

From: Derek Maynard [mailto:]

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