

From: James Corrigan
Sent: 1 Dec 2020 21:55:22 +0000
To: Planning Services
Cc: Cllr.Alf Abbott;Cllr.John Atkinson;Cllr.Andrew Backhouse;Cllr.Alex Bailey;Cllr.Derek Bastiman;Cllr.Eric Broadbent;Cllr.Stewart Campbell;Cllr.John Casey;Cllr.David Chance;Cllr.Bill Chatt;Cllr.Mike Cockerill;Cllr.Guy Coulson;Cllr.Sam Cross;Cllr.Michelle Donohue-Moncrieff;Cllr.Will Forbes;Cllr.Glenn Goodberry;Cllr.Simon Green;Cllr.Jim Grieve;Cllr.Neil Heritage;Cllr.David Jeffels;Cllr.Janet Jefferson;Cllr.Phil Kershaw;Cllr.Hazel Lynskey;Cllr.Helen Mallory;Cllr.Carl Maw;Cllr.Joanne Maw;Cllr.Rich Maw;Cllr.Jane Mortimer;Cllr.Eileen Murphy;Cllr.Roxanne Murphy;Cllr.Theresa Norton;Cllr.Clive Pearson;Cllr.Heather Phillips;Cllr.Peter Popple;Cllr.Tony Randerson;Cllr.Paul Riley;Cllr.Neil Robinson;Cllr.Subash Sharma;Cllr.Guy Smith;Cllr.Michael Stonehouse;Cllr.Roberta Swiers;Cllr.Phil Trumper;Cllr.Sue Tucker;Cllr.Marion Watson;Cllr.Liz Colling;James Corrigan;Marcus Whitmore
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]

By email : planning.services@scarborough.gov.uk at **21:53 1/12/20**

[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](#)

OBJECTION

I write to set out the grounds of my Objection to the above planning application and respectfully request that the application is REFUSED.

I wish to make it clear that I am not opposed to the provision of accommodation for NHS Key workers or for Students in general – indeed I strongly support this principle. However, this proposal is fundamentally flawed and the location of the proposed accommodation is not appropriate.

The grounds of my objection are 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 will explain further each of these points as follows:

1) Parking

The building is proposed to house in excess of 50 NHS key-workers, including junior doctors and nurses, together with in excess of 150 students studying at Coventry University, Scarborough Campus, totalling 200+.

No provision has been included in the proposal to accommodate the large number of vehicles that will be required by the occupants of the accommodation. Clearly, the distance to Scarborough Hospital is quite significant (approximately 4Km), with various routes across the town. The distance to the Coventry University Campus is approximately 3Km.

It is highly likely that the NHS Key workers will be working shifts and will therefore have their own vehicles to access Scarborough Hospital. It is common for students to have their own vehicles with an estimated 30% of students having their own cars. It is not unreasonable for there to be an additional 100 cars attributable to the occupants of the proposed building.

During the Summer months the building is likely to have a tourism use, which will create significant additional vehicle journeys and parking requirements and thus conflict.

Where will these cars park? The Castle Ward already suffers from significant parking shortfall. The additional cars equate to all the parking on the following streets and is likely to result in significant conflict with the existing residents.

AVAILABLE PARKING SPACES (21/11/2020)	
STREET	NUMBER OF SPACES
Newborough *	35 (20 + 15)
St Thomas Street *	15
North Marine Road	83 (28 + 55)
Albert Street	7
New Queen Street *	42 (31 + 11)
Castle Road *	56
Queen Street *	31
Cross Street	28
Longwestgate *	70
Friargate *	13
St. Sepulchre Street	38
St Mary's Walk *	9
TOTAL	434
<i>* Streets marked thus are located immediately adjacent to the Application site.</i>	

In the context of the immediate locality, this Application entails unsustainable demand for parking spaces, especially in summer, for the inhabitants of up to 210 apartments. This is equivalent to the **complete removal of parking** from the whole of the parking offer from:

St Thomas St (15)
Newborough (9)
Queen Street (31)
Cross St (28)
Longwestgate (70)
Friargate (13)
St Sepulchre St (36)
St Mary's Walk (9)

A TOTAL of 211 spaces lost to residents.

This loss of parking will make an already difficult situation almost impossible for Castle ward residents and tenants returning from school runs, from doctor/dentist/hospital appointments. etc.

The impact will be significant to retailers, especially members of the Chamber of Trade, as this will significantly reduce the amount of available on-street parking spaces in A2, Castle ward.

I have raised my concerns regarding the catastrophic loss of parking with the Castle ward Residents and Tenants Association chairperson to have this debated at public

meetings, especially with the absence of any recommended pre-planning public meetings from the developers and their partners (**SBC**) without any success whatsoever. I have also raised my grave concerns with our Ward Councillor, who has since has stated her support openly for this premier investment at a Tourism advisory group meeting.

2. Size of the proposed structure

The building is too big and too high. The proposal indicates that at the highest point the building will be 20+ metres high and will tower over the adjacent buildings by up to 10 meters, creating an overbearing appearance.

3. Overall appearance of proposed structure

The design of the building is that of a modern office block and is not in keeping with the historic part of the town in which it is proposed to be situated. No account has been taken of any of the special architectural features of the buildings in the area. It is, in effect, a monstrous concrete building.

4. Failure to provide the Market Square

This site was earmarked as the ideal location for the Market Square in the original 'Kissing Sleeping Beauty' masterplan from 2003 adopted by Scarborough Borough Council, local residents and the business community. The opportunity to deliver on this fundamental aspiration would appear possible, but the opportunity is being squandered by this proposal.

5. Failure to comply with the principles recommended by Grimsey Review 2020 to “Build Back Better” – COVID -19 Supplement for Town Centres

Bill Grimsey has published many reports on the future of the High Street and is a highly respected and well known commentator on the future of town centres. In June 2020 he published a supplement to the Grimsey Review 2020 – COVID-19 Supplement for Town Centres. This report has three main recommendations. Bill Grimsey states for Town Centre’s and High Street’s to thrive post COVID -19 and rediscover their community purpose we need to see:

1. Localism
2. Leadership, and
3. Fewer cars and more green spaces

Under point 3 Bill Grimsey states *“Fewer streets and a huge expansion of green space, parks and town squares. Our towns and cities must no longer be designed solely around*

the car as people learn to appreciate the benefit of open space” [page 3 Preview of the Grimsey Review 2020 COVID-19 Supplement for Town Centres – underlining added].

When the idea of using this site as a Town Square was put forward as part of the Kissing Sleeping Beauty master plan it was the forerunner to the principles that Grimsey is recommending as the best practice way forward.

Today we have learnt the sad news that Debenhams is going out of business and is to be wound up. This will leave a huge retail space in the Brunswick shopping centre and be hugely damaging to our town centre. The town does not need more retail space, there is already an over supply.

This proposal is to redevelop existing unused retail space on the ground floor into new retail space and to bring into use the upper floors of the building. There is unlikely to be any demand for new retail space on the ground floor, so rather than improving the area it will actually have the opposite effect of creating unnecessary retail space with the depressing effect of the “To Let” sign.

I urged you to follow your conscience and do the right thing. Grasp the opportunity that this site holds and deliver what the residents and businesses want - the Market Square (as recommended by Bill Grimsey) and as first put forward in the Kissing Sleeping Beauty master plan.

Please acknowledge safe receipt of this e-mail.

Yours faithfully

James Corrigan

□