

**THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (MEETING 84 - 18.12.06)****ACTION**

Held at the National Tramway Museum, Crich, Matlock, Derbyshire, on Monday 18<sup>th</sup> December 2006 at 10.30am.

Issue: 1

Present: Messrs B Pennyfather (Chairman), I.M. Dougill (Secretary), A. Smith, G.C.G. Wilton, M.C. Wright, A. K. Thorpe (Minutes Secretary)

84.1 Apologies for absence: A.W Bond

The Committee recorded their best wishes to Mr Bond and noted that he had attended every previous meeting of the Committee. Members sent their best wishes for a speedy recovery.

84.2 Minutes of Meeting 83 (03.11.06)

Following a number of comments relating to the minutes of the previous meeting it was agreed that IMD would re-issue the minutes. In future AT to send draft minutes to IMD who will seek comments from the Chairman and formally issue them.

AT  
IMD

84.3 Membership of the Committee:

It was agreed that John Sampson would be sent copies of papers and attend when he felt it appropriate. Roger Webster's attendance at the committee would be discussed at a future meeting. RTP requested that consideration be given to skills that may be required on the committee in the future.

84.4 Future Role of the Committee:

It was agreed that IMD would update the terms of reference.

IMD

84.5 Red Lion Ramp:

AS noted that the existing scaffolding system was old and that better systems were now available. It was important that any replacement created a feeling of space and did not make users feel 'hemmed in'. AS had found a contractor who could meet the Easter 2007 deadline. RTP requested a site visit, work programme, plans and a quotation by 29<sup>th</sup> January. A quote for the ramp had already been submitted to the Board; however a firm proposal was required before formal approval could be given.

AS

RTP noted that there is a need for a cool room underneath the ramp of the Red Lion to act as a cellar. AS said that a permanent solution had been investigated in the past but it was likely to require planning permission / building regulations approval. RTP said that he did not consider development to be necessary - a space / void that could be accessed from the Red Lion corner door would be adequate. It was noted that this could affect the route from the kitchen and that consultation with Miss Isaacs would be necessary.

AS

GCGW noted that the fence needed replacement, possibly with an advertisement hording which would be more in keeping with the street. MCW noted that the foliage needed to be cut back. GCGW noted that this could be a job for the British Trust for Conservation Volunteers (BTCV) and that it should be added to Neil Daft's list for them.

MCW

It was agreed that the ramp and fencing were two separate projects and that GCGW would investigate possible hoardings/artwork. Durability was important and GCGW would investigate modern print technology.

GCGW

84.6 Entrance Ramp:

AS reported that levels had been taken and possible layouts created. MCW said that it is essential that there was 9ft 6in to the kerb for historical reasons, so the plans would need to be amended to reflect this requirement. It was also thought that this would encourage more people to use the ramp.

AS

It was felt that aerial imagery would be useful to demonstrate the plans to the Board and RTP suggest the use of Google Earth.

## THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (MEETING 84 - 18.12.06)

RTP also said that it would be useful to break down this project into the following phases:

- Revised route to / from the entrance.
- Fitting of a proper kerb line and a more accurate start to the reserved track to the north of the entrance.
- Complete the kerb lines at the Victoria Park stop (possibly to allow a bus to do a 'U' turn at the northern end of the street).

MCW and AS agreed to discuss further and to bring proposals to the next meeting.

MCW  
AS

GCGW said that a Wolfson Grant could be available to help fund this project, if lead in times allowed. MCW said that the project was unlikely to begin until winter 2007. In respect of the grant, the Museum would need to provide a third of the total cost and the maximum grant would be £300,000. The total cost was likely to be £150,000, although it was noted that resurfacing and drainage work would be involved, both of which are considerably expensive. The deadline to submit bids is 16<sup>th</sup> February 2007.

GCGW

GCGW agreed to pursue possibility of grant.

### 84.7 Discussion of ideas for toilet facilities at Town End:

It was noted that the interim refurbishment of the Emporium toilets had been approved at a cost of £3,000. GCGW commented that a tile containing a tram image existed and suggested that the Museum incorporate some in any re-tiling.

There was much discussion over a number of ideas including making either the Sweet Shop or the Assembly Rooms toilets, single sex, to increase capacity and provide unisex disabled facilities. RTP indicated that there would be a need to maintain sufficient capacity for gents if the existing Assembly Rooms toilets were to be converted to 'ladies' facilities. He suggested the possibility of building a new men's urinal which would fit into the street scene and could demonstrate the various designs of men's urinals over a period of years.

GCGW noted the Wolfson Grant could also be used to fund this project.

There was discussion as to the appropriate ratio of toilets and it was noted that the HSE have a ratio of 5:1 but this is based on the number of staff at a workplace rather than a public museum.

Neil Daft was looking at new signposting, particularly pointing out men's urinals which people do not always realise are for public use. It was also noted that better leafleting would assist.

AS agreed by mid January 2007, to provide costs relating to the preferred solution of converting the existing Assembly Rooms toilets to all ladies, plus disabled facilities and providing a new men's urinal.. GCGW to investigate whether there was a men's urinal in stock and to investigate locations of drains.

AS  
GCGW

### 84.8 Options for Glory Mine:

MCW presented a written report outlining a number of options for Glory Mine, which promoted some discussion amongst the Committee. He added that the issue of solar powered lighting for the area had also been raised.

A discussion followed in which RTP said that he would like to see the three car stub re-instigated as this would be useful operationally. He therefore favoured option 2 which provided for this, but also thought option 4 was worthy of future investigation.

RTP  
AS  
MCW

He agreed to report to the Board with the Committee's preferred options which were options 2 and 4. MCW would provide descriptions and advantages and disadvantages of each option, together with likely costs. AS suggested sketches to illustrate ideas and possible use of 'Google Earth'. RTP requested that the involvement of the PDMS be placed on a future Agenda for discussion.

### 84.9 Rights and Responsibilities regarding the Quarry

IMD indicated that he had nothing further to report at present.

## THE DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE (MEETING 84 - 18.12.06)

### 84.10 Stone Workshop

GCGW reported that his last meeting with Des Gallagher had been very positive and he was hopeful that the grant would be forthcoming.. Des was working with GCGW through the two stage application process to work the proposal into a Conservation Management Plan at which point it could be submitted to the Panel. GCGW agreed to circulate a copy of the proposal to the Committee by email.

GCGW

### 84.11 Offer of an original 'Road Traffic Act 1930' road sign

GCGW reported that the sign had been received. MCW was to obtain a quotation for two copies to be cast along with extra signage and for their erection at either end of the Bowes Lyon Bridge. The likely cost was £2-3,000. It was thought that this could be funded through the Subscriber Plus Fund.

MCW

### 84.12 Storage Facility

GCGW mentioned the possibility of locating a building in the storage yard. It was noted that planning permission would likely be required.

GCGW and AS agreed to liaise to find a suitable building and to inform RTP before the next Board Meeting.

AS  
GCGW

### 84.13 Premises Management

This was to be discussed at a future meeting.

IMD  
MCW

### 84.14 A tick-over project

It was agreed that this would likely be the Glory Mine project.

### 84.15 Longer term projects

To be discussed at a future meeting.

### 84.16 The Development Report

To be discussed at a future meeting.

### 84.17 Any Other Business

RTP noted that a 100% grant was available from Sustrans towards cycle storage facilities, provided they were made available to staff and visitors. It was agreed that lockers would be better than racks and that they should be located near to the entrance building or behind the Assembly Rooms.

RTP

There was a problem with water egress into the Burnley Tramways Office due to an inappropriately routed down pipe.

GCGW and AS agreed to liaise over the most appropriate solution.

AS  
GCGW

**Date of Next Meeting:** Monday 29<sup>th</sup> January 2007, at 10.30 am