

From: Derek Maynard [mailto:████████████████████]
Sent: 21 May 2018 13:22
To: NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>
Subject: RE: Proposed Road Closure & Diversion of PRINCES PARADE HYTHE KENT by Folkestone & Hythe District Council

Dear Mr Crass

We thank you for your prompt response to our objections, which do NOT predominantly relate to the Councils proposed development – though the stoppage arises from the Councils aspirations as a real estate developer.

As residents fronting the A259 with close access on foot to the sea front by crossing over Princes Parade, we are very familiar with the status quo and the needs of the town population. The diversion proposed would be a most retrograde and unnecessary action, purely from a highways and public interest point of view.

Kind regards,
Derek H Maynard FRICS

From: NATIONALCASEWORK [mailto:NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk]
Sent: 21 May 2018 12:01
To: 'Derek Maynard'
Subject: RE: Proposed Road Closure & Diversion of PRINCES PARADE HYTHE KENT by Folkestone & Hythe District Council

Dear Mr and Mrs Maynard

TOWN AND COUNTRY PLANNING ACT 1990: S.247
PROPOSED STOPPING UP OF HIGHWAY AT PRINCES PARADE, FOLKESTONE CT21 6AQ
OS GRID REFERENCE: E:618281, N:134781

Our ref: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254

Thank you for your email submitting an objection to the above mentioned Order.

As you are aware, planning permission for the associated development has not yet been granted by Folkestone and Hythe District Council. Should planning permission be granted for the development we will be re-assessing the objections that we have received to ensure that they are valid in relation to the stopping up Order.

If it is evident that concerns pertain predominantly to the impact of the proposed development rather than directly to or any possible consequences arising from the stopping up of the section of highway verge proposed by the above stopping up Order, then they will not be accepted. The Secretary of State's role in the matter is limited to considering the impact closure of a highway would have on users, and to take a decision which determines where the ultimate public interest may lie.

Should the planning permission be called in or if there is an inquiry then we would look to join that inquiry. The Secretary of State for Transport would then look to issuing a decision following that inquiry.

Although planning permission has not yet been granted, Section 253 of the Town and Country Planning Act 1990 as amended by the Growth and Infrastructure Act 2013 allows the Secretary of State to start the consultation to stop up the highway as long as an applicant has applied for planning permission. An Order would then be issued following the granting of planning permission and assuming that any objections had been resolved either by the applicant or via a form of inquiry.

In the meantime, a copy of your email has been forwarded to Folkestone and Hythe District Council, the applicant, who may get in touch with you to discuss the objection. I should be grateful if you would forward copies of any correspondence you may have with the applicant, and should matters be concluded to your satisfaction, confirm to us that you no longer object.

Please be aware that where a stopping up Order becomes the subject of a local Public Inquiry (PI), all correspondence is copied to the Inspector conducting the Inquiry and will also be kept in the PI library, where it is publicly available.

Kind regards

Neil Crass
National Transport Casework Team



Neil Crass
Casework Officer, National Transport
Casework Team
Ground Flr, Tyneside House
Skinnerburn Road
Newcastle Business Park, Newcastle Upon
Tyne, NE4 7AR
020 7944 4162

[Follow us on twitter @transportgovuk](https://twitter.com/transportgovuk)

From: Derek Maynard [<mailto:> [REDACTED]]

Sent: 21 May 2018 11:31

To: NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>

Subject: Proposed Road Closure & Diversion of PRINCES PARADE HYTHE KENT by Folkestone & Hythe District Council

Dear Sirs

My wife Sonia and I wish to lodge a formal objection to the application being made by our local authority to stopping up of the public highway.

- (1) We consider that the existing long established road is a major amenity for local people to be able to drive along an open stretch of coast road, especially as it carries light traffic and does not have the heavy trunk road traffic that the A259 carries.
- (2) At its Seabrook/Sandgate Esplanade end, it turns off from the A259 road from Folkestone to Hythe (westbound), and provides an alternative (emergency) alternative to the corresponding section of the A 259 Seabrook Road into Hythe. This road is relatively a narrow carriageway with very narrow footpaths either side for pedestrians and is often disrupted by road maintenance and new services excavation works, which frequently is left as a one carriageway thoroughfare to and from the town for freight and busses and the like – with serious congestion and vehicle queuing.

- (3) A number of major housing developments are planned along Seabrook Road (such as currently at No 70) causing contractors parking their personal cars and sub-contractors vans along the northern side of the A259 for up to 100 metres of kerb length, without traffic controls. Consequently there are often long tail backs, especially when heavy plant, like cranes, are trying to achieve access and egress into such sites. Princes Parade can act as short term diversion into and out of Hythe town centre when disruption to the flow of traffic. The Councils proposal to divert the existing road to a more indirect route would be riskier in terms of creating inferior sight lines for drivers and encourage more on-street parking on the diverted section on both sides irrespective of imposed parking controls and thus cause further traffic congestion.
- (4) The reason for the diversion is unnecessary and would provide no benefit to vehicular access to the proposed Leisure Centre, which could be designed with safe and convenient road entrances and exits.
- (5) Princes Parade would benefit from some moderate traffic calming features, for although the majority of road users drive at moderate speeds, there are some, particularly motorcyclists that test their machines along that stretch. However, we have nor heard of any accidents – because the sight lines ahead are so clear and traffic are aware of pedestrians crossing. Indeed, the latter can see all traffic very well and decide when it is safe to cross. The diverted road is likely to worsen a clear view for both pedestrians and motorists. Why change the configuration of a road alignment which works well safety-wise and which motorists and walkers really enjoy.
- (6) The Council’s application is premature as the approval of their “luxury” housing development may not be granted consent given the local controversy. If it achieves consent, there would inevitably be a new population of very local road users and walkers, most owning vehicles increasing road usage via a contoured 2 Km stretch of road, which will be more dangerous. The government department should insist upon a detailed design showing all sight lines and safety measures for the diverted kilometre of highway (likely supported on stilts over the 6 hectares of landfill with a precipitous drop on its norther side – requiring strong concrete barriers) and its intersection with the unaffected westernmost section. A residential/leisure centre scheme could be designed more easily without diverting Princes Parade.
- (7) The Council’s reasons are purely architectural and aesthetic and to enhance property values of the new homes and thus maximise the market value of its adjacent land – despite its status as a “valueless” toxic landfill site. There are no technical needs to divert the highway which we can discern or good case made by FHDC.

We would much appreciate an acknowledgement of this objection email.

Yours faithfully

Derek H Maynard FRICS