

From: James Corrigan
Sent: 30 Dec 2020 18:32:15 +0000
To: Planning Services
Cc: Marcus Whitmore;James Corrigan
Subject: 20/02167/FL

[BE CYBER AWARE. THIS IS AN EXTERNAL EMAIL: Please do not click on any links or open any attachments unless you trust the sender and are expecting the content to be sent to you]

OBJECTION

I write further to my previous OBJECTION submitted on 1 December 2020, as I note that the applicant has revised its proposal. I am surprised that the change in the proposal does not require any re-advertising or extension to the consultation period.

I confirm that the changes to the design that have been proposed do not in any way address any of the grounds of my objection and respectfully repeat my request that the application is REFUSED.

Whilst the revised plans change the overall appearance of the proposed structure, it remains an oversized building which is not appropriate for the location.

The grounds of my objection remain as follows:

1. Parking
2. Size of the proposed structure
3. Overall appearance of proposed structure
4. Failure to provide the Market Square
5. Failure to comply with the principles recommended by Grimsey Review 2020 to “Build Back Better” – COVID -19 Supplement for Town Centres

I have revisited the large number of documents that were part of the application and I wish to draw your attention to the following matters:

1. The Planning Statement and Statement of Community Involvement dated October 2020 signed off by various individuals on 5 November 2020 refers at section 4.1.13 to 4.1.21 to consultation with the local community.
2. At para 4.1.15 reference is made to consultation with various named parties including South Bay Traders Association and Janet Jefferson in March 2020. I am a member of the South Bay Traders Association and can categorically state that we were

not consulted. I also am aware that Janet Jefferson cannot have been consulted with as she stated at the recent Chamber of Trade meeting held on 8th December 2020 to not be aware of the details of the scheme. Janet Jefferson is also the Chairperson of the Castle Ward Tenants and Residents Association. I have contacted her twice now as a resident asking for copies of any meetings or committee meetings held to discuss this and have received no records of any discussions held.

3. Para 4.1.17 makes reference to a dedicated consultation website. Having checked out the website it would appear that the SSL certificate is dated as valid from 2 October 2020, which indicates that the website was not available in March 2020 and only went live at the time the application was submitted.

4. Para 4.1.16 refers to sending out approximately 400 consultation newsletters to residents and businesses. As a local resident and have multiple business in Castle Ward and I did not receive this newsletter. I have spoken to over 25 fellow Castle Ward residents and business owners who were similarly omitted from this "consultation".

5. Para 4.1.21 refers to only receiving three positive comments as part of this extensive consultation exercise on a major project. The low level of responses suggests that perhaps the consultation process was flawed and the intended consultees were not reached and therefore invalidates the whole consultation exercise.

6. The Daylight and Sunlight report prepared by Hollis dated 5 October 2020 contains many redactions, including the reference to the standards adopted in conducting the report (para 1.2.1). There are at least 9 redactions in the document, which appear to redact the standards and basis of the assessment. Also parts of the documents appear to have been modified with different text fonts inserted into various sections including for example 3.2.15 (referring to 31 Newborough not meeting the required light threshold).

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this e-mail.

Yours faithfully

James Corrigan

47-48 Sandside
Scarborough
YO11 1PG