

**From:** Chris Turnbull [mailto: [REDACTED]]  
**Sent:** 24 May 2021 14:17  
**To:** Princes.Parade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk  
**Cc:** NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>; NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>  
**Subject:** NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254 – Princes Parade Stopping Up Order

Dear Tim Madden,

Thank you for the email below.

I have reviewed the report considering the objections received and can confirm that I would like my original objections, which have not been satisfied by the Council's report, to remain in place.

The original objections are below with additional rationale in italics:

Princes Parade itself is iconic (opened by the Prince of Wales in 1890) and is a major asset to Hythe in that it attracts a huge number of tourists to that stretch of beach where they can park right next to the promenade and unload fishing gear and family equipment direct from their car in preparation for a day on the beach. Moving the road back will remove that facility and ease of access to the beach. It may make for a better view for the inhabitants of the new houses and people sitting in the leisure centre, but it is a significant and unacceptable detriment to all of the current users. *The number of parking spaces is significantly reduced and the parking much less convenient for visitors /tourists and beach users (who the council allege will benefit from the changes) The council argue that there is sufficient parking provided to the west of the development. However, this undermines their merit reasoning that tourists will be drawn by the open spaces and facilities at the new promenade section where the road has been moved from. The Council claim that "The realigned road will enhance visual amenity and enjoyment for public users of the road and the RMC;" cannot be true. The visual amenity will be the same for the part of the road which remains the same and reduces hugely as it effectively, goes through a housing estate and past the parking area for the leisure centre.*

There are very few stretches of the coast where walkers, joggers, cyclists and mobility scooters can travel along a promenade looking out on one side across a beautiful bay and the other, up to the hills and then walk across a few yards and be on the footpath of a tranquil, beautiful and historic section of canal in the countryside. By moving the road, as pointed out by Historic England, the ambiance and surroundings of the historic, peaceful and beautiful Royal Military Canal will be lost on that section where the road is proposed to run along the top overlooking the canal. This represents a significant disadvantage to the people of Hythe, Seabrook, Sandgate and the many visitors. *The road design at the top of the bank overlooking the canal has not been released, but cannot be achieved without significant reinforcement of that bank which is unstable. The route of the new road performs 90 deg bends where it turns parallel to the canal and away from it. For adequate safety above the large drop down to the canal path, crash barriers will be required. Hence, creating additional height of the eyesore visible from the acknowledged valuable Green Corridor below.*

The Stopping up of the Road is not required in order to achieve the planned development (should this ill advised development get the go-ahead) The new development could be accessed from the existing road. *The Council's explanation of why the development cannot be undertaken without moving the road is extremely vague. It may be that some of the perceived merit is diminished if the road is not moved, but an alternative, viable design was submitted to the council by their own sub-contracted design consultants at the early stages of this development planning. This plan did not*

*involve any moving of the road.*

FHDC state that " By relocating the road to the rear of the site, we can generate a vehicle free link from the proposed leisure centre and housing development to the beach and existing promenade". This is not a good enough reason to disadvantage all of the current users of the road and promenade. There are plenty of examples of speed control and traffic management systems enabling pedestrians and vehicles to co-exist perfectly happily and the same could be achieved here without the need to place a road so close to a historic monument and spoil the tranquility of the green haven of the Royal Military Canal. *Since the supporting surveys were carried out, much has changed in terms of the value attributed to quiet green corridors for outside recreation and exercise. The permanent damage to this tranquil and historic space is not merited by the speculative and dubious claims made by the council for the design they claim necessitates the stopping up of the road.*

There is no doubt that Princes Parade needs traffic calming measures now . However, by stopping it up and diverting the road, traffic along the busy A259 will be significantly increased past a Primary School and an already dangerous junction with Horn Street where, with the increase in housing on Shorncliffe, traffic management is currently inadequate. *Since, these objections were submitted, the house building on Horn Street and on Shorncliffe have indeed hugely increased the traffic at the 2 junctions where Horn Street and Hospital Hill meet the A259 and there is always a traffic build up, particularly at School start and finish times when children and parents are already being subjected to increased air pollution from slow moving or stationary traffic. With Princes Parade ceasing to be a viable alternative route, this situation will become significantly more dangerous. Princes Parade is a 'Strategic Link Road' between Hythe and Folkestone and for many residents is the route of choice from South Hythe through to Seabrook, Sandgate and Folkestone. Their alternatives are the narrow, parked up Stade Street or Twiss Road where the junctions to access the A259 are already very congested and difficult. The road stoppage will significantly disadvantage these residents.*

In any case, The Stopping Up Order should not be granted until the full plans for the development and the road layout together have been approved. It is neither sensible nor necessary to grant the order in advance of the planning permission having been granted as changes to the existing proposal may affect the consideration of the decision on the road. *This objection is clearly valid. For example, until the design of the road layout and construction has been approved, the visual detriment to the Historic Monument and the Green Corridor cannot be assessed.*

Yours sincerely

Chris Turnbull.

On 10/05/2021 11:35, [Princes.Parade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk](mailto:Princes.Parade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk) wrote:  
Dear Sir/Madam

**Reference: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254 – Princes Parade Stopping Up Order**

**Why we're contacting you**

We're contacting you because you responded to the statutory consultation regarding the stopping up and diversion of the highway known as Princes Parade. This consultation ended on 7 June 2018. Since then, the development has been subject to a judicial review which was finally dismissed on 29 November 2019. This means that we can move forward and consider the responses to the consultation on the stopping up order.

Your objection has been carefully reviewed and considered by the council along with the other objections received. A report has been produced by Buckles Solicitors setting out the key themes of the objection to and the council's response to the objections. The full report can be found on the council's website at <https://folkestone-hythe.gov.uk/princesparadetimeline>.

The report sets out the objections received against the legal tests such as the merits and the necessity tests for a stopping up order. Please see the report for full explanations of the legal tests and considerations for stopping up order. If you have difficulty accessing the website or require a copy of the document to be sent separately to you please let us know by emailing [princesparade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk](mailto:princesparade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk).

You will note in the report, the objections have been categorised into 10 themes. The theme(s) relevant to your specific objection and the corresponding response is/are shown in pages 13-20 of the report.

## What happens next?

The report reviews and addresses the objections received, against the legal tests for stopping up order. If you feel your objection has been adequately addressed, you can withdraw your objection by writing to us at the following email address: [princesparade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk](mailto:princesparade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk)

**Any responses will need to be made by 4pm Monday 7 June 2021.**

If you feel that your objection has not been addressed adequately you may either notify us that you wish your objection to remain in place or, if you do not respond, **it will be assumed you do not wish to withdraw your objection**. Please note that any communication must be in relation to the original objection made and new objections can no longer be submitted. Any objections must also only relate to the stopping up order for the road and not to do with any wider issues of the development.

If you choose to respond, please copy in the case officer at the Department for Transport quoting the above reference number and email it to [nationalcasework@dft.gov.uk](mailto:nationalcasework@dft.gov.uk).



**Tim Madden**

## **Director of Transition and Transformation**

Folkestone & Hythe District Council,  
Civic Centre, Castle Hill Avenue,  
Folkestone, Kent. CT20 2QY.

Office: 01303 853000

Email: [princes.parade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk](mailto:princes.parade@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk)

Website: [www.folkestone-hythe.gov.uk](http://www.folkestone-hythe.gov.uk)

<https://folkestone-hythe.gov.uk/princesparadeFAQ>