

From: peter cross [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 28 September 2021 16:39
To: Programme Officer <Programme.Officer@folkestone-hythe.gov.uk>
Subject: Re: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254 or DPI L2250 21 22 SUOH - Princes Parade, Folkestone, CT21 6AQ - Update from Dft - [REDACTED]

Good day,

Thank you for the amended version of the Post Meeting Note following the Pre-Inquiry Meeting held on 21 September 2021, for the above.

The Inspector invited objections to the stopping up of highways, if they did not relate to the development itself, which was granted planning permission.

As stated, the main issue to be considered is if the development could proceed without the road closure.

A question of necessity.

Is this not the wrong way to look at this? It seems to me there are many available sites suitable for housing which could be developed instead of this essential benefit to the community. If the developer cannot proceed with the development without this closure then they should be looking at more appropriate sites, or amending the scheme to suit the site restraints. Why are the Environmental agencies and Planning departments making compromises and concessions when there are so many other options?

This point has not been properly addressed in the application. The emphasis appears to be on the planning authority to decide if the road closure is necessary, rather than the other way around, The developer should be presenting more acceptable proposals.

The construction of the road and associated works will result in an unquantifiable loss of benefit to the community.

I can see no reference in the Officers Report on the planning application to alternative schemes being considered whereby the highway and the public amenity were no lost. It seems it is for the developer to demonstrate that there was no alternative way to provide their access without closing the highway. That the costs or loss of any profits would be prohibitive are neither here nor there as the loss of benefits of these public amenities is immeasurable.

regards

Peter Cross

Peter Cross Dipl Arch

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]

T : [REDACTED]
M : [REDACTED]

E : [REDACTED]
W : [REDACTED]