

Bridlington Harbour and Marina Comments on BHC Additional Matters Statement Appendix 2

Rebuttal of Mr Trevitt's Comments on the Review of the Phase 1 Development (ED51)

Generally

1. Mr Trevitt appears to believe that the scheme design should be finalised at this stage of the development process, which is unrealistic. The scheme design is still in its early stages of development and would be expected to have areas of uncertainty at this stage. For example, the planning process usually introduces changes to the design of a scheme of this scale and nature.
2. Mr Trevitt makes numerous statements regarding construction costs which are not substantiated with any estimates. A cost estimate has been prepared for the AAP scheme, which includes substantial allowances for works at the West End of the Harbour, including contingency for physical condition risks.

Access

3. Mr Trevitt makes several comments regarding access (17 to 28). None of these issues appear to be substantive reasons why the scheme cannot be developed by an experienced contractor. EROYC have undertaken an assessment of the levels and the vehicle and pedestrian access can be accommodated. Access during construction would raise similar challenges if the BHC in-harbour scheme were to be developed.

Retaining Structures

4. Mr Trevitt identifies several items of works which he considers would render the scheme too complex and expensive (29 to 35), without presenting any cost estimates to substantiate his statements. Whereas a risk adjusted cost estimate has been prepared for the full AAP scheme, with due allowance for such works. The works required are not considered to be too technically complex to develop.

Alternative Design Options

5. Mr Trevitt contends that the alternative design options would increase the cost (36). An increase in the scope of works would obviously increase the cost. The options would form part of the completed AAP scheme and were considered solely to address BHC's desire for additional operational area if found to be necessary during detailed design development.
6. Mr Trevitt raises several concerns regarding the design of additional land reclamation (37 to 41), without identifying any substantive issues that would prevent development of the works. The technical issues are well understood and would be expected to be addressed at the design stage.

Second Conclusion

7. Mr Trevitt contends that the Proposed Phase 1a would not reduce peak funding requirements (44 & 45). There does not appear to be any substantiation for such a claim. Virtually all of the Phase 1a costs would be incurred under any phasing sequence for the whole AAP scheme. It is self evident that if a section of work can be completed which allows a capital receipt to be realised before the main breakwater is constructed (such as Phase 1a) it will reduce the peak funding requirement compared to a scheme which does not realise such a receipt until after the main breakwater has been constructed.

Third Conclusion

8. Contrary to Mr Trevitt's assertion that mitigation measures would somehow over-burden the scheme cost (47), the proposed mitigation measures would be relatively low cost, many would form part of the completed AAP scheme and the provision of temporary car parking would actually benefit the harbour by providing additional revenue.
9. Mr Trevitt's claim that there would a loss of operational land (48) due to Phase 1a is not borne out by our assessment of the scheme.

Fourth Conclusion

10. Mr Trevitt states that the enhanced car parking would somehow undermine the other revenue streams for the harbour (51), without any substantiation. As the area set aside for parking would be similar to existing arrangements (providing some increase in capacity), it does not seem reasonable that this could be the case. It is difficult to see how the car parking could be detrimental to other operations. On the contrary, improved car parking would be expected to support the other activities within the harbour. Also, it is not clear how increasing revenue from car parking would reduce revenue from elsewhere.
11. Mr Trevitt claims the electronic car park signage would mean the increase in car park revenue is overstated (52). The directional signage actually directs drivers to the town car parks. The park and ride signage is activated at peak times (as he states) once the town car parks are full. It is not apparent how this would reduce car park usage.
12. The proposed Phase 1a development does not increase the area of open car parking and would move a substantial element of the car parking out of view, within a multi-storey car park. Hence, Mr Trevitt's comments regarding "large areas of public parking" and car park revenue (53) appear unfounded.

Rebuttal of Mr Trevitt's Comments on the Review of the In-harbour Scheme (ED52)

Generally

13. The main difference between the BHC in-harbour scheme and Phase 1a at the West End of the Harbour is the commercial development proposed in the AAP and some relocation of harbour facilities. The in-harbour scheme is much more extensive and expensive to develop than Phase 1a and is comparable in scope to the AAP scheme without the Outer Basin. The in-harbour scheme would create much more disruption to the harbour operations than the AAP scheme, including the proposed Phase 1a.
14. Mr Trevitt claims the Commercial Operations Requirements Study does not apply to the in-harbour scheme (66 and 67) and was a retrospective justification of the AAP scheme: If the Commercial Operations Requirements Study does not apply to the in-harbour scheme (68), it would not apply to the AAP scheme. Either there is a commercial berthing requirement, or the report presents a misleading argument simply to justify the AAP scheme and should be withdrawn.
15. In checking the capacity to accommodate the commercial fleet (66), the size of the fleet and demand for berths must have to have been established by Mr Trevitt. Indeed, the Commercial Operations Study report brief states "2.2 The study was to review work already undertaken by the Commissioners and others, identify the current commercial fleet operating out of Bridlington, look at trends in the number and size of commercial vessels using Bridlington, including use as a harbour of refuge, and deduce the number and size of berths required ...", which would apply to any harbour configuration. It goes on to say "... deduce the number and size of berths required in the proposed new tidal basin." - the in-harbour scheme has a tidal basin and is surely intended to meet the same need as the AAP scheme.
16. BHC claim the in-harbour scheme is "a good example of a value engineering solution" (57). Value Engineering of a scheme would aim to meet the same objectives in a more efficient manner. Therefore, either the in-harbour scheme it is intended to meet the same need as the AAP scheme or it doesn't meet the needs of the harbour and is not a value engineering solution. Hence, the Commercial Operations Requirements Study must apply to the in-harbour scheme or be invalid.
17. The Commercial Operations Study report identifies a future requirement for 76 commercial berths. BHC evidence (Appendix A) identifies 58 fishing boats + Yorkshire Belle based at Bridlington (plus 13 other visiting landing vessels). Hence, the in-harbour scheme would have insufficient space for expansion, relies on the use of the marina basin for commercial vessels and has restricted access for visiting/landing vessels.
18. The Commercial Operations Study report states "1.11 However, it should be noted that Grimsby could be considered as an alternative landing point for the area fished from Bridlington. There are a number of reasons for the fishing fleet currently prefers to land its catch at Bridlington rather than Grimsby. However,

Bridlington will remain susceptible to the loss of fishing vessels to ports like Grimsby if the facilities that Bridlington offers deteriorate in relation to those offered elsewhere.” It is unclear how the reduced berthing capacity of the in-harbour scheme would address this risk.

Phasing

19. BHC claim the in-harbour scheme can be developed incrementally (80), without disruption (85). Our assessment shows that construction would involve major works within the harbour basin and would cause significant disruption to operations.
20. The proposed Phase 1a of the AAP scheme includes the land reclamation at the West End, as does the BHC in-harbour scheme. Hence, these statements (80 &85) imply that it is possible to develop the West End of the Harbour without undertaking the full scheme.
21. Mr Trevitt’s statements (80 & 85) are contradicted by his own evidence, as a substantial element of the in-harbour scheme is made up of land reclamation at the West End which is similar to the proposed Phase 1a, which Mr Trevitt claims cannot be constructed due to access constraints (17 to 24) (at least in part). Either the West End area can be developed reasonably, or these statements (80 & 85) conflict with his assertion that Phase1a cannot be reasonably constructed, as these statements (80 & 85) would apply more or less equally to the in-harbour scheme.
22. The in-harbour scheme builds an impounded basin without providing space to temporarily decant operations out of the harbour, creating disruption to the operation of the harbour. Whereas the AAP scheme would develop the outer harbour before constructing the impounded basin within the inner harbour, allowing space to decant operations and minimising disruption.

Marina

23. Mr Trevitt claims assumptions regarding berthing lengths are unsubstantiated (64). The assessment was based on the advice of a reputable consultant, whereas Mr Trevitt’s views are largely unsubstantiated by supporting evidence. This matter was discussed with BHC and Mr Trevitt, who are aware that the precise berth mix is not particularly relevant to the overall business case at this stage. To ignore the long term trend in increasing boat lengths would be short sighted. ED52 does not “rely” on this issue, it is a consideration only. The overall demand for marina berths is considered the primary driver, the mix of berth sizes will change with time and is not the prime consideration at this stage. Also, larger berths will require more water areas, which reduces the capacity of the in-harbour scheme in terms of boat numbers. The primary concern regarding berthing relates to the commercial berthing capacity.