



WATERFRONT DEVELOPMENT WORKING GROUP

INITIAL MEETING

MONDAY 3RD FEBRUARY 2014 @ 8.30AM – PWD MEETING ROOM

MEETING NOTES

ATTENDEES

MLA Mike Poole (Chair)	(MP)
Roger Spink	(RS)
Dave Eynon	(DE)
Leona Roberts	(LR)
Simon Fletcher	(SF)
Manfred Keenleyside	(MK)
Steve Butler	(SB)
Darren Christie	(DC)
Josh Peck	(JP)
Michael Betts (Project Coordinator)	(MB)

MEETING

1. Introduction from Chair

- 1.1 MP thanked everyone for attending the meeting and mentioned his belief that this development is important for tourism in the Falkland Islands. MP added that he was asked to be the Chair of this meeting and wished to continue in the role if the group felt this was appropriate.

2. Review of Draft Terms of Reference

i. Objectives

- 2.1 DC asked MP if there was funding available for the waterfront development and RS added that the private sector are unwilling to invest in the waterfront development until FIG are committed to do the same. MP responded by stating that the development is considered as a key FIG infrastructure project and FIG is a key facilitator and lead for its development. MK added that the key for the development is deciding what components can work and what can't.
- 2.2 RS stated that the wider benefits, particularly the business case, of the Waterfront and its key components need to be assessed and evaluated prior to development. MB added that the

Policy Unit could be consulted on providing figures on the economic benefit of the waterfront development. MP suggested that Jamie Fotheringham, Head of Policy, could be invited to meetings when necessary to input into discussions.

2.3 MP asked the group if the deadline of providing a development plan by the 1st July 2014 was realistic. SB suggested that it would tie in with the submission of the Infrastructure Plan Report. MP added that the deadline was ambitious and the group was correct to be ambitious.

2.4 The group agreed to the Objectives as outlined in the draft Terms of Reference.

ii. Membership

2.5 MP stated that the current membership is aimed at stakeholders with a direct interest in the waterfront development. MP suggested that a representative from the Yacht Club, the Fishing Industry or a cruise ship agent could be added to provide relevant input. Also, as suggested earlier, Jamie Fotheringham, could attend meetings when required to provide input.

2.6 The group agreed to the Membership as outlined in the draft Terms of Reference.

iii. Administration

2.7 MP asked the group if two or three meetings between now and the deadline (1st July 2014) as enough to achieve the agreed objectives of the group. The group agreed to change the meeting schedule from every two months to every month.

2.8 The group agreed to the Administration as outlined in the draft Terms of Reference, with the exception of the regularity of the meetings (outlined in 2.7).

3. Any Other Business

3.1 MP asked MK to provide an update to the group regarding the two key waterfront projects that are currently being delivered. MK informed the group that it is hoped the Museum would be completed by the beginning of 2014/2015 tourism season and work would restart on the Public Jetty in April 2014 and hopefully be completed by October or November 2014.

3.2 MP asked RS if FIC had any plans for developing their jetty and its associated area. RS informed the group that FIC were moving the freezers from the site to a different site on Airport Road. RS added that FIC were waiting to see movement on the development of the Public Jetty before making any further decisions with regards to their land on the waterfront.

3.3 MP asked MK if there were any plans for works to improve the path and seawall from Gilbert House to Government House. MK stated that there were not any plans or future plans for that path.

3.4 SB suggested that the 'waterfront walk' should be assessed and issues with it identified. SB said the pathway was not clearly sign posted as an option and was blocked in areas. SF added that on cruise ship day's tourists tend to walk in the road as path options aren't signposted or current paths are inadequate for the volume of people. DC added that with the opening of the Museum, access to the Historic Dockyard will need to be looked at and resolved.

- 3.5 MK stated that the areas East and West of the Boathouse could be resolved; however the Boathouse remains the 'pinch point' and is key to future development of a clear footpath along the waterfront. DE added that the original Waterfront Master Plan suggested creating a path over the Boathouse's slipway, which would have a negative impact on the business.
- 3.6 MP asked DC if he could take the lead, along with MK, to look at the waterfront walk and report issues and ideas back to the Working Group at the next meeting. DC and MK agreed to work on this.

ACTION – DC and MK to assess waterfront walk and identify issues to be reported back to Working Group at the next meeting.

- 3.7 MP asked SB how the agreed Waterfront Master Plan fitted in with the Town Plan. SB explained to the group that the Waterfront could be identified in the Town Plan as a development zone and some explanation could be provided. This would allow the Working Group to develop the detail. SB favoured this approach as it didn't tie down the waterfront development, as any changes to this project would need to be reflected in the Town Plan, and changes to this document can take some time to carry out.
- 3.8 RS stated that he felt it was important to look at the business cases for key components of the waterfront development, if the private sector is going to be heavily involved. SF suggested that there are ways that Government could assist in making the business cases more viable. SF added that the jetty proposed in the Waterfront Master Plan was included in the Strategic and Outline Business Case for Port William. The Report is expected to be submitted to FIG in May 2014. SF agreed to share the findings specific to the Waterfront jetty to the Working Group.

ACTION – SF to share the findings of the business case for the Waterfront Jetty in May 2014.

- 3.9 MP asked the group if it was aware of any plans for the Stanley House site. MK stated that his interpretation of Stanley House being highlighted in the approved Master Plan was that the site was available for proposals. MP agreed and stated that the Master Plan was effectively FIG policy. SB added that FIG can put restrictions in place if Stanley House was to be developed into a hotel, for example keeping the main building. MP suggested that he and MK discuss the availability of Stanley House with the MLAs to clarify the availability of Stanley House for potential hotel development.

ACTION – MP and MK to discuss the availability of the Stanley House site for development with MLAs. The result of the discussion is to be reported back to the group at the next meeting.

4. Date, time and venue of next meeting

- 4.1 MK stated that the PWD meeting room could be used, depending on availability. The group agreed to meet in the first week of March.

5. Agenda for next meeting

- 5.1 MB suggested at the Working Group's objectives can start being achieved, such as considering areas of responsibility. MP stated that the Agenda can be debated by the group.

Action – MB to create draft agenda to distribute amongst working group members