

From: Roger Wild [mailto: [REDACTED]]
Sent: 06 June 2018 09:01
To: NATIONALCASEWORK <NATIONALCASEWORK@dft.gov.uk>
Subject: NATTRAN/SE/S247/3254

I strongly oppose the stopping up order for Prince's Parade.

It seems the basis for this proposal is related to providing sea front access to the "potential sports pavilion / swimming pool" so I make the following observations:

- 1) The pathway along Prince's Parade is currently a minimum 6m wide and in places 9m wide (if you measure like an Estate Agent). This provide adequate space for all walkers and cyclist who currently comfortably share this space, there is no evidence that "a large flow of people will need to access the proposed swimming pool from the sea side pathway. I suggest that 6m wide is "motorway standard" and there can be no need for an increase in width.
- 2) I doubt the Swimming pool will ever be built, however visitors would mainly arrive by car and park adjacent to the facility, they would not need to cross the current road to enter the facility. If they arrive by foot it will be approaching from the land side of Prince's Parade road as that has already a standard width footpath, they will not need to cross the road.
- 3) The routing of the proposed road alongside the canal would a monstrous act of vandalism on an area of outstanding natural beauty. I regularly walk peacefully along the canal bank and enjoy the peace and solitude that this lovely environment provides. Wanton destruction of this natural environment would in my view be amount to a criminal act.
- 4) I know that Hythe Town Council voted to formally oppose the proposed stopping up order for Prince's Parade. Of the 11 councillors present, 9 voted to support an amendment which in effect gave rise to the objection. That 82% level of objection is supported by the local community as many thousands have signed petitions objecting to ANY development on this land.

There is no detailed Cost / Benefit analysis of the proposed "potential sports pavilion / swimming pool" and if this had been done then the matter would have been dropped months ago. We all realise this is a backdoor tactic to build homes and the pool will never be built, it is a travesty that elected members should support this idea, and one can only wonder about their motives.

This stopping up order provides no additional merit to the current environment and should there be rejected.

Regards
Roger Wild

[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]
[REDACTED]