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Project Hull 2017, ‘Zephyr’/Nayan Kulkarni
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Purpose Briefing re; Feasibility Study – objectives & scope
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Present Chris Clay, Hull 2017 CC

Andrew Knight, Hull 2017 AK

Javed Hussein, ARUP JH

Circulation Attendees

Nayan Kulkarni

Sam Hunt, Hull 2017

Hazel Colquhoun, Hull 2017

1 The purpose of the meeting was to review with JH the requirements of the Feasibility Study in order that ARUP could submit a costed proposal to Hull 2017. The questions which it is expected that the study should answer are

* Is it possible to transport a 75m wind turbine blade from Alexandra Dock such that it can be situated in a city centre location for 12 weeks?
* Where are the viable locations within the city centre?
* What arrangements/consents will be required?
* How can the blade be displayed?
* What scale of costs are likely to be incurred?
* What would be the most effective management/advisory structure to deliver this proposal?

2 Siemens have advised that they may be able to provide an out-of-commission B75 turbine blade, transported to Hull. The implication is that they offer the blade as ‘value-in-kind’ sponsorship. It is not yet clear whether they will want the blade returned to them at the end of the project in the condition in which it is provided.

3 JH advised that at this stage they felt that the proposed display was ‘do-able’, that there were site options other than Carr Lane and that with careful planning there could be effective integration with the public realm works (e.g. scheduling of street furniture removal and installation to facilitate access).

4 With respect to transport arrangements JH commented that a number of hauliers who specialise in abnormal loads also offer specialist consultancy services. ARUP would want to engage one of them in the process at this stage, noting that this would not restrict any future tendering process for transport.

5 If Siemens don’t require the blade returned then there could be cost savings in as much as the blade could be ‘dismantled’ on site and then removed in pieces rather than as an abnormal load.

6 Agreed that for now the study should be undertaken on the basis that the blade is to be on site for 1st January 2017.

7 JH keen to engage with Nayan Kulkarni to review possible locations and the form of support/display. Noted that blades are stored on stands in Siemens yard, thus there is existing provision which might meet necessary specifications.

8 JH considered that the key challenge might be securing the necessary warranties and insurances for the public display of the blade. These would not be provided through Siemens and it was noted that we would be utilising a de-commissioned blade for purposes for which it was not designed. As part of the study we should establish who will take responsibility should the blade fail on site, how this risk can be mitigated and covered.

9 CC explained that Siemens were looking for an early meeting with Hull 2017 and ARUP, initially Finbarr Dowling, Project Director Hull, will lead for Siemens and he will assign one of their engineers to liaise with ARUP.

**Action** CC to co-ordinate first meeting with Siemens, 4th May proposed.

10 Communication protocol – JH to cc CC & AK into email communications, on behalf of ARUP JH to sign Hull 2017 non disclosure agreement.

11 JH considered that ARUP will require 12 weeks to carry out the study, will look to provide a costed proposal by Friday 29th April.

**Action** JH to submit ARUP proposal

12 Information

Contact details for Nayan Kulkarni

Email [nayan@nkprojects.co.uk](mailto:nayan@nkprojects.co.uk)

Tel 0208 291 0880

Mob 07957 556719