

**Whitby Marina Onshore Facilities  
Notes of Focus Group 2 Meeting no 1  
24th July 2008, 18:00, Sneaton Castle.**

**Present:**

Cllr S Smith (SS):	Whitby Town Council
Ms Diana Jeuda (DJ):	Chair of Focus Group 1 & Whitby Boating Association
Mr John Freeman (JF)	Whitby and District Tourism Association
Mr Tony Darling (TD)	Eskside Residents Association
Mr Geoff Wilson (GW)	Whitby Civic Society
Mrs Wynne Jones (WJ)	Whitby Community Cultural Arts
Ms Elizabeth Cheyne (EC)	Whitby Civic Society
Cllr. Mike Ward (MW)	Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr. Dorothy Clegg (DC)	Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr. Herbert Tindall (HT)	Scarborough Borough Council
Alex Richards (AR)	Scarborough Borough Council
John Riby (JR)	Scarborough Borough Council
Gary Hornsby (GH)	Salt Architects
Daniel Garfoot (DG)	Gardiner and Theobald

**Apologies:**

Judith McWhinney:	Whitby Disablement Action Group
Cllr Jo Plant	Scarborough Borough Council
Capt Bill Estill	Scarborough Borough Council

**1. Welcome and Introductions**

- 1.1 The Group members introduced themselves.
- 1.2 JR gave an introduction to the purpose of the Group as outlined in the information note previously distributed to those in attendance.
- 1.3 In summary, the Group had been established to bring together all of the known stakeholders concerning the development to build on the work that Focus group 1 had done in considering the internal facilities of a new Onshore Marina Facility at Whitby's Upper Harbour and consider the external appearance.
- 1.4 JR listed the membership that had been invited to attend as follows, and asked if any had been inadvertently missed?
  - Whitby Town Council
  - Whitby Civic Society
  - Whitby & District Disablement and Action Group
  - Whitby & District Tourism Association
  - Whitby Hospitality Association
  - Whitby & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce
  - Community Cultural Arts
  - Esk Terrace Residents Associations
  - A representative from Focus Group 1 (Diana Jeuda – Chair, Group 1)
- 1.5 The Group agreed that the list was comprehensive and that no key stakeholders had been omitted.

- 1.6 JR also highlighted that consultants had now been engaged to progress and deliver the project, these being Gardiner and Theobald (Project Managers and Quantity Surveyors) and Salt Architects (Architects). They had gone through a competitive tendering exercise, including cost and quality, before a panel of officers and members of the Borough Council.

## **2. Nomination and Election of Chair (also minute taker)**

- 2.1 JR invited the group to elect a Chair to manage the remainder of the meeting and future meetings.
- 2.2 Cllr. Herbert Tindall nominated Ms Diana Jeuda for the position of Chair of Focus Group 2. Mr John Freeman seconded the nomination. Ms Diana Jeuda (DJ) accepted the post of Chair for Focus Group 2 and was duly elected.
- 2.3 DJ proposed that the minutes of the meeting be taken by SBC officers and issued to the Group for approval prior to publication. This proposal met with approval from the Group and the role will be undertaken by SBC (AR).

## **3. Budget, specification, footprint, timetable and location.**

- 3.1 An information note had been provided to the Group. JR presented the contents of the note (attached), in summary:
- Budget: including all fees and contingency: £851,000
  - Proposed facility specification: To conform to Yacht Harbour Codes of Practice to provide facilities for 254 Berths. Public toilets would also be provided equivalent in number to those already present. Building to be of single storey and approximately 175 sqm in plan.
  - Outline Programme: Proposed completion of facility December 2009 although we would endeavour to improve on this.
  - Location: Proposed location adjacent to existing facility. This location is situated between the 2 pontoon access bridges, adjacent to the car park entrance and will allow for utilisation of the existing sub station, hence providing logistical and coast benefits.
- 3.2 JR asked the Group for comments on the proposals
- 3.3 TD questioned the costs in relation to expenditure to date. AR stated that expenditure had been incurred in the installation of pontoons, rock revetment works, site investigation and professional fees. A proportion of the costs incurred for professional fees were specific to the previously proposed and now aborted scheme. However, much of this information was still pertinent.
- 3.4 JF suggested that additional ladies public toilets be included in the plan as the current provision was often found to be inadequate particularly at peak times. JR proposed that the architect (GH) review the public toilet layout to determine if any additional facilities could be incorporated.
- 3.5 SS and WJ both highlighted that public facilities must be of the highest standard and best utilise modern technology in order to remain relatively maintenance free and user friendly. All agreed.

- 3.6 WJ requested that public art be incorporated into the fabric of the building rather than as an “add on / afterthought”. Again all agreed.

#### **4. Facility Design Workshop and Presentation from Salt Architects**

- 4.1 GH gave some background of Salt Architects practice. GH stated that the purpose of today’s presentation was to ensure that Salt’s understanding of the brief, the issues and desires of the Group were in line with theirs.
- 4.2 GH then gave a presentation to the Group culminating in some conceptual sketch proposals of the development.
- 4.3 Following the presentation DJ invited the Group to comment.
- 4.4 In summary, overall the Group were impressed with the work Salt Architects had done to date and their understanding and interpretation of the project in the context of Whitby Town. The following comments / observations and questions were raised in relation to the suggested design concept.

#### **Comments and Questions**

- SS asked what material was proposed for the roof? GH stated possibly lead or stone with a glass apex.
- WJ asked if a ‘green’ roof would be feasible? GH stated that probably not in this location due to environmental demands.
- JW liked the shape of the building, which had reference to the whale bone feature in Whitby. The architect attention was drawn to the fact there was a former whaling shed up river of the development.
- JF was impressed with the architects understanding of the issues within the town of Whitby and the proposed outline solution. He however would like to see a photomontage of the proposals from a number of viewpoints in order to obtain a real perspective on how the facility would look in the proposed setting.
- DJ liked the proposal and approved of the use of stone throughout the building and the intention that the facility is light and welcoming within.
- MW liked the form of the building but had concerns about access. GH stated that recessed door could be incorporated. JF suggested that doorways could also be constructed to stand proud of the building (possibly made of hardwood i.e. oak).
- JR suggested that the structural ‘ribs’ of the building be incorporated in the internal and external finish as a feature?
- SS commented that the proposal had the potential to provide exactly what the area need in terms of design.
- WJ concurred with the above.
- JR asked the Group and the architect to consider the buildings ability to stand alone in the area and be attractive.

- JW stated that the building needs to set the standard for future development in the town.
  - SS asked if any thought had been given to alternative options? GH stated 'no' but this proposal had evolved from developing a picture of the town and the location and making reference to the towns history.
  - JR asked if the Group needed a number of options to consider? DJ put this to the Group who were of the opinion that this would be unnecessary and assuming the proposal could be implemented in terms of cost, quality and timeliness, it should be pursued for further development.
  - DJ commented on the need to ensure that the local linkages and references of the building are interpreted to give the building context and interest to visitors.
  - HT, TD outlined the need to have good IT and comms access available in the facility.
- 4.5 At this point the debate (on the appearance of the building) was closed. JR instructed Salt to further develop the concept for presentation at the next Group meeting with a view to ultimately releasing it to a wider audience including the general public. JR said that GH however should be mindful of raising expectations any further until he has obtained some assurance that the design can be implemented within the project budget.

**Action: GH to develop outline concepts for the next meeting of the Group and for consideration with stakeholder groups and general public.**

## **5. Communications and Press Release.**

- 5.1 JR suggested that, if the Group were willing, all communications with the media be directed through the Chair of the Group. The Group were in approval.
- 5.2 It was agreed that a draft press statement would be agreed with the Chair and released to the Whitby Gazette for publication.
- 5.3 DC wished it to be noted that both she and MW, as Members of SBC's Planning Committee, would be unable to comment directly on the merits of any proposal which would be subject to a planning application in due course.
- 5.4 MW stated that he felt it important to represent the members of his electorate on the design of this facility and would be willing to declare an interest and abstain from the planning decision in order to have this input on the Group.

## **6. AOB**

- 6.1 DJ proposed the election of a Vice Chair in case of her absence.
- 6.2 MW was proposed by DJ and seconded by JF.
- 6.3 MW accepted the role.

## **7. Date and Time of next Meeting**

7.1 JR outlined the necessity for the design and associated meetings to progress in order to meet the schedule for Cabinet and Planning Committee in accordance with the project plan.

7.2 The Group agreed on the following dates for future meetings.

- Thursday 14<sup>th</sup> August 2008, 18:00, Sneaton Castle
- Thursday 4<sup>th</sup> September 2008, 18:00, Sneaton Castle