

Whitby Marina Onshore Facilities
Notes of Focus Group 2 Meeting no 3
2nd October 2008, 18:00, Sneaton Castle.

Present:

Ms Diana Jeuda (DJ)	Chair & Whitby Boating Association
Chris Carbro (CC)	Whitby Boating Association
Cllr Mike Ward (MW)	Vice Chair & Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr Steve Smith (SS)	Whitby Town Council
Judith McWhinney (JM)	Whitby Disablement Action Group
Mr Geoff Wilson (GW)	Whitby Civic Society
Ms Elizabeth Cheyne(EC)	Whitby Civic Society
Mrs Wynne Jones (WJ)	Whitby Community Cultural Arts
Cllr. Herbert Tindall (HT)	Scarborough Borough Council
John Riby (JR)	Scarborough Borough Council
Gary Hornsby (GH)	Salt Architects
Mr John Freeman (JF)	Whitby and District Tourism Association
Capt Bill Estill (BE)	Scarborough Borough Council
Alex Richards (AR)	Scarborough Borough Council

Apologies:

Mr Tony Darling:	Eskside Residents Association
Mr Tom Saunders:	Whitby & District Chamber of Trade & Commerce
Cllr. Dorothy Clegg:	Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr. Joe Plant:	Scarborough Borough Council
Cllr. Peter Booth	Scarborough Borough Council

1. Notes of previous meeting:

- 1.1 Notes of the previous meeting were accepted as a true record.

2 Matters Arising

- 2.1 JR outlined that discussions had been held with Focus Group 1 members to discuss the amended footprint. Further comment had been received from the Group and implemented by Gary.
- 2.2 The project team had also met with Northern Area Members to inform them of progress and discuss the consultation strategy.

3. Facility design, amendments to floor plan and concept design for progression to planning.

- 3.1 GH gave an update on the project design process.
- 3.2 The Project Team had met with NEDL and established that the Substation could be retained in its existing sate for use within the new building. There was plenty of capacity remaining within the sub-station for future expansion of the Marina user facilities if necessary.

- 3.3 This was beneficial to the project as it would; save money which might otherwise be used building a new sub-station, allow facilities to remain in operation as long as possible during the works and also provide future power provision should it be required.
- 3.4 GH went on to give a presentation of the revised Footprint of the building which incorporated the comments of Focus Group 1 and to present sketches of the external design development.
- 3.5 The following Questions and Comments were raised by the Group:
- DJ: Has the internal footprint of the building been reduced to accommodate the changes and the covered way outside the public toilets?
 - GH: No the internal space provided for facilities had remained the same, the overall footprint had increased slightly.

 - DJ: had concerns about the security under the covered way and how this area might provide a haven for antisocial behaviour?
 - GH: Security gates had been provided to the covered way for operation during “out of hours” period. The gates would have to be sensitively designed so as not to detract from the appearance of the building.

 - JR and BE stated that CCTV coverage of this area could also be provided and monitored by Marina staff and port officers.

 - JF and WJ suggested that the walls in the “covered way” perhaps incorporate a mural to assist in preventing graffiti. This had worked in the past. Also that any gates installed should be decorative.

 - MW: raised concerns that the sluice access was located behind the locked gate and that during the “out of hours” period this would be inaccessible.
 - GH noted this concern and after some debate suggested that through a reorganisation of the internal layout and the installation of an internal gate be provided to maintain access to the sluice at all times. This will be incorporated into the final design.

 - DJ and CC: Commented that the waste store provision still appeared too small to accommodate the amount of waste that could be generated at the site, particularly in view of the increase in recycling. DJ recommended that enough room for 4 x1100ltr bins be provided. Perhaps the baby change facility could be reduced in size to provide additional space?
 - GH noted the comments. At the present time he estimated there would be sufficient room to locate 2 x 1100ltr bins in the store but would confirm this. There was however a separate recycling

facility at the site. BE suggested that further discussions be undertaken with Cleansing Services to determine the actual requirement.

- MW's opinion was that the building usage was split wrongly, with too great a separation between the bins and the marina user facilities.
- Group debate followed this comment but the consensus was that the facility was in-fact laid out satisfactorily for all users.

- JM noted that the facility access needed to conform to Part M building regulations.

- 3.6 GH went on to present the external landscaping and design concept incorporating the access ramp (necessary to provide disabled access and accommodate the 700mm flood risk requirement).
- 3.7 The group required clarification of the route of the walkway. GH stated users of the Upper Harbour footpath would be using the ramp and therefore passing the entrance of the building.
- 3.8 There was much debate around this issue and discussions as to whether the building could be moved away from the riverside or pedestrians diverted away from the building.
- 3.9 It was determined that the location of the building could not be moved without the loss of parking spaces and was fixed around the sub-station. Clear demarcation to differentiate between public footpath and marina facilities could be achieved through the use of materials and planting however.
- 3.10 The group accepted this solution.
- 3.11 Subject to the alterations and considerations highlighted in the debate the group were happy for the conceptual proposal to proceed for further development to a full planning application.
- 3.12 DJ asked the group whether they were happy with the proposals so far and for GH to go ahead to finalise the plans. The group confirmed their approval.

4. Consultation strategy

- 4.1 JR presented a consultation strategy paper, circulated to the group, which aimed to progress the scheme on behalf of the Focus Groups to a full planning application in November 2008 and Planning Committee decision on 29th January 2009.
- 4.2 JR asked for comments.

- 4.3 JF noted that Whitby Pavilion might not be the best location for the public presentations to be undertaken. This was revised to Whitby Coliseum.
- 4.4 JR invited Group members to attend the Whitby Town Council meeting, 7th Oct 2008 in support of the scheme and specifically suggested that DJ represent the group at this meeting and the meeting of Cabinet on 14th Oct 2008.
- 4.5 DJ agreed to do this subject to availability.
- 4.6 SS, DJ, JF and JR agreed to discuss the project with the Whitby Gazette prior to the Whitby Town Council meeting.
- 4.7 DJ requested that another meeting of the Focus Groups 1 and 2 be called prior to the presentation to Planning Committee on the 16th October 2008 to see the final amendments. AR to arrange.
- 4.8 The consultation strategy was endorsed.

5. Next Steps

- 5.1 The project team would undertake the consultation and design development in readiness for submission of a full planning application in November 2008.

6. AOB

- 6.1 None

7.0 Future Meetings.

- 7.1 6pm. 15th October 2008, Sneaton Castle.