe the MCA should lead in this. The DoT came up with model bye-laws which subsequently they disagreed with.

The government plan to devolve responsibility to local authorities for bye-laws. If this goes ahead, it may give us the opportunity, but at the moment FHC will not dip their toe in due to significant costs and implications. FHC are awaiting more clarity.

There is a positive and negative impact on quango disbursement.

TL reported that there is a tenfold discharge of sewage by Prince of Wales Pier. SWW declare that this is a legal discharge due to high rainfall, but the impact on business and visitors needs to be addressed. It is discharging into FHC area and ferry operators have to wear PPE. He asked if FHC could monitor and/or assess issues. In the past the level of input has been so small that the impact has not been raised. SWW accept the problem which will lead to a legal problem and will need help chasing it. It was suggested that Harriet Knowles could help through the Portonovo project, as could Roger Holland.

It was stated that the primary format should be to concentrate on areas of expertise and not to rely on specific stakeholder groups. PM said that they have seen an improvement with a good representation of skills which needs to continue otherwise the CC would devolve into a clique.

DE, on behalf of the Board, thanked the CC for their contributions which the Board greatly valued.

The meeting ended at 1135 hrs.