

---

# WHITLEY BAY CENTRAL PROMENADE COASTAL DEFENCE SCHEME

---

## CONSULTATION FEEDBACK REPORT

---

AGENT: HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

---



North Tyneside Council



HARTLEPOOL  
BOROUGH COUNCIL

## DOCUMENT HISTORY

<b>Project</b>	Whitley Bay Central Promenade Coastal Defence Scheme	
<b>Document Title</b>	Consultation Feedback Report	
<b>Issue Date</b>	04/11/16	
<b>Prepared</b>	S Parkes	
<b>Reviewed</b>	K Bostock	
<b>Approved</b>	M Newlands	

<b>Rev</b>	<b>Date</b>	<b>Details</b>	<b>Prepared</b>	<b>Reviewed</b>	<b>Approved</b>
<b>A</b>	03/11/16	First Draft	SRP	KB	-
<b>B</b>	04/11/16	Second Draft	SRP	KB	-
<b>C</b>	04/11/16	Final	SRP	KB	MN

## **CONTENTS**

<b>1.0 INTRODUCTION</b>	<b>4</b>
1.1 Purpose of Report	4
1.2 Proposed Development	4
1.3 Purpose of Consultation	4
<b>2.0 FEEDBACK</b>	<b>5</b>
2.1 Attendance and Feedback	5
2.2 Quantitative Questions	5
2.3 Common Themes	6
<b>3.0 SUMMARY</b>	<b>8</b>
3.1 Summary	8
<b>4.0 APPENDICES</b>	<b>9</b>
4.1 Appendix A: Completed Questionnaires	9

## **1.0 INTRODUCTION**

### **1.1 Purpose of Report**

The purpose of this report is to detail and summarise a public consultation which was undertaken on the 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016 regarding the upgrading of the existing coastal defences at Whitley Bay Central Promenade.

### **1.2 Proposed Development**

The Whitley Bay Central Promenade scheme encompassed within the Planning Application briefly comprises:

- Cladding the existing lower promenade sea wall
- Construction of a mechanically stabilized earth retaining wall on the lower promenade and subsequent widening of the upper promenade
- Improvement of appearance of existing lower promenade and coastal frontage access
- Associated public realm works

### **1.3 Purpose of Consultation**

Consultation was undertaken to gauge the opinion of the public with regard to the proposed scheme. Public opinion is vitally important at the outline design stage of a development which will have a large public interface. The area has previously been subject to a planning application (ref: 15/00201/LARGE3) for an alternative development to achieve the same output therefore it was critical that the public were aware of the current and preferred proposal.

### **1.4 Consultation Format**

Public consultation was undertaken 20<sup>th</sup> and 21<sup>st</sup> October 2016 in the form of drop in sessions at Whitley Bay Customer First Centre, Whitley Bay. Both sessions were advertised in advance in the News Guardian, North Tyneside Council's website and on social media. Consultation material was available for the public to view and discuss with the Project Team comprising officers from North Tyneside Council and Hartlepool Borough Council.

## 2.0 FEEDBACK

### 2.1 Attendance and Feedback

The two day event was well attended, with a total number of 166 people visiting over the two sessions. Written feedback was provided in the form of questionnaires. In total, 79 questionnaires were completed, 75 on the day, 2 via email and 2 via post.

### 2.2 Quantitative Questions

The following quantitative questions were asked, where the public were asked to rate their support on a scale of 1 (do not support) to 10 (fully support):

1. 'Please rate your support for upgrading the defences that protect Whitley Bay.'
2. 'Please rate your support for the preferred option presented today namely; to clad the lower seawall, reinstate the lower promenade, construct a new rear wall and general improvements to the access ramps, steps and paved areas.'

#### 2.2.1 Positive Ratings

Of the 79 questionnaires completed, 73 provided an answer to Question 1 and 71 to Question 2.

Of the responses in relation to Question 1, 93% rated a score of 7 or above. Of the responses provided in relation to Question 2, 92% rated a score of 7 or above.

This measureable evidence would indicate strong public support for upgrading the existing sea defences and also the proposed development.

#### 2.2.2 Negative Ratings

Of the questionnaires which provided an answer to Question 1, 7% scored a 6 or below. Of the questionnaires which provided an answer to Question 2, 8% scored a 6 or below. Comments relating to the negative ratings are summarised below:

Question 1: Upgrading Defences	
Rating	Comment
5	20 years or more of poor or no maintenance has meant that 'upgrading' is essential
5	What about the bit between Watts Slope and where this new 'CLP' Project?
5	A missed opportunity. Should have gone further and added attractions – café, shops.
2	I support the defences, but would like there to be aesthetic consideration in the design and also durability.
1	It will cost little more to add in commercial opportunities. Discuss

Question 2: Preferred Option	
Rating	Comment
6	-
5	-
5	Why was the previous not refurbished.
3	Support fully lower wall, reinstate lower prom but strongly suggest either permanent or semi permanent retention of the space (or part thereof) previously occupied by the units on the lower prom.
3	I support this whole heartedly but have concerns that a grey clad wall is not the most attractive of options.
1	It needs further though and more architectural input.

## 2.3 Common Themes

### 2.3.1 Cladding Units

The proposed scheme incorporates cladding the existing sea wall with pre cast concrete blocks, the proposed retaining wall which will form the upper promenade will also incorporate the same finish. The consultation material included photographic examples of the proposed finish to the concrete cladding units. This is formed using a formliner manufactured by Reckli, the product details are; Reckli 2/122 Yukon. This finish has been utilised on the Hartlepool Headland Walls scheme. This proposal was well received by the consultees.

### 2.3.2 Edge Protection

The proposed development requires the incorporation of two forms of edge protection, one to the upper promenade and one to the lower promenade. Previously, the upper promenade has been served by edge protection in the form of a concrete balustrade. This balustrade was removed as part of enabling works for the previous proposals. There had previously been strong public support for the reinstatement of like for like balustrades. Over the two days, there was a lot of discussion regarding the reinstatement of the balustrades. Gauging the general opinion, there was more support for the reinstatement than there was for the incorporation of an alternative form of edge protection. That being said, there were a number of consultees who voiced support for an alternative solution such as railings.

Of the 79 questionnaires completed, 28 comments were passed on edge protection. Of these 27, 15 were pro reinstating the concrete balustrade as close to the original as possible to the upper promenade, with two being against. None of the other options discussed received greater support than one person.

Edge protection to the lower promenade was discussed on the day, with comments drawn on maintenance. There appeared to be a large amount of support for a low maintenance option such as polyurethane over metal railings. This was not commented on to a great extent in the questionnaires, therefore this evidence is anecdotal.

### **2.3.3 Upper Footway/Promenade Surface Finish**

The proposed scheme incorporates returning the upper footway/promenade to its original width. Generally, little comment was passed on particular surface finishes but it is apparent that there is support for reinstatement of street furniture. Heavy support was offered for returning the upper footway/promenade back to its original width and this appeared to be the more pertinent issue rather than aesthetics.

### **2.3.4 Cycle Designation**

A number of consultees expressed a wish for a designated cycle lane to reduce the interaction between cyclists and pedestrians along the upper promenade/footway. Of the 79 questionnaires completed, 7 comments were passed relating to this issue. All 7 comments were in favour of pedestrian/cyclist segregation, this is not something currently proposed. This represents support of 9% of the consultees.

### **2.3.5 Commercial Units**

The site previously housed a number of commercial units which were permanent fixtures. These were located on the lower promenade, beneath the footprint of the upper promenade. The preferred option incorporates infilling this area with a mechanically stabilized earth retaining structure which will allow for the reinstatement of the upper promenade. The current proposal allows for the future installation of 'pop-up' stalls which could house commercial ventures, if there is the demand for such.

A total number of 15 comments were passed relating to commercial units, be it permanent or temporary. 9 consultees were in favour of incorporating permanent units with 1 person against. 4 were in favour of 'pop-up' units with 1 person against. Taking into account the number of questionnaires completed, 12% of consultees were in favour of seeing the permanent units reinstated, with 5% in favour of the 'pop-up' units, 83% did not pass comment.

### **2.3.6 Shelter**

A total number of 11 consultees expressed a wish to see some form of shelter incorporated into the final scheme, offering the public protection from inclement weather. This represents 14% of consultees.

### **2.3.7 Additional Comments**

There were a number of themes that drew comment from consultees. These included; lighting provision, toilet facilities, surface finishes, street furniture and preference of preferred option compared to previous proposal.

### 3.0 SUMMARY

#### 3.1 Summary

The two day event was well attended, with a large number of the public visiting the consultation event. It was apparent that the range of advertising allowed for a wider audience to be reached.

Taking into consideration that the quantitative questions offered an outturn of 93% and 92% in favour of upgrading the defences and the preferred option respectively, it is fair to assume that there is enough support to warrant pursuing the preferred option.

Identification of common themes which have been highlighted by consultees offers the opportunity for further consideration to be given to areas which have attracted comment, as summarised in the table below:

Theme		For	Against
Edge Protection	Balustrade	15	2
	Railing	1	4
Cycle Lane		7	N/A
Commercial Units	Permanent	9	1
	Temporary	4	1
Shelter		11	N/A



## **4.0 APPENDIX**

### **4.1 Appendix A: Completed Questionnaires**