

POLICY HO2G - PRINCES PARADE, SEABROOK, HYTHE

Objections

119/1	HO2 G	Mr/s R Fryer Alison Graves	nfs
12/1	HO2 G	Mr E B Fancourt	nfs
120/1	HO2 G	Mr/s R Masterson	nfs
121/1	HO2 G	Mr D Moule	nfs
127/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) C S Turnbull	nfs
178/1	HO2 G	Mr/s D McCrory	nfs
203/1	HO2 G	Ms Christine Connell	nfs
214/1	HO2 G	Mr/s Lawless	nfs
321/1	HO2 G	Dr A R Nutbeam	nfs
322/1	HO2 G	Mrs W A Coward	nfs
329/1	HO2 G	Mr/s G C Wyatt	nfs
388/10	HO2 G	Pentland Homes Ltd Charles Evans	nfs
397/1	HO2 G	Dr John Woodward	nfs
399/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) S Musgrave	nfs
400/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) J M Fish	nfs
405/1	HO2 G	Mr/s I Falconer	nfs
406/1	HO2 G	Mr/s M Chatfield	nfs
408/1	HO2 G	Mr/s Watts	nfs
41/1	HO2 G	Mr/s B Gilliland	nfs
413/1	HO2 G	Ms M Little	nfs
419/1	HO2 G	Mr Norman Buckley	nfs
423/1	HO2 G	Mrs K Todd	nfs
435/1	HO2 G	Mr J K Seddon Mrs A Graves	nfs
45/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) M R Steel	nfs
50/1	HO2 G	Mrs A B E Martin	nfs
500/1	HO2 G	Mr F T Moore	nfs
501/1	HO2 G	Mr/s P Banbury	nfs
535/1	HO2 G	Mr G L Gillett	nfs
538/1	HO2 G	Mr/s L A Clarke	nfs
558/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) R H Critchley	nfs
559/1	HO2 G	Mr/s Pound	nfs
560/1	HO2 G	Ms Philippa Burden	nfs
638/2	HO2 G	Mr Peter Davenport	nfs
643/2	HO2 G	Mr R Swandale	nfs
645/1	HO2 G	Mrs R M Singleton	nfs
651/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) P A Pemberton	nfs
653/1	HO2 G	Mr/s J Reed	nfs
655/1	HO2 G	Mr Kenneth Tee	nfs
660/1	HO2 G	Mr/s R K Arnold	nfs
661/1	HO2 G	Ms Kandy Wellens	nfs
662/1	HO2 G	Mrs E Deakin	nfs
665/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) R D Popkins	nfs
666/1	HO2 G	Mrs N Chapman	nfs
667/1	HO2 G	Mr P Chapman	nfs
669/1	HO2 G	Mr John Bridge	nfs
670/1	HO2 G	Mrs Beryl Bridge	nfs
677/1	HO2 G	Ms Belinda Cheriton	nfs
678/2	HO2 G	Miss E Spark	nfs
686/2	HO2 G	Mr Andrew Craven Kent Wildlife Trust	nfs

Shepway District Local Plan Review - Inspector's Report 2004

766/1	HO2 G	Ms Sue Moore	nfs
781/1	HO2 G	Mr Richard Simmonds Ms Samantha Perks	nfs
88/1	HO2 G	Mr/s B Daynes	nfs
9/1	HO2 G	Mr and Mrs M Harper	nfs
96/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) S Hughes	nfs
102/1	HO2 G	Mr David Lay	INQUIRY
103/1	HO2 G	Mr/s H J Adams	NFS
109/1	HO2 G	Mrs H McCabe	NFS
126/1	HO2 G	Mr George Binns	INQUIRY
133/1	HO2 G	Mr Fred Willmott & Ms Marie Willmott	W/R
135/1	HO2 G	Capt A W Kensett	W/R
136/1	HO2 G	Mr/s E Hards	NFS
173/1	HO2 G	Mr/s G Maxted	NFS
204/1	HO2 G	Miss J A Senter	NFS
213/3	HO2 G	Mr Roger Heald	NFS
226/1	HO2 G	Mr/s Whybrow	NFS
296/3	HO2 G	Hythe Civic Society Colin Colson MBE	NFS
299/1	HO2 G	Mr/s A W Boud	W/R
30/1	HO2 G	Ms Isobel Anderson	NFS
304/1	HO2 G	Mr S G Karpetas	NFS
314/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) J T Davies	W/R
32/1	HO2 G	Mr A Setter	NFS
326/1	HO2 G	Dr P McGuckin	NFS
39/7	HO2 G	Mr Roger Joyce Roger Joyce Associates	NFS
401/1	HO2 G	Mr/s J M J Darke	NFS
402/1	HO2 G	Mr C Pike	NFS
404/1	HO2 G	Mrs Norma Kensett	W/R
407/1	HO2 G	Miss Rita Ericson	NFS
411/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) J P Medlicot	NFS
420/1	HO2 G	Mrs Betty Allan	NFS
421/1	HO2 G	Mr G H Allan	NFS
426/2	HO2 G	Mr(s) C Page	NFS
433/1	HO2 G	Miss C Banner	NFS
439/1	HO2 G	Mr C Young	NFS
476/1	HO2 G	Mrs J Hanks	NFS
477/1	HO2 G	Mr J Hanks	NFS
478/1	HO2 G	Mr W G Leyton	NFS
480/1	HO2 G	Mrs E Spicer	NFS
484/17	HO2 G	Mr P Garber, Planning Director George Wimpey UK	INQUIRY
489/6	HO2 G	Folkestone Development Company R Stevenson, John Bishop & Associates	INQUIRY
497/1	HO2 G	Miss Harris	NFS
498/1	HO2 G	Mr F H Bromley	NFS
530/5	HO2 G	Kingston Homes Ltd Mr R Stevenson	NFS
537/1	HO2 G	Mr(s) P Rivers	NFS
649/1	HO2 G	Ms Denise Maskell	INQUIRY
650/1	HO2 G	Mr/s P Rowe	NFS
652/1	HO2 G	Mr M Jaros	NFS
654/1	HO2 G	Ms Rose Grigsby	NFS
654/2	HO2 G	Ms Rose Grigsby	NFS
656/1	HO2 G	Mr Angus Macmaster	NFS
657/1	HO2 G	Ms Julie Goodall	NFS
658/1	HO2 G	Mr/s P J Oliver	NFS
659/1	HO2 G	Mr/s B Twist	NFS

663/1	HO2 G	Mrs Gladys Cockell	NFS
664/1	HO2 G	Mr/s J Atkins	Cond WD
672/1	HO2 G	Mrs J Pettinger	NFS
673/1	HO2 G	Mr/s J Hall	NFS
674/1	HO2 G	Mr/s G Dunn	NFS
676/1	HO2 G	Mr/s Mike Pratt	NFS
678/1	HO2 G	Miss E Spark	NFS
724/6	HO2 G	Mrs Linda Rene-Martin Sandgate Society	INQUIRY
751/33	HO2 G	Mr(s) Claerwyn Lock, The Environment Agency	NFS
82/3	HO2 G	Dr Richard Scarth	NFS
824/1	HO2 G	Mrs V Collins	NFS
831/1	HO2 G	Mr J A Gill	INQUIRY
870/14	HO2 G	Folkestone Development Company Ltd Jennifer Owen Associates	NFS
873/7	HO2 G	Mr/s M Walker Jennifer Owen Associates	NFS
94/1	HO2 G	Mr F Whittaker	NFS

Issue

Would the allocation achieve the right balance between the housing needs of the District, the environmental, historic and tourism value of the area and the need for open space.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.1.349 To my mind the prospect eastwards along Princes Parade from the vicinity of the Hythe Imperial Hotel is one of the finest vistas in the District. The main characteristic of the area is its grassy openness coupled with public access to the seafront, somewhat akin to the cliff-top open space of The Leas and rare elsewhere in the District. The character, appearance and historical interest of the area is enhanced by the Royal Military Canal (RMC) which separates it from the built-up part of Hythe to the North. The view is closed to the east by the high ground of Sandgate, and inland by tree-clad slopes rising towards the AONB. The sharp contrast revealed in travelling westwards between the closely-developed nature of Sandgate, constrained by topography, and the sudden openness of the Princes Parade area, adds to its character and strong sense of place.

3.1.350 In my view dwellings on the site, particularly if of 4 or 5 storeys, would be unacceptably disruptive and harmful to the attractive open character of Princes Parade and its long vistas, particularly in looking eastwards. The opportunity to provide high quality and high density modern coastal architecture would not outweigh that harm. The loss of openness is as important as visual impact at this key site. The suggested layout shows dwellings at the shore edge, and Princes Parade diverted inland for a significant proportion of its length. Such matters are purely indicative at the Local Plan stage, but there are few options on this shallow site. I consider that the diversion of the road away from the seafront would erode its attraction and integrity as a unified seaside drive from all the way from Sea Point to the Imperial Hotel, whilst compromising the quiet setting of the Canal, an Ancient Monument. The other main alternative of leaving Princes Parade in place and locating dwellings towards the north of the site would, the Local Planning Authority agrees, be even more likely to adversely affect the character of the RMC. I am aware that various forms of mitigation could be secured at the development control stage, but in I find that the harm from residential development would be so fundamental that I cannot recommend it, in principle, for this site.

3.1.351 I agree therefore with the Inspector in his report on the previous Local Plan inquiry that residential development would be out of character with the site's open nature (CD4.03, paragraph 5.56). This part of Seabrook is deficient in every sort of public open space, according to the plans in Appendix 9 of the RDD, and the tourism industry is of great importance in

Shepway. To my mind the site is best suited to low-key recreation or tourism use, that would take advantage of and enhance the unique appearance, setting and recreational value of both the seafront and the Canal. A severely limited amount of building might be possible, if essential for those uses and if it would retain the attractive character and openness of the area. I consider that development of the scale of a hotel would be unlikely to meet these requirements, and I recommend that this site be deleted from Policy TM3. The previous Inspector mentioned hotel development somewhat tentatively. He clearly did not consider that hotel use was such a strong contender on this site that it should be included in his recommendation, nor did it feature in the 1997 Local Plan.

3.1.352 It is unfortunate that the site is one of the District's few significant areas of previously-developed land within the urban area, although that status arises from the lack of a restoration condition on the old planning permission for landfill use. There is no doubt that it is a sustainable location for housing and that it ranks in the top category of the search sequence of PPG3. Its deletion as a housing allocation would make it more difficult for the Local Planning Authority to achieve its target of 60% of dwellings on previously-developed land in the Plan period, although I do not consider that this is determinative. However, I find that this is one of the rare occasions where the need to preserve the open character of a site, and its relationship to both the sea and the Canal, is so important that it outweighs the imperatives of PPG3.

3.1.353 I recognise that good design would be a prerequisite of housing development on this site, and that a narrow belt of Policy LR9 land would provide a buffer between development and the Canal. I note also that the previous Inspector made his comments in the climate of an over provision of housing land at the time, and before the publication of PPG3. The Environment Agency (EA) confirm that there is no risk at the site from fluvial flooding. A flood risk assessment has been carried out which indicates that, because of its history of landfill, the site surface is above the 1 in 1,000 year flood level. This affords protection from tidal flooding considerably in excess of the 1 in 200 year standard required by PPG25. The EA have yet to comment on the detailed assumptions and calculations which underlie the assessment, but from the evidence presented I consider it unlikely that lack of defence from flood risk would prevent housing development, in principle, at Princes Parade. As with many brownfield sites there is some contamination, but a range of reclamation treatments are available. A preliminary investigation of ground conditions shows no reason to suppose that a more detailed survey would reveal levels of contamination that would preclude development. I have taken into account the fact that housing development could help to finance the provision of recreational facilities and landscaping on the Policy LR9 land. Developer contributions could also help towards the provision of any necessary social, community or transport infrastructure, and a development of 100 dwellings would yield a proportion of affordable housing under Policy HO6. I saw that at present the site is somewhat untidy and is not open space to which the public have access. However, I find that none of these matters, nor any others put before me, are enough to outweigh my overall conclusion that this site should not be allocated for housing or for hotel use.

3.1.354 The removal of Site HO2G would leave the housing supply short of 100 dwellings in the second part of the Plan period. I have recommended elsewhere in this report the allocation of replacement land for housing at Herring Hang Field New Romney, at Links Way on Park Farm, Folkestone and at Site HO2L at Barnhurst Lane, Hawkinge, which would replace that shortfall. Full reasoning is found under those headings and in the section on Policy HO2 and Policy CO24.

3.1.355 I consider that the Policy HO2G allocation should be replaced on the Proposals Map by washing the Policy LR9 designation over that site. Alternatively the Council may wish to

consider a mixed low-key tourism/recreation use on the land, supported by a new policy and reasoned justification in Chapter 6 of the Plan.

RECOMMENDATIONS

3.1.356 *Modify Policy HO2 and the Proposals Map by removing site HO2G, Princes Parade. Carry out consequential amendments to housing figures and reasoned justification in Chapter 3.*

3.1.357 *Modify the Proposals Map by replacing the Policy HO2G designation by a Policy LR9 designation. Alternatively the Council may wish to consider a replacement mixed low-key tourism/recreation use on the HO2G designation area, supported by a new site-specific policy and reasoned justification in Chapter 6 of the Plan.*

POLICY HO2H - LAND OFF ROMNEY AVENUE, FOLKESTONE

Objections

295/1	HO2 H	Mr T Bull	nfs
409/1	HO2 H	Mr P M Baker	nfs
496/1	HO2 H	Ms Emma Santer	nfs
199/1	HO2 H	Mr Peter Farrell	NFS
213/1	HO2 H	Mr Roger Heald	INQUIRY
42/1	HO2 H	Mr A R Watson	NFS
514/1	HO2 H	Mr(s) R Taylor	NFS
60/1	HO2 H	Mrs Kate Amor	NFS
679/1	HO2 H	Mr David Kesby The Ramblers Association	INQUIRY

Issue

Whether this allocation is the best way of contributing to meeting the housing needs of the District having regard to the issues of surface water drainage, access and the Green Walk.

Inspector's Reasoning and Conclusions

3.1.358 The site is on steep land of the Enbrook Valley. It is overgrown with scrubby vegetation and a number of large trees which may be important in restricting surface and ground water flows. I understand that there have been instances of flooding in the area, and problems arising from certain private foul drains. However I consider that there are satisfactory engineering solutions to questions of foul and surface water drainage, and land stability, which could be addressed at the planning application stage. The Council confirms that off-street parking would be provided and there are no access or other highway objections to the proposed allocation. There is no right in planning law to a private view, and I am satisfied that design, height and massing would be matters that the Local Planning Authority would consider carefully as part of any planning application for this hillside site.

3.1.359 The land is designated in the currently adopted Local Plan as public open space under Policy LR12, but there is no practical public access to it due to its overgrown state. It was identified many years ago as part of a Green Walk from Sandgate to Shorncliffe Road but that part through site HO2H was not implemented, and land ownership issues may make the
