



SPECIAL ECONOMY, CULTURE AND TOURISM SCRUTINY PANEL

10th August 2026 at 3.00pm

Present:

Councillor Morland (in the Chair)

Councillors Bright (substitute for Henderson), Charlesworth, Dawkins, Humphrey, Jackson (substitute for Parkinson), Mayne and I. Oliver (substitute for Mills).

Officers in attendance:

- Carolina Borgstrom (Director of Economy, Environment and Infrastructure)
- Zoe Campbell (Senior Scrutiny and Committee Advisor)
- Damien Jaines-White (Assistant Director Regeneration)
- Simon Jones (Assistant Director Law and Governance)

Also in attendance:

- Councillor Batson (Portfolio Holder for Housing Infrastructure and Transport)
- Councillor Freeston (Leader of the Council and Portfolio Holder for Strategic Renewal, Delivery and Place Leadership)
- Councillor Crofts, Immingham Ward Councillor

There was one member of the press and one member of the public present.

SPE.19 APOLOGIES FOR ABSENCE

Apologies for absence were received from Councillor Henderson, Mills and Parkinson for this meeting.

SPE.20 DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

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

SPE.21 CALL-IN MARKET PLACE CLEETHORPES

The panel considered a request from members to call-in the above Cabinet decision.

Councillor Crofts addressed the panel on the call in and called for greater transparency and scrutiny of the proposed transport, parking and Market Place changes. He requested evidence of their safety, accessibility, effectiveness and financial sustainability, questioned the decision-making and approval process, and raised concerns about limited councillor awareness and reduced public consultation.

A member enquired about the previous council-approved free parking scheme, including the number of spaces, location, and funding. The Leader confirmed it was for the car park next to the 'Old Vic' public house, which was deemed insufficient and too far from the high street. He stated that funding would come from transformation reserves, costing approximately £2,500.

A member sought clarification on the free parking cost, which was confirmed as lost revenue. Mr Jaines-White noted that as it was a new car park, usage was not established, leading to a low initial financial consequence.

A member compared the distance of the Old Vic car park to the proposed new location, suggesting minimal difference.

Emphasis was placed on the importance of listening to residents and businesses, and the need for a fair, open, and honest consultation, especially given the significant changes planned for the area (e.g., Christmas tree light switch-on events). A member suggested referral to Full Council if agreement could not be reached.

A member enquired about the impact of further consultation on project schedule and costs. Mr Jaines-White confirmed that the twelve spaces did not fundamentally alter the material design, so there would be no impact on the build contract. The main consequence would be a delay in the Traffic Regulation Order (TRO) process, with minimal direct consultation costs.

Concerns were raised by a member about the road safety audit for the proposed changes, asking what would happen if it was negative. Mr Jaines-White explained that the physical build remained unchanged, but the 12-space proposal was subject to road safety audits and TROs. If these did not support the design, it would be amended or aborted, which was standard procedure. The original scheme's road safety audit was understood to be satisfactory. An audit for the proposed changes would be undertaken, with pre- and post-implementation phases.

The member asked if the TRO consultation would allow public comment, to which Mr Jaines-White confirmed it would provide a third opportunity for comment.

A member reiterated the request for more detail on the use of reserves for funding. Mr Jaines-White confirmed that the two-year trial would be funded from the council's wider reserves, with permanent implementation requiring future budget setting and Full Council approval.

A member highlighted the vagueness of the proposal, noting that only twelve parking spaces were known, with no details on operation (e.g., duration, bollard use, traffic flow, safety measures) and requested a full picture for consultation, including hours of operation and safety provisions.

The Leader responded, stating the scheme aimed for a flexible space. He confirmed the scheme remained largely the same, with road safety audits and TROs addressing concerns.

A member asked about the costs to cancel the original scheme which the Leader stated were under £700,000, contrary to higher figures circulated. A member reiterated the need for clear information for the public and businesses.

The Leader stated a timetable would be published after business consultations, allowing for flexibility. He contrasted his own door-to-door video consultation with businesses (claiming 86-96% opposition to the original scheme) against previous consultations.

A member asked if a risk-benefit analysis would be conducted for the two-year free parking trial. The Leader acknowledged the difficulty in measuring business impact but confirmed work was underway on methodology, noting other authorities' experiences.

Referring to the TRO consultation, a member asked if it would detail opening/closing times. Mr Jaines-White indicated it would clarify spaces, seasonality, and flexibility for markets, with a core pedestrianised period, while acknowledging regulatory requirements for traffic access at certain times.

A member commented on the robustness of the original consultation process and clarified that the £700,000-£1 million cancellation cost was an estimate for day one of the administration and questioned why this cost was not a barrier to cancellation if the Leader felt strongly about the scheme. The Leader explained that a £1 million loss to local funds was unaffordable, leading to a compromise.

A member asked about the impact on street furniture. Mr Jaines-White noted minor amendments to bench locations might be needed but not a material impact.

A member challenged the assertion that business closures were due to pedestrianisation, stating its closure was unrelated and he argued pedestrianisation often worked. The Leader clarified he did not link all closures but stated some businesses had attributed their closure or relocation to the marketplace scheme.

Councillor Dawkins recommended a referral back to Cabinet to reconsider a public consultation on the proposed scheme and that such consultation carried sufficient detail around traffic and pedestrian management.

Councillor Jackson seconded the proposal, adding that the public consultation should comply with the council's normal processes.

A vote was taken on the recommendation with five members voting in favour, three against and no abstentions therefore the recommendation was carried.

The Chair concluded the meeting by expressing hope that the Cabinet would follow the democratic process and take note of the panel's request for a public consultation.

RECOMMENDED TO CABINET – That Cabinet reconsiders a public consultation on the proposed scheme and that such consultation carry sufficient detail around traffic and pedestrian management.

There being no further business the Chair closed the meeting at 3.53 pm.