

Objection No 1

On behalf of Scarborough Hospitality Association and its members, I wish to object to the proposed changes to (Off-Street Parking Places) Amendment Order 2018 for the following reasons:

- The introduction of a reduced resident tariff and an increased visitor tariff is overly complicated.
 - The reduction to residents is so insignificant as to offer any noticeable advantage or benefit;
 - In comparison, the increase for visitors is punitive. It is likely to create bad publicity and be detrimental to the tourism economy of the region;
 - The implementation and ongoing running costs to support a system necessary to enable parking attendants to correctly identify resident from visitor will be administratively cumbersome and expensive.
 - Without such a scheme, there is bound to be confusion which will increase the risk for parking tickets to be challenged producing delays in payment with associated costs.
 - The scheme will be unlikely to produce the results the Council are expecting.
- While the introduction of a proposed winter tariff of £1.00 may seem small, the present suspension of parking charges between 1st November and 28 February is popular and supports many hospitality businesses from small sea front cafes and snack bars to the larger visitor attractions especially during weekends when accommodation providers also benefit from short-break out of season holiday makers.

Objection No 2

REF: INTRODUCTION OF WINTER PARKING CHARGES

I am writing on behalf of SBTA members to say how very disappointed we were to learn that SBC are proposing to introduce a £1.00 winter charge at various locations across the Borough, particularly Marine Drive and other tradition day visitor car parks.

Scarborough is a Town that relies on its visitor economy to flourish and this reliance is as important during the lean winter months as it is in the summer. In the past the concession of Free Winter Parking has been a valuable marketing tool, helping to attract visitors to come that bit further afield to visit us during the short winter days and a ploy also adopted by SBC itself to help benefit the town centre during the Christmas period. We believe that SBC's proposal to do away with free winter parking, in spite of current national advice to reduce parking costs, will be seen as short-sighted and counterproductive. We believe that this policy change has the potential to do untold damage to our reputation, a Borough that warmly welcome's its visitors. When you then add the proposal to reduce residents parking charges as a side benefit, the whole idea becomes rather more insidious and one that might be considered to be a prejudicial, anti tourist policy.

We have heard much of the argument that a pound is only a nominal sum and shouldn't put folk off and perhaps it won't, but we believe that the message contained within this proposal will. Whilst understanding the severe financial pressures placed on the local authority, we would however strongly urge the council not to adopt this flawed policy and continue to offer free winter parking across all seasonal visitor car parks.

Objection No 3

I would object to two aspects of the proposed changes.

The introduction of a Visitor Tariff for a town so dependent on visitors is disgraceful. It sends a mean spirited and unwelcoming message to visitors for the sale of what 20p.

The introduction of a winter charge will result in empty parking meters having to be 'emptied'. I suspect it will cost the council more than it will recoup.

I appreciate funds are tight and that an increase in revenues is needed. But it really is time that the council appreciated that people will pay for services they value and object to having to pay for services that they feel are simply exploitative.

Objection No 4

We would like to comment on the proposed changes to (Off-Street Parking Places) Amendment Order 2018.

We feel that the introduction of a reduced resident tariff and an increased visitor tariff will be complicated to administer.

The very small reduction for residents offers very little benefit, whilst charging visitors more to park will create a bad impression and have a negative affect on tourism in the town.

There will be additional costs in setting up and running such a scheme as well as ensuring that parking attendants correctly identify residents from visitors and deal with them according.

The other matter is the introduction of £1.00 charge for parking at the seafront. Visitors are used to this out of season benefit (which no doubt encourages them to visit the town in the winter months) and again will feel aggrieved at the loss of it.

Visitors to the town consider a range of factors when planning their stay and parking is a vital element in their decision to come to Scarborough – or not....

This scheme is complicated and could have the result of confusing residents and alienating visitors to the town.

Objection No 5

Here your press release is disingenuous . we are invited to cheer a few pennies reduction in car park fees.

...oh , I just noticed the annual £10 fee. i'll leave you to do the arithmetic. quite aside from the fact that locals don't want to , and *currently* often don't have to use the designated car parks as , just like you and me, people prefer to park as close as possible to their homes.

everything you do re parking, is designed to favour visitors. but not those local taxpayers who pay your wage.

Objection No 6

1. As stated in the preface to this emailed letter, I wish to object to the proposed changes to SBC's Parking Amendments which, for ease of reference, are contained within one of the attachments to this communication. Facilitating additional reference for your replies, I number each paragraph within this letter.
2. I find some of the proposed 2018 Amendments confusing, with others an untimely, unnecessary imposition given the parking conditions prevailing within Scarborough's Southcliff, for the foreseeable future. To ease my confusion, may I please seek the clarity I am unable to determine within the Press Notice, in addition to the connected issues to which this letter also refers?
3. One of these issues concerns ambiguous parking rules and conditions. A conflicting financial claim by Councillor Siddons, my Ward Councillor. Then the successful appeal, by a Scarborough resident, against the imposition of his parking fine. This appeared to set a precedent relating to the other fines paid for the same offence, only successfully appealed by this single individual. Consequently, those 'fines' collected from other identical 'offenders' remain within SBC's coffers. However, this individual's accepted appeal was then successfully challenged by North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) with anticipated, retrospective financial consequences then ruled inapplicable. From press reports, I gather this last issue saved North Yorkshire County Council (NYCC) approximately three million pounds in reimbursed fines. I do not recall the name of the successful appellant but you will know to whom I refer since the press reported that this gentleman's daughter, also a lawyer, assisted her father with his successful appeal.
4. 2018 AMENDMENT DETAILS
The deadline for objecting to this scheme gave just 17 days from the posting of the Amendment in the local press. Residents wishing to acquaint themselves with a copy of the proposed Order, a statement of the reasons for which it is proposed to be made, maps showing the locations of the car parks concerned and a copy of the 2012 Order (as amended) may only be examined, during office hours at (a) the Enquiry Office, Town Hall, St. Nicholas Street, Scarborough. Consequently, I have some difficulty in understanding why this narrow, limited degree of access makes a comparison of the maps showing the locations of the car parks concerned and a copy of the 2012 Order (as amended) with the 2018 Amendment so much more difficult. This disparity appears to hinder the necessary, democratic process required: Particularly for residents and others whose day to day work schedules coincide with the Town Hall's Office hours. This will hinder rather than facilitate a genuine comparison, negating the required,

democratic scrutiny facilitating the Amendment, prior to implementation. On this basis and others which follow: **Object** to the **time limit** attached to the 2018 Amendment and its implementation during 'Scarborough's Spa Slope Stabalisation Scheme' (SSSSS).

5. The Amendment appears to have the sole purpose of generating additional revenue, while discriminating against the visitors to Scarborough, upon whom the Borough depends for a large degree of both commercial and SBC revenues. The introduction of a Residents Permit also introduces additional levels of bureaucracy and costs. This appears to contrast with the town I partly grew up in, which over the years has made significant, successful efforts in other directions, expanding the Borough as a prestigious tourist resort. However, I now see discriminations likely to alienate visitors, inhibiting the potential this Borough possesses.
6. The discriminatory parking tariff I refer to is one example. Another I experienced centres on Peasholme Park. This location is not connected to this FOI questionnaire, but illustrates other policies alienating our visitors. A few weeks ago I was relaxing in Peasholme Park, hitherto a free public space, when at 3.30 pm the whole area was cleared of the public: Only to readmit those occupants willing to re-enter 30 minutes later, for a fee, in order to watch the Naval Battle. As I departed, the adverse comments I overheard were entirely understandable. One very notable quote: -

"I thought this was a public park? Well if they're daft enough to expect me to pay to get back in again they've had it".

Employing such ridiculously clumsy tactics, the sudden, arbitrary evacuation of an entire public park reeks exclusively of greedy, cynical revenue generation.

7. Where parking in Scarborough is concerned, there are similar examples which create resentment amongst our visitors, and also amongst Scarborough's residents. Today, I received a phone call from a friend, who weeks ago placed SBC Parking 'Scratch Cards' on the dash board covering a four day period. I understand this friend has just received a 'Notice to Owner' demanding money for 'Failing to display a Parking Disc' alongside the scratch cards. The four scratch cards had 160 hours of validity and were dated sequentially as required. The 'Parking Disc', actually a square card, indicates a validity period of just three hours. The illogicality here is absurd. When SBC then amplifies this absurdity by attaching a fine this inevitably becomes offensive.
8. I've had the same experience in connection with my Residents Parking Permit. To avoid repetitions, I then attached four square parking 'Discs' to a dashboard mount, each one advanced sequentially by three hours. Since each square 'disc' displays a maximum of just 12 hours, this can be either midnight to noon or noon to midnight. Therefore, displaying four square 'discs', each set and advanced sequentially by three hours, they cover a 24 hour period. This display then enables your CEO's to 'unambiguously' observe a full days account of parking duration, commensurate with each day the vehicle remains parked in any designated parking position. With visitor 'Scratch Cards', procured and purchased by a resident, already possessing a Residents Parking Permit, a similar display of four square parking 'discs', each advanced by three hours, therefore avoids similar ambiguities regarding the time, legitimately identified vehicle have arrived at a parked location. What I suggest would obviously cover every hour in each day. But appreciating the required absurdity this unnecessary timing sequence requires, you will understand my own bewildering incomprehension at the offence the existing, nonsensical bureaucracy represents. Consequently? It needs to end.
9. When I moved to Scarborough in September 2015, available parking along the

Esplanade adjacent to my home was frequently nonexistent. As a War Pensioner, I possess a disabled person's Blue Badge, but often this did not confer an easy ability to park close to my home. I then parked on the very wide, shore-side pavement opposite, immediately adjacent to a grassed area (photo attached).

10. I continued this practice for a year, without penalty. But then I began collecting PCN's. My understanding was that parking on a pavement, unless across disabled persons wheelchair access point, was outside a CEO's authority to intervene with a PCN. I checked this with the North Yorkshire Police and they confirmed this. Parking on a pavement area was technically prohibited, providing police officers were satisfied that a parked vehicle did not hinder pedestrian access, they usually exercise discretion. Indeed, examples of this are still very evident in many areas of Scarborough. When your CEO's then began to affix further PCN's to my vehicle I sought additional police advice and confirmation.
11. About three weeks ago a neighbour, possessing a small motorcycle, had parked this against the fence overlooking the Spa Complex. He and I came out of our apartment block, just as a CEO was about to attach a PCN to his machine. I witnessed this and intervened on my neighbour's behalf. The CEO stated that the police advice I had now twice received was inaccurate. In that case, I replied, clarification was essential. I named the last police officer providing this advice, urging your CEO to bring this conflict of authority to the attention of his Line Manager. I stated that clarification was essential since either the Police or SBC were in error, with one or the other Authority erroneously misleading the public. If the CEO's are in error, then they are enabling SBC to collect money by false pretences. If SBC are aware that such monies are indeed being collected in these circumstances, then this appears to be described, in English Law, as 'Theft'. Clearly, the potential here for a serious miscarriage of justice is obvious.
12. Given the very recent implementation of the Scarborough Spa Slope Stabilisation Scheme (S.S.S.S), residents and visitors to Scarborough's Southcliff area are now experiencing serious parking restrictions. The demise of the Holbeck Hall Hotel 25 years ago reminded SBC of the known, inherent instability of the Spa Complex and its immediately adjacent coastline, extending from Hull to Whitby. Very sadly, a 9 year old girl's life was tragically and recently ended by falling rocks, which took place on the beach at Staithes. The inherent instability of this stretch of coast and here in Scarborough has been well documented for decades. Therefore, it seems astonishing that 25 years have elapsed since the demise of a highly valued hotel, a few hundred yards from Scarborough's most prestigious Spa Complex, seemed not to portend a similar demise for the Spa Complex, this most valuable asset in Scarborough's 'Crown Jewels'. The more recent deterioration and destructive instability at Knipe Point further emphasising this serious fragility and threat to our Town. This too appears to have been ignored.
13. It appears that a degree of complacent inattention to serious, known geological threats and remedies has been needlessly neglected. Remedial actions are at last being implemented. Just in time? The collapse to the pavement area fronting the Café and cabins/bungalows just south of the funicular tram occurred after the SSSS Scheme began. I believe that remedial actions must, not should, have been implemented immediately following the sudden Holbeck Hotel collapse. The dithering by SBC over the Futurist Theatre reflects a symptom of inherent indecision within this Borough. But at least this structure remained safe, only threatened by man-made destruction. The inevitable potential for losing the Spa slope and the Complex at its base was, without remedy, a geological certainty. But this issue was neglected and left unattended. Now, a leading local Councillor is claiming credit, in writing, for this tardy stabilisation attempt, stating this overdue

scheme is actually being implemented, solely to protect the value of private dwellings along the Esplanade. Read Cllr Siddons letter claiming SBC is funding this scheme. I understood NYCC and the Environment Agency were funding the work.

14. All this leads to parking issues and your intention to implement PARKING AMMENDMENT ORDER 2018. I strongly object to this and use here the same questions Cllr Siddons ignored, now mandating your legal obligation to answer these questions under FOI Legislation. In my letter of reply to Cllr Siddons, which he ignored, I asked for answers, to these now FOI Question, reprinting our entire exchange of correspondence below, highlight the questions he failed to answer, now absolutely pertinent to the objections I make to you.

The Letter to Cllr Siddons

August 2nd 2018.

Dear Cllr Siddons,

CAR PARKING SOUTHCLIFF

Thank you for your emailed letter dated the 30 07 2018 @ 7.21pm. As a point of easy reference I print your narrative below: -

Dear Mr Hampshire,

Thank you for giving me sight of your letter to Robert Goodwill MP.

To be honest, I am really surprised at your suggestion to convert the Prince of Wales Gardens into a car park. I could not support this idea and I would suggest it would be met with total horror by the majority of local residents and the public at large and I would agree with them.

It has to be remembered that the main reason for carrying out the cliff stabilisation work is to ensure the future of properties in your terrace which are the most at risk. The government insisted that beneficiaries (ie.You) should pay their fair share of the cost which would have run into many thousands of pounds. We have worked hard, as your local councillors, to ensure the burden doesn't fall on you and is covered by SBC. If it is inconvenient for your parking arrangements during this essential work, so be it.

I would suggest you drop the idea of converting the gardens into a car park so that you can park closer to your property. I used to live on Prince of Wales Terrace and it wasn't unusual, particularly during the holiday period, to have to park at the top of Esplanade near the clock tower. It's just one of those things.

Be heartened by the fact that your property will be safe and, hopefully, give you many years of enjoyment in the future.

Regards.

Steve.

Cllr Steve Siddons, Labour Councillor for Ramshill

(My Continued Reply)

Perhaps I did not explain the purpose of my approach and comments with sufficient clarity. My overall aim was to highlight the enhanced parking difficulties now being caused by civil-engineering works in a recognised problem area. Difficulties you experienced when living along Prince of Wales Terrace, now made even worse since you moved, almost equidistance away, you'll be relieved to know. Those left behind now have to contend with the inconvenience I'm attempting to alleviate, for at least the next 18 months. Presumably a point you will understand.

It is fully understood that SBC is responsible only for on-street parking. However, the severe restrictions now being imposed were entirely predictable. They have an adverse effect on both income generation and our reputation as welcoming holiday resort. Personal family experience of the strict parking and penalty enforcement regime indicates that visitors are avoiding the town in the area where I live.

Accordingly, did SBC previously consult NYCC regarding extra, temporary, off-road parking facilities throughout the duration of the contract? If not, why not? It may be that my own suggestions do not find favour but what alternatives have been explored?

Your personal point about remotely parking near the Clock Tower is well made. Unfortunately, as a disabled war-pensioner and blue badge holder this is almost beyond my capabilities. Equally, your suggestion that Esplanade property values may benefit from stabilisation work is purely academic. My own apartment is rented from a private landlord on a shorthold agreement. Had he been forced to contribute financially to the restoration scheme I suspect that my rent would increase beyond my financial capabilities.

In any event, I maintain that SBC will be the prime beneficiary since the Spa Complex is a most significant revenue-earner, for the town as well as its council.

You state my suggestion, an easy temporary conversion to a small part of the Prince of Wales Gardens, would likely be met with horror by the majority of local residents. I do not agree. The area I chose is immediately adjacent to the Esplanade, directly opposite the busy funicular tram, giving direct access to the Spa complex below, obviously enhancing the significant revenue generated there for SBC.

The temporary parking area I suggest is mostly grassed, at street level and, unlike the more distant areas of the gardens, does not have any walled or other structure across this easily accessible area. As stated previously, the turf here could easily be lifted and stored for later re-use. A gravelled area could then form an alternative replacement car park, until Balfour Beatty relinquishes the car park they were permitted to occupy a few hundred yards away. At which point the minimal disturbance in the area I suggest would then be easily remedied and brought back into use. I suspect that Balfour Beatty would likely have incorporated this conversion and subsequent remedial work, had they been asked. They may even agree to do this with or without additional cost, retrospectively. What are your thoughts here?

Like me, I suspect you have also made a pledge towards the South Cliff Gardens improvement scheme, now awaiting augmentation from the National Lottery Fund. If this bid is successful might what I 'm suggesting be incorporated into this scheme? What do you think?

Councillor, I too was elected to public office in South Yorkshire and as a Councillor I am proud of the contribution I made in my Parish. I therefore regret that you see fit to dismiss my concerns in such an arbitrary manner. I would have hoped for a more constructive approach from a senior local politician.

15. In my opinion, Cllr Siddons has departed from well documented facts regarding the prime purpose and finance underpinning the Spa Slope Stabilisation Scheme. He appears to have chosen his rebuttal of my suggestions for a temporary, alternative parking area, immediately adjacent to the Esplanade Funicular Tram, using easy words of dismissal, unworthy of his position as a Ward Councillor and Senior Local Politician. My alternative suggestion possesses the simplest and least expensive solution to the disruption caused by the SSSSS. Yet Cllr Siddons has dismissed this solution and opportunity out of hand.

I accept that the temporary conversion of the area of gardens I proposed is far from desirable, detracting visibly from a very pleasant area of relaxation. However, it provides a retention of Southcliff's parking space, available prior to the Spa's Slope stabilisation. The temporary environmental 'blight' I suggested to Cllr Siddons is understood, but it will **only be temporary**. This area of land is easily convertible and reversed. The aesthetically displeasing suggestion I put to Cllr Siddons, which I understand, would not be so easily rejected were he still a resident in Prince of Wales Drive. However, the present visually diminished aesthetics of the Esplanade, with its inevitably reduced, difficult pedestrian access, is being accepted. However,

a rather dangerous limited pavement access and diversion now presents one avoidable safety hazard. Most of the residents in this immediate locality seem to accept the blight to our environment. My suggestions to Cllr Siddons, well intended but ignored, are inevitably reiterated here, but now under FOI legislation. I was attempting to make a contribution towards alleviating the present degraded parking, and these suggestions deserve to be taken seriously, not disregarded with words of casual dismissal: And seemingly based on false information.

16. This objection to SBC's PARKING AMENDMENT ORDER 2018 is a serious attempt to halt these intended implementations. I have explained why I believe the process you intend to implement is flawed, given insufficient time and opportunity, for proper democratic scrutiny, with modifications then enabling its implementation. I have also instanced, with written and photographic evidence, misleading and/or avoided, inadequate explanations surrounding current and future parking proposals by an elected member of SBC. In addition, I make recent historical comparisons of tardiness, regarding serious, problematic geological resolutions, significantly inhibiting the intention to implement inappropriate Parking Amendments by SBC.
17. Please respond to this letter as soon as possible, noting that I make this objection within your short ill timed deadline. At least providing you with sufficient notice to respond, advising me and other residents of alternative procedures fitting the process currently intended: Unhindered by otherwise convenient, clever bureaucratic tactics of well practiced avoidance. And please forgive any perceived, inappropriate cynicism inherent in my comments.
18. I will now collate the FOI questions scattered throughout this letter's contents.
 - A. In your proposed Parking Amendment 2018, within the highlighted area of my paragraph 4 there is reference to: - during office hours at (a) the Enquiry Office, Town Hall, St. Nicholas Street, Scarborough. There is no mention of other places where inspections may take place so can I assume that the reference to (a) is a type error, or was it intended to list other methods of examination but then overlooked or intentionally left out? For example, SBC Websites where the more time consuming, complicated inspections of maps and the previous Parking Amendment can then be been more easily accessed?
 - B. What if any prior consultations took place to facilitate a temporary alternative to the car park now commandeered by Balfour Beatty and located between St Martin's Avenue and Albion Road: If such consultations did not take place was this option ignored or simply overlooked?
 - C. If alternative parking areas were considered, please identify these and explain why they were not made available?
 - D. I have suggested a temporary alternative car park opposite Southcliff's Funicular Tram, in the open, unobstructed grassed area of the Prince of Wales Gardens. Its conversion and then restoration would be relatively inexpensive, providing a most convenient solution during the Spa slope's stabilization. Do you believe this would be a pragmatic choice and if not why not?
 - E. Referring to Cllr Siddons emailed letter dated the 30 07 2018 @ 7.21pm, part of paragraph 14. I highlight his claim that SBC is financing the Spa Slope Stabalisation to protect the value of the properties along the Esplanade at this point. He does not make any reference to the preservation of the Spa Complex below, behind which serious instability has led to the expensive work now underway. Notices fixed outside the Funicular Tram indicate that NYCC and the Environment Agency are financing this project. Please state precisely the source of finance and the main purpose for this scheme's implementation. In your position as SBC's Senior legal Officer, If your reply differs from the claim made

by Cllr Siddons, please advise me of any action which may follow if any incorrect statements made by this Councillor were intended to be deliberately misleading. It seems rather odd that an experienced, senior local politician appears to hold an opinion well informed people would find incomprehensible.

- F. In the wider context now affecting parking in Scarborough's Southcliff, do you share my opinion that that the geological instability inherent in Southcliff is a very serious problem, needlessly neglected for at least 25 years and if so what are the explanations attached to this neglect?