

# 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 David Britton

Address: 8 Blands Cliff Scarborough

## Comment Details

Commenter Type: Objector

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Ward/Parish Resident

Comment:20/02167/FL 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 | 50-59 Newborough Scarborough North Yorkshire YO11 1ET

I hereby write to object to the above application.

I include the following grounds for my objection.

- 1) Building size and heritage/conservation area.
- 2) Educational changes and accommodation.
- 3) Parking and transport.
- 4) Retail units.
- 5) Market square and missed opportunity.

1)The proposed building is too high and does not fit in with the surrounding conservation area and heritage of the town.

I have studied both the plans and the addendum and although a reduction in height from street level may be achieved visually by a pitched roof, the overall height has not changed and is some 7 to 10 metres higher than the original building, although though this is difficult to accurately tell as the cross sections of the old building and new application plans are in different places.

Although in the amendment there has been an attempt to stagger the building line within the incline of the hill and to break it up into separate units, the overall appearance would still not fit in with the local conservation area and as the old building is now, would not be acceptable to include

in the conservation area. Several photos of neighbouring buildings have been highlighted, a good majority having bay windows, putting a box around a window as to reproduce a similar aspect in my opinion does not work. I have tried to look at the design objectively but I am always drawn back to comparing it to a military barrack block.

2) Due to the Coronavirus the way teaching will be delivered, especially for FE and HE students has and will change considerably. Distance learning has been put in place by most if not all educational establishments, technologies for making this possible have been readily available over the last few years but have never been taken up as a method for teaching. It has already been demonstrated that the time in the classroom can be minimized by these technologies and the change the method of teaching and will now become a core aspect of any course. This reduced time in the classroom puts into question the need for the 152 university places that are planned. I also question the uptake of the 152 places as I believe most university students may use a hall of residence for the first year but after that they seek out shared accommodation in a house or flat therefore having no requirements for hall of residence after the first year.

Also in question is the distance from Newborough to the university and especially the hospital. The distance is definitely too great for the hospital for anyone walking with late/early shifts and any cycle paths are of no use to access the hospital. There are much better sites such as the old Comet site next to the railway station for both university and NHS requirements.

3) The number of parking places available in A2 area for parking will not be able to cater for the additional number of cars brought by students and NHS staff. I know of some universities that do not allow students to bring their cars to university car parks but in no way could this be enforced at the Newborough site. I would suggest there would be a high number of students/NHS owning cars, especially with the finance deals young drivers are able to obtain nowadays. The bringing and use of cars will also be heightened as unfortunately the train and bus links from Scarborough to the rest of the country are not a strong option.

4) The retail aspect of the proposed building in my opinion would not be viable financial prospect with the current high street situation. There are several High street stores empty with others such as Debenhams and Bon Marche closing down due to Coronavirus and the use of online shopping.

5) In 2002 the Scarborough renaissance charter was produced, the programme put in place to support the regeneration of the town. As part of that the Public Space Framework a statement to provide a cohesive vision that integrates existing initiatives in the borough appeared, this statement is as relative today as it was then. The current plan for the `Peoples square` is wholly inadequate and the whole of the proposed site, 50-59 Newborough, should be looked at as a town square. The square would integrate the tourism area of Eastborough, the Market, Blands cliff and the seafront to the town centre and vice versa, increasing the flow through the town as a whole. This would keep no. 1, of St.Helens square and the public house which I believe Scarborough Archaeological and Historical Society have shown a desire to leave in situ. The square would create and open green space for entertainment with a possible stage or band stand, cafes,

restaurants and seating. A reduced size building around the square creating an area that could be included in the conservation area.

Once again I object to the proposed application.

Yours Sincerely,

David Britton  
8 Blands Cliff  
Scarborough  
YO11 1NR