



SPECIAL ECONOMY, CULTURE AND TOURISM SCRUTINY PANEL

10th July 2026 at 9.00am

Present:

Councillor Morland (in the Chair)
Councillors Charlesworth, Dawkins, Henderson, Humphrey and Jackson (substitute for Parkinson).

Officers in attendance:

- Paul Evans (Assistant Director – Infrastructure,
- Damien Jaines-White (Assistant Director Regeneration)
- Simon Jones (Assistant Director Law and Governance)
- Joanne Paterson (Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Brasted (Portfolio Holder for Culture, Heritage and the Visitor Economy)
- Councillor Freeston (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Renewal, Delivery and Place Leadership)
- Councillor Augusta
- Councillor P Batson

There was 1 member of the press and 7 members of the public present.

SPE.1 APPOINTMENT OF CHAIRMAN AND DEPUTY CHAIRMAN

It was noted that at the Annual General Meeting of the Council held on 21st May 2026, Councillor Morland had been appointed the Chair and Councillor Henderson the Deputy Chair of the Economy, Culture and Tourism Scrutiny Panel for the ensuing Municipal Year.

SPE.2 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

An apology for absence was received from Councillor Parkinson for this meeting.

SPE.3 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

There were no declarations of interest received in respect of any item on the agenda for this meeting.

SPE.4 MARKET PLACE CLEETHORPES DESIGN, AND ST PETERS AVENUE AND THE OLD VIC PARKING CHARGES

The scrutiny panel convened to examine proposed revisions to the Cleethorpes Marketplace scheme, primarily concerning the introduction of 12 seasonal parking spaces, ahead of it going to the Cabinet on 15th July 2026.

Officers set out the background to the report and highlighted key matters for consideration.

The Chair and Deputy Chair asked Councillor Freeston, Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Renewal, Delivery, and Place Leadership, to confirm the net change in costs arising from the recent change request to alter the scheme, for example including the car parking facility. This was asked to help explain to the public whether the revisions would cost or save any money. A complete view of cost was requested, not just any third-party contractor costs. For example, officer time, and the cost of the new free car parking scheme in St Peter's Avenue. .

Councillor Freeston responded that the cost of £160k represented good value for money. This figure included approximately £140k in lost revenue from one-hour parking tickets, plus Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) fees. He emphasised the proposal's importance in supporting local businesses.

The Chair and Deputy Chair stated that the Council had ran a consultation and come up with a design that suited the majority of views. There had now been a change to the scheme. They suggested that either the original scheme did not reflect the views of the majority or the change was resulting from the views of an unscrutinised minority, without consultation.

Councillor Freeston explained that there were mixed public views and that year-round pedestrianisation, particularly on cold winter nights, was not practical. The current proposal represented a medium approach to adapt the scheme.

A member queried the significance of the Leaders consultation methods, such as social media engagement and door-knocking, compared with the more extensive consultation previously undertaken by officers. He also

highlighted a petition from local businesses opposing the proposed changes.

In response, Councillor Freeston maintained that the changes remained consistent with the original plan and funding arrangements. He stated that consultations carried out two years earlier may no longer reflect current public opinion and considered door-knocking and social media feedback as legitimate forms of councillor engagement. He also suggested that seasonal pedestrianisation was a sensible and widely accepted approach.

A member highlighted concerns raised by local businesses about the storage of outdoor furniture and the potential negative impact on al fresco dining. The members referred to successful pedestrianisation schemes elsewhere, including within Castleton and Sheffield, which had increased footfall. Members also expressed significant concerns about public safety, particularly the risk posed by vehicle movements and a perceived lack of enforcement and called for a full public consultation.

In response, Councillor Freeston responded that comparisons with Sheffield were not appropriate due to differences in public transport usage and local weather conditions. He stated that concerns about furniture storage had not previously been raised and maintained his informal consultation methods were valid means of engaging with residents and businesses.

A member provided historical context, highlighting that the original Cleethorpes Masterplan was supported by an extensive consultation process involving more than 2,500 participants, public meetings, and engagement with local businesses. The member further noted that pedestrianisation had received strong support through this process and stated that the marketplace had largely been used for employee parking. The member also expressed concern that the proposed 12 parking spaces would mainly be used by delivery drivers rather than the general public.

In response, Councillor Freeston maintained that the scheme would continue to allow residents and visitors to enjoy the area.

A member questioned the conciseness of the current report compared to the 2024 equivalent, which had reassured members about no loss of parking and sought clarification from officers on this. Councillor Freeston responded that this had been very well documented.

The Chair asked the Leader to inform the panel of the impact of the changes, if implemented, on the surrounding environs and other parking area. The Chair felt that the changes would clearly impact existing arrangements for car parking in Cleethorpes especially the St Peter's Avenue Car Park. The Chair understood that free parking was being proposed in this car park, and asked what would be the flow of traffic and would a new TRO be required. He also asked what would be the loss in revenue for St Peter's Avenue car park by implementing the 12 spaces in

the Market Place. Furthermore, the Controlled Parking Zone (CPZ) was creating enough problems for those already living with its consequences. Would the Leader please inform the panel of the expected impact of traffic in this area if the proposed parking scheme were to be allowed. The Chair did not consider enough impact assessment, and revenue loss had been identified along with the wider impact on the scheme.

Councillor Freeston confirmed that a TRO would be required. He further agreed that the CPZ was problematic and was under review. He stated that the impact on wider car parks would be assessed during a two-year trial period, which would depend on customer habits.

In response to a query, Mr Evans confirmed that any TRO would follow due process. The Chair asked about timelines for the TRO. Mr Evans highlighted this typically took around 3-6 months to draw up, followed by a public consultation period.

The Chair referred to a representation submitted by a local businessman expressing concern that partial pedestrianisation would be less effective and more disruptive than the original plan. The Chair noted that all panel members had received this via email.

The Chair also read out a question from a local resident who was unable to attend the meeting. The question raised concerns about public safety, respect for the democratic process, original consultation, the future of Cleethorpes, and the enforceability of seasonal parking rules. The resident also advocated for pedestrian-friendly spaces.

Councillor Freeston acknowledged the need to balance safety with the necessity of cars and explained that bollards would prevent vehicle entry during pedestrianised periods, addressing enforcement concerns.

A member asked if the proposed parking spaces would be located in areas where businesses typically placed outdoor seating. Councillor Freeston confirmed that the spaces would be in front of the food establishments and these spaces would be removed during peak seasons to allow for outdoor seating, aligning with the original scheme's intent. He reiterated his view that outdoor seating in winter was not viable.

The Deputy Chair summarised the discussion, noting the shared aspiration for the marketplace, the original public consultation, and the anecdotal nature of arguments against winter pedestrianisation. He highlighted the perceived lack of substantive weight in the consultation supporting the proposed changes compared to the original and suggested re-running the consultation.

A member proposed a recommendation to Cabinet that a full public consultation be held on the proposed changes before their implementation. This was duly seconded.

A further discussion ensued regarding the scope and duration of the proposed consultation with some members suggesting a light touch, quick consultation to avoid undue delays, acknowledging the upcoming Cabinet meeting. The Monitoring Officer advised that any consultation would adhere to usual parameters, 4-12 weeks depending on significance.

Councillor Freeston expressed concern that further consultation would cause project delays and suggested a more formal consultation could be conducted after 12 months of the trial period.

The Monitoring Officer clarified that the panel's function was to scrutinise and influence Cabinet decisions and that any recommendations made by the panel today would be presented to Cabinet before their decision.

Following extensive debate on the rationale, consultation processes, costs, and potential impacts of these changes, the panel agreed to recommend to Cabinet that a public consultation exercise be undertaken before the proposed changes were implemented.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET - That a consultation exercise be undertaken prior to any decision on the proposed changes to the Cleethorpes Marketplace scheme

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 10.13 am.