

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 Antony Fenter

Address: 6 Blands Cliff Scarborough

Comment Details

Commenter Type: Objector

Stance: Customer objects to the Planning Application

Comment Reasons:

- Affected Neighbour
- Interested Third Party

Comment: Objection to Demolition of existing building and erection of building to provide commercial floor space (Class E) at ground floor and accommodation for NHS key workers and students at upper levels at 50-59 Newborough, Scarborough [20/02167/FL]

Tony Fenter
6 Blands Cliff
Scarborough
YO11 1NR

I wish to object to and make representations upon this application. Firstly I fully agree with and support the comments made by Messrs Allison, Somerville, Williams, Green, Hall and Wilson. All of whom are, of course, qualified and very experienced planners, who know and have lived in the Scarborough area for many years.

I also agree with and support the objections and comments raised by Scarborough Civic Society in their letter. This together with the representation from these professional planners, cogently and coherently express my views on the scale, mass, design and impact of the proposed development far more competently than I could.

There are other aspects of these proposals which also concern me greatly and I feel justify refusal of the application. These mainly concern access, parking and transport.

There is an allegedly environmentally friendly commitment to make the development car free and thus almost no provision is made for parking. It is claimed that this will reduce overall vehicle movements and demand for parking in the area: it simply cannot be the case.

Medical staff connected with hospital will require transport 24 hours a day seven days a week. Much is made of the near proximity to several bus stops: however the bus services only run between 0:700 and 18:00 on weekdays, with reduced services on weekends and bank holidays. Students also will require to travel outside these times and clearly the buses will be of very limited use to staff working at the hospital.

Clearly in the foreseeable future a significant amount of car use will have to occur. Where are these vehicles going to park? There is already a lack of on street parking availability for existing residents of the area at many times of the day, week and year.

The applicants also make much of the availability of off street car parks and of season tickets for these. In practise such tickets cost just under £500 pa. (Far more than a yearly on street Residents Parking Permit) are payable in advance and are limited to a total maximum of 100 with a permanent very lengthy waiting list. The multi-storey NCP car park is only available in the day time.

I am also concerned by the claims that permitting this development will benefit the area by enhancing and developing the night time economy. Whilst promoting Scarborough as a University Town is laudable, having up to 200 or so students housed in this area is not the most suitable location.

In fact the site is firmly in the Cumulative Impact Zone where operation of, in particular, licensed premises and night time hospitality and entertainment are already considered to impact unfavourably on the area and its nearby residents.

I also note the claim that "there will be no nuisance to the amenity of nearby residents or businesses." Presumably this claim relates to Statutory Nuisance, actionable by the council or individual residents! That, even if true, is by no means adequate reassurance for an area with a substantial number of existing residents.

I return to the objection from "the planners" and also agree with their comments about smoke and mirrors: a huge amount of material has been submitted by the applicant but much of it seems aimed to impress and overwhelm people.

I think that many people (even those with a genuine interest in the area; and the location and nature of the scheme) will simply not have the time, ability or the inclination to plough through it all properly and grasp its significance.

Indeed I can envisage many giving up and concluding erroneously that if the applicant has gone to so much trouble and submitted so much documentation, the proposal must be alright.

Far from true.