

Comments for Planning Application 20/02167/FL

Application Summary

Application Number: 20/02167/FL

Address: 50-59 Newborough Scarborough North Yorkshire YO11 1ET

Proposal: Demolition of existing building and erection of building to provide commercial floorspace (Class E) at ground floor and accommodation for NHS key workers and students at the upper levels

Case Officer: Mr M P Whitmore

Customer Details

Name: Mr Michael Rivers

Address: 4 Prospect Place Scarborough

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Objector

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affected Neighbour

Comment: I object to the proposed plans for the following reasons;

1. 50 of the 202 units are for NHS key workers. This group of people will be working shifts so they will be unable to access public transport to get them to the hospital in time for work or get them home after finishing work. It is likely that this group of people will own their own vehicles. The transport statement and travel plan only refers to students and there is no mention of NHS key workers and the impact their cars will have on parking in the surrounding area because no parking is provided within the development.

2. The occupiers of the 202 units will also have multiple family and friends visiting, this will without a doubt impact on parking in the area. As a local resident who has lived in the area for over 30 years I can tell you that it is practically impossible to get a parking space anywhere in the A2 zone during the summer months and we do not need an extra 202 people with all their associates vying for the very limited number of residents parking spaces which are currently available. Residents already have to contend with a number of large hotels in the vicinity which do not provide parking, the Grand, Travel Lodge, Bike and Boot, the Royal and the Premier Inn which is also extending creating more rooms. There are also many other hotels and guest houses in this area who rely on street parking and hotel distributed scratch cards because they don't have their own parking. The hotel guests along with the local workers and shoppers who use the few parking spaces available in the A2 zone leave practically nowhere for residents to park. Zone A2 has also lost the car park on King Street which was demolished along with the Futurist, further reducing the available parking in the town centre.

3. Para 6.1.37 of the applicant's planning statement, states the site is 1.9km from Scarborough General Hospital, This is clearly not the case, the hospital is much further away than 1.9km. If a simple detail like this is incorrect in the application how many more facts and figures are incorrect?

4. Page 10 of the transport statement states 'in terms of student parking, evidence suggests that car ownership amongst this age group is declining'. Locally this is not true. At the current student accommodation across the road at The New George Hotel, there are 35 rooms available for students. I understand from a student at the accommodation that potentially as many as 20 students had resident parking permits for this address in 2019, which evidences that a high percentage of students do actually own their own cars and impact on parking in the local community. Additionally Coventry University currently provide 96 parking spaces which are available for students, this is further evidence that students do own cars and choose to drive.

5. Page 10 of the transport statement states 'there are some 2006 off street parking spaces available across Scarborough, with a choice of 6 monthly or annual season tickets available'. This is not true. The SBC website states very clearly here;

<https://www.scarborough.gov.uk/home/parking/car-parks/car-park-permits> that there are waiting lists for both annual and 6 month long stay permits and also for William Street coach park and Westwood Car park. Annual permits are limited to 100, 6 monthly permits are also limited although the website does not say what the limit is. William St car park is limited to 80 permits and Westwood is limited to 50 permits. The cost of short stay permits is £1589 annually, so hardly affordable for most of the public. These figures are very different to the 2006 'spaces available' quoted by the applicant. Friars Way car park is usually populated by town centre workers, including multiple workers from SBC who lost their car park at King Street when the Futurist was demolished.

6. The transport statement identifies that NYCC minimum car parking standards indicate one parking space per 3 students. NYCC have clearly based this figure on evidence, which totally contradicts the applicant's insistence that students don't own cars. Using the NYCC quota this development should have a minimum of 67 parking spaces associated with it.

7. I am unsure from reading the transport plan if the occupants of the proposed development will be able to access residents parking permits, I sincerely hope that they can't, but that aside all the cars that accompany the NHS key workers and students will have to park somewhere and this development should have dedicated parking spaces available, within the development, for the occupants to use.

8. The public notice about the proposed development was put up for public viewing around 27/10/20, however because lockdown started 5/11/20 the majority of the public are not around to view the notice. The length of the public notice should be extended for another month so when

lockdown ends people at least have a chance to view the notice.

9. I also have reservations about the size and scale of the proposed development, it is not in keeping with a town centre High Street and is not the place for residential accommodation. What happened to the plans for a town Square? This area would be perfect for a town Square rather than an overcrowded building in an already densely populated and deprived area. Also universities have come and gone from Scarborough before, both York and Hull universities. What would happen to this building if Coventry also pulled out of Scarborough, would we be left with a huge accommodation block filled with private rented tenants but with no management in place?

I would like the planners to refuse this application for the reasons mentioned above.