



Record of the Extraordinary Committee Meeting

Held in the Centenary Room on 12 February 2020

1) Present

Conal Grier, Commodore [and Chair] (CG)
David Nixon, Vice Commodore (DN)
Richard Davis, Rear Commodore, Fishing/Motor Boating (RD)
John Garlick, Rear Commodore, Sailing (JG)
Mike Tennuci, Rear Commodore, Stores (MT)
Paul Walker, Rear Commodore, Social (PW)
Dave Casson, Hon. Treasurer (DC)
Mike Harvey, Health and Safety Officer (MH)
Chris Kershaw, Hon. Secretary (CK)
Peter (“Perry”) Mason (PM)
Torsten Richter (TR)
Bob Spendley (BS)
Tony Cole, President (TC)

2) Apologies for absence

Peter Evans

3) Preparation for the AGM

- a) CG - The general purpose of the meeting was, firstly, to tie up some loose ends and then to discuss what is likely to be the most important matter that will assuredly be discussed at the AGM – i.e. CHC’s development proposals and our discussions with them.
 - i) **Senior Club Officials** – CG noted that under Rule 4 the General Committee is required to recommend persons for the positions of President and Vice Presidents, the Club to endorse (or otherwise) such recommendations at a General Meeting of the Club. For the record therefore, the following are the committee’s recommendations: -
 - (1) President Tony Coles
 - (2) Vice Presidents Paul Walker; David Casson and Paul Denham
 - ii) It was agreed unanimously that the above should be recommended for appointment to the positions stated. (DC pointed out that the existing Vice Presidents were not an issue; their previous appointment entitles them to hold the post for life.)
- b) **CHC and our negotiations as at date** - CG said that some concerns had arisen within the Club on the connection of D pontoon to the hammerhead and the potential

implications on the cost of moorings. Substantial increases were expected for which the only benefit would be the “walk ashore” facility.

- c) The other problem was the interference caused by the closure of the gap. CG said that one couple who are members had already lodged a formal objection to the proposals in this respect.
- d) The Harbourmaster is prepared to consider modification of the plans and D could remain unserviced at standard current rates. Those not worried about the walk ashore facility could be transferred to E Pontoon. Notionally, D pontoon could be reserved exclusively for ECSC members.
- e) The new run of pontoons would start from the location of the same pile running north to the dolphin and beyond. The club would wish to take on the first five pontoons under lease from CHC (each one being 11.5m). We would then be able to accommodate other boats permanently on the hammerhead while having more facilities for tidal stopovers.
- f) CG went on to present some crude (as he put it) cost projections. CHC are offering to lease to us five pontoons at £75.00 per metre, which would incorporate Crown Commission and Harbour Dues, with also the potential for walk ashore. He suggested £260/m could be charged (for the serviced option), which would compare favourably with other Island based facilities – Cowes Corinthian charge £305.00 per metre, £264.00 UKSA, Shepard’s Marina £470.00 and Yarmouth £398.00. DC was more sceptical, arguing that the actual income, charged against each boat’s length, could not be compared like for like; one had to take account of the need to leave spaces between the boats. We have four boats currently on the hammerhead and this could not be increased to more than five. He thought that we would be running at a net loss on those projections.
- g) BS said that we will get increased facilities – including the ability to cater for visitors, with which JG expressed agreement. CG felt that given that we would no longer be responsible for Harbour Dues directly, also, we could possibly sell a couple of berths at say c £2K, the situation would be improved and he still felt that the figures were more or less cost neutral.
- h) In any event, one of the main issues, CG went on to say, was reducing club liabilities; our reserves could be concentrated on maintaining the finger berths and the walk ashore pontoon. A lot of our liabilities would effectively disappear – no dredging, being a good example. Obviously, the details would be spelled out in a contract in due course.
- i) CG said he had spoken with Ed Walker about the prospect of providing a single visitor’s pontoon, which would have services; there is still the opportunity to get more out of CHC, if the ideas were feasible. Also, as and when the piling lighter comes over from Poole (we assume) we would be able to put in a couple of new piles of our own closer to the shore in front of the Centenary Room. PW thought that we should budget for £1600.00 per pile.

- j) CG suggested that we insist that we have security of tenure, but to include a break clause. DC said that he would want our rights on the hammerhead to be in perpetuity. CG commented that the apparent underlying suspicion that the harbour authority were trying to get one over on us was unfounded; he felt that they would like the project to work – to be able to present it as a success story on their patch as it were.
- k) TR said that it was time for the committee to make a decision – as DN added, we must decide whether as a committee we were for “go or no go”. PW said and it was agreed, that there is a great deal of emotion and hostility among the members and there was a level of misinformation floating about. If the worst came to the worst and we were unable to pursue negotiations, we needed to consider the worst case scenario. JG said that he agreed with views expressed above to the effect that CHC were not against us and indeed wanted to work with us. However, in the last analysis, if we were totally uncooperative, they could probably make life very difficult for the club. He informed the meeting that over on the west bank of the Medina, the authority had already struck several deals already – mentioning John Lewis Group as an example. We had to understand that as part of their broader objective CHC wanted some control over all of the pontoons in their area PW said that this needs to be emphasised at the AGM.
- l) All were agreed that we needed to proceed with negotiations; the issue to be decided now was how we broached the subject at the AGM. Clearly, CG’s presentation will help inform and hopefully dispel some of the rumours and misinformation, but, as PW emphasised, this would not necessarily quell a potentially lengthy and acrimonious debate; he therefore strongly urged that we tell the members that we will continue negotiations (we have obviously already made a substantial start) and that we (the General Committee) will, prior to making a legally binding commitment on behalf of the Club, put the terms of such agreement to an EGM for the final say.
- m) **The latter was agreed by all present**
- n) TC made the observation of a small point that might otherwise be overlooked to the effect that we pay the Commissioner dues for a few berths upstream. DC said that CHC will probably absorb these into their overall reckoning.

The meeting was formally closed at 20:10 hours