



# Robin Hood's Bay Project Appraisal Report

Appendix M: Stakeholder Engagement

February 2016

Scarborough Borough Council



# Robin Hood's Bay Project Appraisal Report

Appendix M: Stakeholder Engagement

February 2016

Scarborough Borough Council

Town Hall, St Nicholas Road, Scarborough



# Issue and revision record

| Revision | Date     | Originator   | Checker     | Approver     | Description |
|----------|----------|--------------|-------------|--------------|-------------|
| A        | 02/02/16 | Lucy Wiggins | Nick Clarke | Peter Phipps |             |

## Information Class: Standard

This document is issued for the party which commissioned it and for specific purposes connected with the above-captioned project only. It should not be relied upon by any other party or used for any other purpose.

We accept no responsibility for the consequences of this document being relied upon by any other party, or being used for any other purpose, or containing any error or omission which is due to an error or omission in data supplied to us by other parties.

This document contains confidential information and proprietary intellectual property. It should not be shown to other parties without consent from us and from the party which commissioned it.



# Contents

| Chapter | Title                                 | Page |
|---------|---------------------------------------|------|
| 1       | Introduction                          | 1    |
| 1.1     | Background to the Project             | 1    |
| 1.2     | Option Appraisal                      | 1    |
| 1.2.1   | Long list of Options                  | 1    |
| 1.2.2   | Short list of Options                 | 4    |
| 1.2.3   | Preferred Option                      | 4    |
| 2       | Stakeholder Identification            | 5    |
| 2.1     | Methods of Stakeholder Engagement     | 5    |
| 2.2     | List of Consultees                    | 5    |
| 3       | Statutory Consultation                | 6    |
| 3.1     | Option Discussion                     | 6    |
| 3.2     | Statutory Consultation                | 6    |
| 4       | Public Consultation                   | 8    |
| 5       | Contributions                         | 10   |
|         | Appendices                            | 11   |
|         | Appendix A. Public Exhibition Posters | 12   |
|         | Appendix B. Bayfair Magazine          | 13   |

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Background to the Project

Mott MacDonald (MM) is preparing the Project Appraisal Report (hereafter referred to as the PAR) for Robin Hood's Bay sea wall on behalf of Scarborough Borough Council. The business case considers the works required to maintain the current 160m long sea wall and ensure that it continues to protect the village from coastal erosion over the next 100 years. The sea wall currently has a residual life of 10-20 years with many areas of the wall suffering degradation and concrete spalling as a result of corrosion. If the wall does fail it would result in the rapid erosion of the cliff which would negatively affect the unique and culturally and historically rich village and lead to the potential loss of 120 properties over the next 100 years.

Robin Hoods Bay is situated on the North East Coast of the UK, 5 miles south of Whitby and 15 miles north of Scarborough. The site is located within the Maw Wyke to Beast Cliff Site of Scientific Interest (SSSI), designated for its geology and is located within the North York Moors National Park. The Beat Cliff-Whitby SAC is 260m south of the site. Therefore any potential impacts on the designated areas will be an important consideration throughout the options appraisal.

## 1.2 Option Appraisal

During the option appraisal process, the views of both statutory and non-statutory stakeholders have been obtained.

The option appraisal methodology adopted follows the FCRM-AG (Environment Agency, 2010), in addition to making use of the project team's experience undertaking similar studies. Developing the preferred option requires an initial consideration of a wide range of options, followed by short listing of the options, developing and refining the short list and undertaking technical, environmental and economic assessments to provide a preferred option.

### 1.2.1 Long list of Options

The first stage within the option appraisal process was to assess a wide range of options to ensure all alternative options were considered. The long list of options was built to consider the widest range of possible items, and is in enough detail to describe how the option could address the problem, and identified opportunities and constraints associated with the Study Area.

The table below presents a summary of the long list of options and whether the option has been taken forward to form the short list of options.



Table 1.1: Long listed options showing the options which were short listed

| Option   | Description  | Feasibility   |
|--|--|---|
| <b>Seawall</b>   |  |   |
| Do Nothing   | No active intervention. Deterioration will still be allowed to continue at present or increased rate. The risk to beach users will increase overtime as the wall deteriorates.   | No – does not address the corrosion and spalling of the concrete, or improve the stability of the wall. Will provide an economic baseline.  |
| Do Nothing H+S   | No active intervention but with regular inspection and removal of loose concrete to prevent injury from spalling concrete.   | No – does not address the corrosion and spalling of the concrete, or improve the condition of the wall.   |
| Do Minimum   | Same as 'Do Nothing H+S' with additional regular repairs to major cracks and spalled areas of concrete. Using proprietary concrete repair materials.   | Possibly – is feasible to be taken forward however needs to be in conjunction with other works as it will not substantially improve the condition of the wall   |
| Sealing Wall   | As 'Do Minimum' but with a capital programme to clean the wall, reseal joints and coat the wall with a clear waterproof sealant to seal cracks and minimise further corrosion.   | No – will not address the existing corrosion of the wall, nor the high chloride content which is one of the main causes of the continued deterioration of the concrete. The reinforcement will continue to corrode, causing concrete spalling and lead to the breakdown of the sealant  |
| Patch Repairs and Installation of Galvanised Anodes          | Undertaking patch repairs and installation of galvanised anodes at the junction of new and old concrete to slow corrosion of the patch repair.   | Yes – Will increase the residual life of the wall but won't reduce corrosion completely. Would need to be combined with a further drainage scheme   |
| Install new rock anchors                                     | Install new rock anchors by coring through the existing structure, anchored into the cliff behind the wall. Anchors will be connected to the current seawall face.   | No – Will increase the wall stability but does not address the residual life of the concrete structure of the wall. There is a risk of causing damage to existing rock anchors ~(if they exist) when coring the wall. Will not address the health and safety problem of spalling concrete so the face of the wall will become more degraded overtime. |
| Concrete wailing beams and install new anchors               | Construct horizontal precast or cast in situ concrete wailing beams to prevent deformation of the wall. Cast panels between the wailing beams to protect the underlying structure. Install new rock anchors by coring through the existing structure, anchored into the cliff behind the wall. Anchors will be connected to the wailing beams. | No- currently there is not evidence of wall movement. This option would need to be carried out in conjunction with a full rehabilitation of concrete panels. Other options address these issues with less visual disruption   |
| Replace individual face panels and install galvanised anodes | Breakout existing face panels and install new reinforced face panels. Install galvanised anodes around the panel to delay the onset of corrosion in the panel.   | Yes – Will increase the residual life of the wall. Damage could be caused to the existing wall structure when removing the face panels. Would need to be installed in conjunction with a drainage scheme.   |
| Replace all the concrete shuttering panels                   | Remove and replace all the concrete panels and columns. The mass concrete fill behind the concrete panels will remain in place. When the new panels are installed, new rock anchors will be installed.   | Yes –. Will increase the residual life of the wall but there is a risk of causing damage to existing rock anchors when coring the wall.   |
| Install rock revetment at toe                                | Install a rock revetment at the toe of the seawall to reduce the impact of wave action on the wall. This will also increase the load on the toe which will   | No – environmentally unacceptable owing to the substantial footprint of the revetment structure.  |

| Option   | Description   | Feasibility   |
|--|---|---|
|  | increase the stability of the wall and resist overturning or sliding. Assuming the panels do not add to the stability of the wall they could be allowed to fail. As this ties in visually with rock armour further along the coast it is more likely to be acceptable than other forms of concrete armour revetment |   |
| Stepped concrete revetment at toe              | Install a stepped concrete revetment at the toe of the seawall to reduce the impact of wave action on the wall. This will also increase the load on the toe which will increase the stability of the wall and resist overturning or sliding. The revetment could be designed as a feature to provide seating.       | No – environmentally unacceptable owing to the substantial footprint of the revetment structure.  |
| Sheet pile wall in front of existing structure | Construct a sheet pile wall in front of the seawall and backfill to the current seawall. Due to the height of the wall it is likely that rock anchors would still need to be connected to the sheet piles through the current seawall   | Possible - will increase the footprint of the current structure so unlikely to be environmentally acceptable. The ground conditions are unknown, so may not be technically feasible to drive sheet piles to sufficient depth.             |
| Breakout and replace the whole wall            | Remove the entire current wall and replace with a new wall.   | No - the risk of removing the current wall is significant – could destabilise the cliff and lead to failures.   |
| Offshore Breakwater                            | Extend rock armour from the north of the site along the same line to create an offshore breakwater to reduce wave impact acting on the structure.   | No – Does not address the condition or stability of the wall or improve the drainage. Will also increase the footprint of the coastal defences as they encroach onto the foreshore area, which is unlikely to be acceptable.              |
| Beach Recharge                                 | Add new material to the beach to raise the beach levels.  | No – Does not address the condition or stability of the wall or improve the drainage. No significant protection gained for the high level cost of installation and will require ongoing implementation following storms.                  |
| <b>Drainage</b>                                |   |   |
| Do Nothing                                     | No active intervention. Provides an economic baseline   | No – does not address the problems of water build up behind the wall and on the promenade. Will provide an economic baseline  |
| Repair and isolate promenade level drainage    | Clean and repair promenade level drainage and isolate from rubble drains. This will prevent surface water from the promenade running behind the wall.   | Yes – would improve the surface level drainage of the wall. Will not prevent groundwater from building up behind the cliff. Will need to be developed in conjunction with a scheme to improve the condition of the wall face.             |
| New weep holes                                 | As 'Repair and isolate promenade level drainage' but with additional weep holes created at the base of the wall by coring through the existing structure at intermediate vertical intervals and lining holes with perforated pipes to allow ground water to drain through the structure                             | Yes – would improve the drainage on the promenade and help reduce the build-up of water behind the wall, which could improve stability. Will need to be developed in conjunction with a scheme to improve the condition of the wall face. |
| Replace Rubble drains                          | As 'Repair and isolate promenade level drainage' but locate, drill out and replace original vertical rubble drains. Combining with 'Repair and Isolate promenade level drainage' will reduce the chance of the rubble drains blocking   | Possibly – Will improve the promenade drainage and drainage within the wall. But very costly and may cause significant damage to the current wall.  |

| Option                        | Description   | Feasibility  |
|-------------------------------|---|--|
| <b>Cliff Interface</b>        |   |  |
| Do Nothing                    | No active intervention. Provides an economic baseline   | No – likely to be outflanking of the seawall and potential destabilisation.                                |
| Reactive Concrete Repairs     | Continue to reactively repair outflanking of the wall with concrete patches.  | Yes – cost effective and reduced impact on the SSSI. Will help stabilise the wall by reducing outflanking. |
| Rock Revetment at interface   | Extend Rock armour from the north of the site along the cliff face to reduce wave impact and reduce erosion of the cliff. | No- will cause unacceptable impact on SSSI   |
| Extend seawall to cover cliff | Extend current wall along the whole length of cliff.  | No- will cause unacceptable impact on SSSI   |

### 1.2.2 Short list of Options

The short listed options were selected from the long list of options. They involved a combination of the long list of options as the wall and drainage options needed to be considered. The short listed options include:

- **Option 1:** Do Nothing – provided an economic baseline
- **Option 2:** Patch repairs with installation of galvanised anodes – patch repairs and installation of galvanised anodes at the interface of patch repairs to the face of the wall and cleaning of the current safeticurb drainage along the promenade,
- **Option 3:** Repair of the concrete wall on a panel basis and installation of galvanised anodes – whole panels that form the face of the wall will be replaced (as opposed to just patched in Option 1); galvanised anodes installed around the joints of the new blocks and cleaning of the current safeticurb drainage along the promenade.
- **Option 4:** Full Replacement of the seawall – removal and full replacement of the concrete facing to the mass concrete wall; capping of the current drainage and the re-drilling of the current weep holes at the base of the wall; cleaning of the current safeticurb drainage along the promenade; construction of a new parapet wall at the same time as the new wall.

### 1.2.3 Preferred Option

Following the detailed option appraisal, Option 3 (Repair of the concrete wall on a panel basis) was selected as the preferred option based upon economic viability and because it has only temporary negative environmental impacts.

The preferred option phases the replacement of the facing wall based on the removal and reinstatement of entire concrete panels on the face of the seawall with installation of anodes at the edges of the new panels. The phased approach ensures that the most cost effective approach is undertaken. Also the current 'safeticurb' drainage will be cleared and maintained to allow surface water to drain from the wall.

## 2 Stakeholder Identification

### 2.1 Methods of Stakeholder Engagement

Stakeholders are defined as anyone who has an interest in the business case and optioneering process and therefore covers both members of the projects and organisations such as Environment Agency, Natural England, Yorkshire Water and English Heritage. Various methods of engagement have been used to ensure engagement was specific to the audience. Throughout the process, the methods of engagement focused around:

- Dialogue – members of the project team available to talk to key stakeholders
- Presentations/meetings – Key statutory stakeholders were invited to meetings during the options appraisal to ensure their views were incorporated into the development of options and a public exhibitions was held on the 24<sup>th</sup> November 2015 to allow the public to have input into the options.

### 2.2 List of Consultees

An initial list of consultees was drafted up by the project team (Mott MacDonald and Scarborough Borough Council). This list has been kept as a live list throughout the Project and updated accordingly (Table 2.1). This list does not include the local residents; however they have been an important part of the consultation process.

Table 2.1: Organisations that were consulted with

| Organisation                             | Name/ Role                      | Email  |
|--|---------------------------------|--|
| North Yorkshire County Council           | Mark Young                      | <a href="mailto:Mark.young@northyorks.gov.uk">Mark.young@northyorks.gov.uk</a>   |
| Fylingdales Parish Council               | Jane Mortimore                  | <a href="mailto:fylingdalesparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk">fylingdalesparishclerk@hotmail.co.uk</a>   |
| Natural England                          | Susan Wilson                    | <a href="mailto:Susan.Wilson@naturalengland.org.uk">Susan.Wilson@naturalengland.org.uk</a>   |
| Scarborough Borough Council              | Nick Edwards                    | <a href="mailto:Nick.edwards@scarborough.gov.uk">Nick.edwards@scarborough.gov.uk</a>   |
| English Heritage                         |                                 |  |
| North York Moors National Park Authority | Barbara Billam/ Malcolm Hodgson |  |
| National Trust                           | Bod Dicker                      | <a href="mailto:Bob.dicker@nationaltrust.org.uk">Bob.dicker@nationaltrust.org.uk</a>   |
| Ramblers Association                     |                                 |  |
| Yorkshire Water                          | Amanda Crossfield/ Michael Wynn | <a href="mailto:Amanda.crossfield@yorkshirewater.co.uk">Amanda.crossfield@yorkshirewater.co.uk</a><br><a href="mailto:Michael.wynn@yorkshirewater.co.uk">Michael.wynn@yorkshirewater.co.uk</a> |
| Environment Agency                       | Chris Ashcroft                  | <a href="mailto:chris.ashcroft1@environment-agency.gov.uk">chris.ashcroft1@environment-agency.gov.uk</a>   |

## 3 Statutory Consultation

### 3.1 Option Discussion

A discussion over the preferred option took place on Wednesday 19<sup>th</sup> November 2014 at Scarborough Town Hall. The aim of the meeting was to discuss the suitability of the short list of options and determine if the preferred option was agreeable. Table 4.1 presents a list of attendees.

Table 3.1: List of attendees to the Options Workshop held

| Name                               | Organisation                | Role  |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|---|
| Robin Siddle                       | Scarborough Borough Council | Senior Coastal Officer                                  |
| Martin Lloyd                       | Scarborough Borough Council | Principal Engineer – Regeneration and Planning          |
| Nick Clarke                        | Mott MacDonald              | Mott MacDonald Project Manager for Robin Hood's Bay PAR |
| Lucy Wiggins                       | Mott MacDonald              | Coastal Engineer  |
| Chris Ashcroft                     | Environment Agency          | FCRM Advisor  |
| Susan Wilson (declined invitation) | Natural England             | Lead Advisor, Sustainable Development                   |

During the meeting the preferred option was presented to the Environment Agency and Scarborough Borough Council, and it was agreed that the option developed is suitable. The Environment Agency was keen on the phased approach as it would help extend the life of the current asset, delaying the need for expensive capital works.

### 3.2 Statutory Consultation

Table 3.2 below presents the primary consultation and feedback from statutory consultees which have been received throughout the option appraisal process.

Table 3.2: Statutory consultation undertaken during the development of Robin Hood's Bay PAR

| Statutory Stakeholder | Method of Contact                                      | Response  |
|-----------------------|--|---|
| Environment Agency    | Email<br>Options Meeting                               | Discussed the options and it was agreed that the phased approach would be appropriate for the structure.  |
| Natural England       | Email<br>Invited to Options Meeting                    | Did not wish to attend a meeting on the options but said in order to receive a Letter of Comfort for the project Natural England should be supplied with sufficient information to answer the following questions:<br>1) Is the project likely to lead to an environmentally acceptable solution?<br>2) Is the project likely to require an Appropriate Assessment under the Habitats Regulations? (i.e. Is the project is likely to have a significant effect on the features of a European site ?). |
| Yorkshire Water       | Emails and phone conversations regarding contributions | Unfortunately the scheme does not meet Yorkshire Water's criteria for funding contribution. The primary reason is that the sea wall does not provide mitigation of risk to their assets.  |
| National Trust        | Emails and phone                                       | Requested additional information, which was subsequently provided.  |

| Statutory Stakeholder          | Method of Contact                     | Response   |
|--------------------------------|---------------------------------------|--|
|                                | conversations regarding contributions | However, no response received despite numerous attempts to contact them.   |
| North Yorkshire County Council | Letter regarding contributions        | Despite several letters being sent no response has been received. Therefore it is unlikely they will provide a contribution to the scheme. |

## 4 Public Consultation

The project team has aimed to involve local communities, stakeholders, and other organisations throughout the options appraisal as they have a deep understanding of the local processes and of use, needs and requirements of the seawall. In particular the small coastal community of Robin Hood's Bay are particularly aware of the need to have continued protection provided by the seawall.

A public stakeholder exhibition was held to inform the wider Robin Hood's Bay community about the seawall. The exhibition posters informed viewers of the PAR process and included details on the survey work undertaken to investigate the condition of the wall. They also identified defects with the performance of the wall and outlined the high level options considered to provide continued protection. The final posters outlined the preferred options and provided information on the next steps which included highlighting the need for contributions towards the scheme. The exhibition posters are attached in Appendix A.

Prior to the exhibition event over 450 letters were sent out to the individual residents of Robin Hoods Bay and the Fylingdales Parish, inviting them to the event. The event was held at the Methodist Church, Robin Hoods Bay, between 1pm and 8pm on the 24<sup>th</sup> of November 2015. The event was hosted by representatives from Scarborough Borough Council and Mott MacDonald in order to answer questions raised and help provide further information and discussion.

In total 45 residents attended the exhibition event. The majority of attendees were residents or property owners within Robin Hood's Bay or the local area. Discussions on the day were unanimously supportive of the proposals to undertake works to the seawall. There was a good understanding from the Public that a phased approach was the most cost effective way forward, and that there was a need to find additional funding.

During the event comments and discussions were on a wide range of topics; however a number of key themes were identified:

- The aesthetics of the wall are secondary to its continued performance. Residents were unanimously in favour that continued protection was more important in achieving continued protection against erosion and whilst the phasing may create a patchwork effect of new and old areas of seawall this was not a key concern (particularly given the current visual appearance of the wall).
- Many of the residents commented that they had not seen the drainage of the wall working properly at both the lower wall level and the promenade.
- The timing of any construction works needs to be carefully considered. The village relies on the summer tourism trade and therefore it is hoped that works would not be undertaken during the peak summer months, as this might affect tourism and visitor numbers to Robin Hoods Bay, which sustain the village economy.
- Access to the beach, especially with heavy plant is very limited. Therefore careful planning will need to be undertaken to ensure that the correct access is available for the plant that may be required.
- Funding was a particular point of focus. With the current funding guidelines a scheme such as Robin Hood's Bay is unlikely to achieve fully funded status. Proposals were discussed with many of the Parish residents about providing an element of funding from an allocated increase in the Parish Precept. Many residents that this was discussed with were fairly supportive of the idea and it has subsequently confirmed that this will be raised at future Parish meetings for further consultation.

The exhibition event was attended by and subsequently reported on by the Bayfair, the monthly local news magazine for Robin Hoods Bay and the wider Fylingdales area. The magazine included a summary article on the Public Exhibition and also a short article by the local Borough Councillor regarding the potential funding of the seawall scheme. The relevant pages from the magazine are included in Appendix B.



## 5 Contributions

During the PAR development discussions have been held with Stakeholders regarding contributions as it was identified that full funding by FDGiA would not be achieved. Discussions around funding streams have been undertaken with the local Parish Council and Scarborough Borough Council to help raise the required contributions to take the scheme forwards.

The proposed values of the contributions to the £642,000 scheme, for the first phase of works, are outlined below:

- Environment Agency Partnership Funding contribution - £455,000
- Local Parish Council Contribution (raised through a £7.50 annual increase to the parish precept) - £50,000
- Scarborough Borough Council Sea Defence Budget - £60,000
- Scarborough Borough Council General Funds - £77,000

It is envisaged that the partnership funding contribution will be spent first, followed by local parish contributions and the Scarborough Borough Council contributions (which will most likely cover the contingency within the project).

# Appendices

|                                       |    |
|---------------------------------------|----|
| Appendix A. Public Exhibition Posters | 12 |
| Appendix B. Bayfair Magazine          | 13 |


## Appendix A. Public Exhibition Posters

The 8 Posters from the Public Exhibition.

## Appendix B. Bayfair Magazine

Below are the articles relating to the Public Exhibition extracted from the Bayfair Magazine.

PAGE 2 Bayfair Dec 15 / Jan 16



### Bayfair

Silver Street, Robin Hood's Bay,  
North Yorkshire. YO22 4SB  
Tel: 01947 880660  
e-mail: bayfair@rhhbay.co.uk  
Twitter: @Bayfair1975

EDITOR: Jim Foster  
Proof Reader and  
Chief Critic: Carol Foster  
DESIGN/PRINTING/  
ADVERTISING: Jim Foster

**CONTENTS:**

|                |                  |
|----------------|------------------|
| NEWS           | 2/3/4/7/12/13/15 |
| NATURE         | 5                |
| TIDE TIMES     | 5                |
| INFORMATION    | 5/6              |
| LOCAL CHURCHES | 8/9              |
| HISTORY        | 9/32             |
| FINANCIAL      | 10/11            |
| OUTDOORS       | 14               |
| ACCOMMODATION  | 15-23            |
| LETTERS        | 27               |
| LOCAL EVENTS   | 23-26            |
| TRADES         | 28-31            |

Copy/ letters/ reports should  
be received before 20th of the  
month, to ensure publication  
for the following month.

Bayfair is published on the 1st of each  
month and is on sale in the districts  
of Fylingdales, Robin Hood's Bay,  
Fylingthorpe, Ravenscar, Hawsker  
and Stainsacre.

The views expressed in letters, state-  
ments, articles etc. are not necessar-  
ily the views of the management.  
Bayfair is not responsible for any  
loss or difficulty arising from edito-  
rial or advertisements placed in this  
publication.

We are always pleased to receive  
contributions although we may have  
to reduce copy to fit available space.

**ADVERTISING RATES**

### LOCAL NEWS

#### SEA WALL PROJECT

Just 45 people attended the consultation event on the future of Bay's old sea wall in the Methodist Hall last month. Robin Siddle, Scarborough Borough Council's Senior Coastal Officer, gave a very detailed presentation, which we can only summarise here.

#### 20 year Residual Life

The sea wall in Bay was built in 1974 with precast concrete columns and curved base units. Concrete panels between the columns act as a permanent shuttering for the mass concrete behind. The wall currently has a low residual life (of just 20 years) if no action is taken. If it were to fail, at least 179 properties would be at risk over the next 100 years.

The deteriorating condition is caused by sea water corroding the reinforcement in the concrete panels, and causing the concrete to crack and spall.

#### Background

The Shoreline Management Plan covering coastal risk from the Tyne down to Flamborough has a policy for R H Bay to "Hold the Line" over the full 100 years. To implement this policy preference has been given to maintaining the existing sea wall asset. The project appraisal report (PAR) shown at the recent exhibition is the first step in ensuring the continued protection of the village.

#### Preferred Solution

The preferred (and most cost-effective) option is a phased approach, with continued monitoring of the wall to increase its residual life through targeted capital maintenance.

Phase 1 (2017/2018) involves replacement of the worst 30% of the concrete panels and the installation of sacrificial anodes at the edges of the new panels.

This first phase of work is estimated to cost £642,000, partly funded by £455,000 from the Environment Agency, leaving £187,000 worth of further contributions needed.

Following the first phase, there will be bi-annual surveys to monitor the wall's condition and ensure it is still stable.

Between 2028 and 2058 four further phases of work are envisaged, with prioritised replacement of wall panels and installation of CP anodes.

By 2073 patching will no longer be sufficient and Phase 5 - the full replacement of the Seawall - will be required!

#### Funding Options

Where is the money coming from to implement this work? An application can now go to the Environment Agency for a £455,000 grant, but the balance will need to be found locally. Will this mean increased rates or Parish Precept? Or perhaps a Tourist Tax or crowdfunding?



PAGE 4 Bayfair Dec 15 / Jan 16



*From your Borough Councillor, Mrs J E Mortimer:*

### Bay Sea Wall

The consultation event on the findings regarding the sea wall capital repairs and the way forward, took place on Tuesday the 24th November. There were officers from the Borough Council present plus a representative from the consultants. They were happy with the turnout and the numbers who came round to look at the displays. The consultant's results together with the comments from those who attended the event will be reported to Cabinet and then onto full Council.

One of the major questions will be how the scheme will be paid for. The Environment Agency paid for the consultants and project report but the works themselves, although they are eligible for some grant funding because we live in what is considered to be a deprived area, will have to be paid for locally. One of the main strands is the Government's insistence is that beneficiaries of the scheme pay towards it. The Chairman of the Parish Council and I will be going to see the Borough's Financial Director to discuss the issues involved.

Lucy & Jonathan Evans  
**Thorpe Stores**  
FYLINGTHORPE

I will report back when the results of the consultation exercise have been put together.

### Financial/budget pressures

Before the last budget it was reported to Councillors that the Borough Council will have to find approximately £8m in savings over the next 4 years. This will mean that cuts will have to be made in services that will have a noticeable effect on residents.

One of the smaller cuts recently discussed and approved by Cabinet is a charge of £35 for the emptying of compost bins. A Scrutiny Committee has considered this charge and has made some recommendations to Cabinet to ease the initial impact of the charges. These recommendations will be considered by Cabinet at its next meeting.

• I would like to take this opportunity to wish everyone a very happy Christmas and a good New Year.

If you have any queries or questions, please contact me at 'Inthorpe', Middlewood Lane, Fylingthorpe YO22 4TT.  
Tel: 01947 880058 or E-mail: [cllr.jane.mortimer@scarborough.gov.uk](mailto:cllr.jane.mortimer@scarborough.gov.uk)

*Cllr. Jane Mortimer*



## LOCAL NEWS

### HISTORY GROUP

At the Fylingdales Local History Group AGM on 20th November, Alan Staniforth was re-elected as Chairman and Rev Michael Waters as Vice-Chair. Pauline Dalby continues as Treasurer and Marion Berry as Librarian and Secretary. Janet Green was re-elected to the Committee. Other members of the Committee are Neil Landers and Sandra Noble. Trish Connell has stepped down as Programme Secretary; thanks to her for all her hard work. There is now a vacancy for a Programme Secretary if anyone would like to assist they would be very welcome. Do get in touch! Barrie Clark, Julie Galliard and John Ryder have resigned from the Committee. The Chairman expressed his thanks on behalf of the Group to the retiring members for all their work.

After tea, coffee and warm mince pies - thanks Julie and Sandra - we saw a slide show of photos from the archives. As with all our meetings, you don't have to be a member of the history group to attend - everybody is welcome.

The next monthly meeting at Wibury on Friday 22nd January will be a Quiz provided by Dave Perry. If this is anything like last year's it will be a most enjoyable evening and is sure to raise some 'points for discussion'.  
*M.B.*