

---

**From:** martin [REDACTED]  
**Sent:** 20 August 2016 13:01  
**To:** [REDACTED]  
**Cc:** [REDACTED]  
**Subject:** RE: Princes Parade - Design Team Meeting  
**Attachments:** Princes Parade Heritage Comments MM200816.doc

Sue – sorry for the slight delay in replying. I was away most of last week.

Please find attached my comments for your consideration.

## **Princes Parade, Folkstone: Heritage Comments MM 20/08/16**

### **Responses to 'Questions for masterplan options'**

*17. The sections are probably the most important in terms of understanding the likely impact on the canal. What's the heritage view of the options?*

Which section is better or worse is a moot point.

Retaining the road in its present position (option 1) would mean that the ARC building in particular would loom over the canal and change the canal's rural, almost wilderness feel. On the other hand its present character is one of enclosure, quite different to the open setting it would once have had. As with the rest of the scheme, it can be argued that whilst the development will make an impact on the present landscape character, it will do less damage to its already damaged and denuded historic setting.

A principle argument for retaining the road in its present position is that the reduction in costs could perhaps mean that fewer houses are needed as a part of the enabling development, thus reducing the impact of the scheme on the existing open landscape.

Unless there are very definite ideas about what to do with the promenade once it is liberated from the road, then an option of retaining the road, reducing the number of houses and thereby increasing the amount of open space on site should be investigated. If acceptable to the client, it would be useful to discuss this matter with Historic England.

I can see no particular advantage, in heritage terms, of running the road through the centre of the site.